

Britton Smith Peters & Kalail CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ohio School Boards Association
Capital Conference & Trade Show
Monday, November 10, 2014
9:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.
Room: D 230-232

**BULLYING LAWSUITS –
MINIMIZING LIABILITY**

November 10, 2014

Miriam Pearlmuter, Esq.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalail CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

PRESENTATION TOPICS

- I. Introduction & Definitions
- II. Relevant Laws
- III. Prevention, Policies, and Forms
- IV. Addressing Bullying Complaints
- V. Special Education
- VI. Questions?

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalail CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

WHAT IS BULLYING?

- There is no one definition.
- Many definitions include a power imbalance.
- Most definitions include conduct sufficiently severe to affect the school environment and/or limit the student's participation.
- Definition differences can have real-world impact, e.g., ODE's model policy requires conduct to take place more than once, but OCR's definition specifies that harassment does not have to involve repeated incidents.

www.ohioedlaw.com

**DOs AND DON'Ts
TIPS 1-4**

1. **Don't** emphasize the infraction title or code to the victim/parent.
2. **Don't** insist behavior can't be bullying or harassment just because it happens only once, especially for egregious conduct.
3. **Do** emphasize that you issue consequences based on the particular facts, and there is no one-size-fits-all approach.
4. **Do** apply student code of conduct flexibly within appropriate parameters. Be careful of zero tolerance policies.

www.ohioedlaw.com

**PART I: AMENDMENTS AND STATUTES
14TH AMENDMENT**

- **Due Process Clause:** The state cannot take away your rights without some sort of process. This can include all kinds of bullying claims.
- **Generally:** These suits fail because the government is not obligated to protect you from third parties.
- **State-created Danger:** State creates or increases the danger more than it would have been had the state done nothing.

www.ohioedlaw.com

**DOs AND DON'Ts
TIPS 5-8**

5. **Don't** issue consequences or solve problems in ways that force victims and bullies to work in close proximity to each other.
6. **Don't** mandate mediation, especially in sexual assault cases.
7. **Do** consider, when possible, scheduling classes and seating to keep bullies away from victims.
8. **Do** offer mediation, unless the conflict involves sexual assault.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

EQUAL PROTECTION

- **Equal Protection Clause:** the state will not intentionally discriminate against you based on your race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, citizenship status, gender, etc. These generally include only bullying based on protected status.
- **Traditionally:** Courts explain that unless the plaintiff alleges that the district took her bullying less seriously than that of non-minority children, she doesn't have a discrimination claim.
- **Recent Developments:** Courts have started to view **deliberate indifference** to bullying as evidence of intent to discriminate.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE

- A clearly-unreasonable response to harassment in light of known circumstances.
- Traditionally, courts avoided evaluating districts' disciplinary decisions.
- Now, courts have started to assess districts' responses to bullying. Deliberate indifference has been found where districts took action but harassment continued or worsened.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE FOUND

- *Patterson v. Hudson Area Schools:* Verbally reprimanding bullies is not enough, even though this approach was successful with each particular child. School district changed victim's IEP and he could not attend the resource room anymore, one of the few places he was not bullied.
- *Mathis v. Wayne Cnty Bd. of Educ.:* Even though 7th grade rape perpetrators were suspended from school for 11 days and from the basketball team, the district was deliberately indifferent because they ignored other incidents and eventually allowed the bullies back on the team.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

NO DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE

- *Williams v. Port Huron Sch. Dist.*: Racial bullying included slurs, graffiti, physical violence, and death threats. The 6th Circuit found that the superintendent and principal were not deliberately indifferent because they:
 - Set-up video surveillance
 - Reported incidents to police
 - Ordered students to remove Confederate flags
 - Expelled students
 - Hired management consultants
 - Held training seminars
 - Held parent conferences

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

DOs & DON'Ts TIPS 9-11

9. **Don't** accept a "kids-will-be-kids" approach to student conflicts.
10. **Do** recognize and address patterns, such as "whack-a-mole" bullying.
11. **Do** invite outside consultants, agencies, presenters. More on this later.



www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1ST AMENDMENT: FREE SPEECH ON CAMPUS

- Schools may categorically prohibit:
 - Lewd, vulgar, profane language on school grounds
 - School-sponsored speech because of any legitimate pedagogical concerns
 - Speech that substantially disrupts school operations or interferes with others' rights
 - Speech that is "a true threat," defamatory, drug-promoting or "fighting words"

www.ohioedlaw.com

1ST AMENDMENT: FREE SPEECH OFF CAMPUS AND CYBERBULLYING

Courts will usually uphold discipline for off-campus conduct if the conduct:

- Substantially disrupted learning
- Interfered with school discipline
- Was a true threat

Courts do not uphold policies that are vague or overbroad.

DOs AND DON'Ts TIPS 12 & 13

12. Do consider:

- Location: Is there a connection to the district system or network?
- Disruptive effect
- Nature of speech
- Manner in which speech was distributed

13. Do take action even if you cannot mete out discipline: increasing monitoring/supervision, offer counseling, mediation.

FEDERAL STATUTES

- Title IX: Prohibits gender-based exclusion, denial of benefits, or discrimination in education programs. Includes bullying based on sexual orientation.
- Title VI: Prohibits discrimination based on race, ethnicity, or national origin in federally-funded programs.
- Section 504/ADA: Prohibits discrimination based on disability.
- IDEA: Requires schools to provide special education students with a free and appropriate public education.

TITLE IX, VI, AND 504/ADA

- To succeed on any of these claims, plaintiff must show that:
 - The student falls within a protected category
 - The student was harassed because of his or her protected status
 - The harassment was severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive so that it deprived the student of access to educational opportunities and benefits
 - The district knew about the harassment
 - The district was deliberately indifferent

MORE EXAMPLES OF DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE

- *Logan v. Sycamore Cmty. Sch. Bd. of Educ.*: In this famous sexting suicide case, school district was deliberately indifferent because the counselors and principals knew about the harassment but failed to address it.
- *Galloway v. Chesapeake Union Exempted Vill. Schs. Bd. of Educ.*: Principal and teachers failed to address severe disability-based harassment and even participated in it.

NO DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE FOUND

- *Paldeen v. Merrill Cmty Sch. Dist.*: School district was not deliberately indifferent in rape case because, after the perpetrator engaged in more minor sexual misconduct, the IEP team convened and assigned an adult to continuously monitor the student for 30 days.
- *S.S. v. E. Ky. Univ.*: School district was not deliberately indifferent to disability-based harassment because it: held mediation sessions; arranged for outside speakers; monitored the victim; had police speak with offenders; communicated with parents; and disciplined the bullies.

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT

- Although this is rare, some courts have found that severe and pervasive harassment denies a child a free appropriate public education.
- *Shore Reg'l High Sch. Bd. of Educ. v. P.S.*: Court upheld tuition reimbursement after parent unilaterally placed her son in a private school to avoid bullying.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

REGULATORY AGENCIES – OCR

- The Office of Civil Rights (“OCR”) is charged with protecting civil rights in federally-funded programs.
- Once a complaint is filed, OCR investigates anything remotely relevant, not only the complaint itself.
- This is not a lawsuit, so districts typically do not risk financial liability. Instead, they may be required to implement various corrective measures.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

OCR REQUIREMENTS

- OCR Requires Districts to:
 - Have well-publicized policies prohibiting harassment in protected areas.
 - Have well-publicized procedures for reporting and resolving complaints.
 - Adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for the prompt resolution of sex and disability discrimination.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

OCR EXAMPLE

- *Monroeville Local School District*: After a parent filed a disability-based harassment complaint, the district resolved the situation by:
 - Developing and providing parents with grievance procedures
 - Training officials in civil rights violations
 - Creating a Peer Mediation Council to address bullying
 - Implementing elementary-school activities to reduce conflict
 - Forming a parent support group
 - Implementing a positive reinforcement system
 - Offering mentoring for bullied students

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

STATE STATUTES

- **Anti-bullying statutes:** R.C. 3313.666 and R.C. 3313.667
- **Anti-hazing statutes:** R.C. 2307.44 and R.C. 2903.31
- **Negligence claims and immunity:** R.C. 2744

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

PART II: PREVENTION

- Policies – general tips and cyberbullying suggestions
- Forms
- Anti-Bullying Curricula
- Communication

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal OD, LLC, P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

POLICIES – GENERAL

- Policy Requirements – R.C. 3313.666.
- Policy Development – consider involving principals and teachers.
- Training and Review – All staff working with children should be thoroughly familiar with your anti-bullying policies and guidelines. Review these policies annually and consider having your employees sign that they read and understood.
- Courts and, especially, agencies examine the staff's understanding of, and compliance with, district policies and guidelines.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal OD, LLC, P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

DOs AND DON'Ts – TIPS 14 & 15 CYBERBULLYING

14. **Do** include cyberbullying in your anti-bullying policy, including your Acceptable Use Policy. Illegal or inappropriate internet conduct should be grounds for disciplinary action.
15. **Do** require students to sign a statement agreeing to comply with district rules on internet use and have parent consent and release form.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal OD, LLC, P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

FORMS – DOCUMENT, DOCUMENT, DOCUMENT!

Use separate forms for reporting and investigating bullying.

- Bullying Reporting Form:
 - All bullying complaints (e-mail, phone call) should be reduced to writing. This creates a clean record documenting your district's responses to bullying.
 - These forms should be easily available and parents, children, and staff should be encouraged to use them.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal OD, LLC, P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

FORMS (CON'T)

- Investigation Form. This form should document each step:
 - Witnesses and their statements
 - Interviews with victim, bully, etc.
 - Results of the investigation
 - Consequences
 - Follow-up
 - Parent contact

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal OD, LLC, P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

DOCUMENT RETENTION

- Store reports by victim so staff can easily retrieve them.
- Do not shred or discard emails, discipline records, or bullying forms on a yearly basis, unless required by your district's policies.
- Save all related documents, emails, forms, etc., especially when litigation or charges are pending or threatened.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal OD, LLC, P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ANTI-BULLYING PROGRAMS

- Your anti-bullying program should:
 - Be evidence-based
 - Be age-appropriate, tailored to different grade levels
 - Include regular activities or presentations
 - Include parent and staff training components

www.ohioedlaw.com

COMMUNICATION

- Staff across buildings should communicate with each other about students who either have a history of bullying or being bullied.
- Relevant teachers should also be informed early on in the school year and asked to keep an eye on the situation.

PART III: ADDRESSING BULLYING COMPLAINTS

- **Immediate steps:** Reduce the complaint to writing and investigate.
- **Responsive Interventions:** School-wide, class-wide, group, or individual interventions may be appropriate.
- **Consultants:** Districts with intensive bullying problems can consider hiring a consultant.

IMMEDIATE STEPS

1. Reduce the complaint to writing by filling out a Bullying Report Form.
2. Contact the parent. **Document.**
3. Conduct a thorough investigation. Investigate everyone involved and bystanders, take statements. **Document.**
4. Determine whether the complaint is substantiated and the appropriate consequences. **Document.**
5. Contact the victim's parent – general explanation only. **Document.**
6. Follow-up with victim as necessary.

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RESPONSIVE INTERVENTIONS

- **Class-wide or school-wide training:** Diversity training may be especially useful for protected-category bullying.
- **Group or individual intervention:** Mediation or Social Skills Group.
- **Individual intervention:** Offer Counseling when appropriate.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

CONSULTANTS AND SURVEYS

- Consultants can be useful when your district's bullying problem is extensive. Ex. *Williams v. Port Huron*.
- Surveys: Some districts like to develop formal surveys to assess the extent of the bullying and determine whether their interventions are successful.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND BULLYING

- Bullying situations may indicate socio-emotional difficulties and may suggest that the bully, the victim, or both should be evaluated for special education.
- If either the bully or victim already has an IEP, a reevaluation may be warranted to determine whether additional services are needed.

www.ohioedlaw.com

MANIFESTATION DETERMINATION

- If the bully has an IEP, a disciplinary consequence that results in a “change of placement” requires the IEP team to meet and determine whether the behavior was a manifestation of the disability or resulted from the district’s failure to implement the IEP.
- If the team finds that the infraction resulted from the disability or the district’s failure to implement the IEP, then:
 - Placement cannot be changed without parental consent. Exceptions: weapons, drugs, serious bodily harm.
 - IEP team must conduct FBA and implement or review/modify BIP.

www.ohioedlaw.com

DISCIPLINE (CON’T)

If the bully’s placement cannot be changed, how do we respond to bullying so we are not found to be deliberately indifferent?

- Convene IEP team. FBA? BIP?
- Separating victim and bully (caution advised)
- Services for victim and bully – individual or group counseling
- Monitoring/supervising

www.ohioedlaw.com

DOCUMENT, DOCUMENT, DOCUMENT!

- Document any IEP team decisions through a Prior Written Notice (PWN, PR-01).
- Document attempts to reach parents, parent refusals to sign consent, and any relevant parent conversations.

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalal ATTORNEYS AT LAW

QUESTIONS?

Miriam Pearlmutter
Britton Smith Peters & Kalal Co., L.P.A.
3 Summit Park Drive, Suite 400
Cleveland, OH 44131
216.503.5055
mpearlmutter@ohioedlaw.com

www.ohioedlaw.com

Britton Smith Peters & Kalail CO., L.P.A.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ohio School Boards Association

Capital Conference
and Trade Show

Monday, November 10, 2014
9:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.
Room D 230-232

Bullying Lawsuits – Minimizing Liability

Presented by:

Miriam Pearlmuter

mpearlmuter@ohioedlaw.com

3 Summit Park Drive, Suite 400
Cleveland, Ohio 44131

Phone: (216) 503-5055

Fax: (216) 503-5065

www.ohioedlaw.com

BULLYING LAWSUITS – MINIMIZING LIABILITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	A. Bullying definitions are not all the same	1
	B. General v. Protected Category Bullying.....	1
II.	RELEVANT LAW.....	2
	A. The Fourteenth Amendment.....	2
	B. Federal Statutes	5
	C. State Statutes.....	8
III.	PREVENTIVE STRATEGIES	9
	A. Prevention and Policies – The Law	9
	B. Prevention and Policies – Practical Suggestions.....	11
	C. Prevention and Forms.....	13
	D. Anti-Bullying Curricula	14
	E. Communication.....	14
IV.	ADDRESSING BULLYING COMPLAINTS.....	15
	A. Steps administrators or teachers should take immediately when a parent, child, or staff member reports bullying.....	15
	B. Responsive Interventions	16
	C. Consultants and Surveys	16
V.	SPECIAL EDUCATION AND BULLYING	16
	A. Red Flags.....	16
	B. Deadlines.....	17
VI.	CONCLUSION	18
	DOs AND DON'Ts OF ADDRESSING BULLYING COMPLAINTS.....	19
	SELECT CASE LAW – BULLYING LAWSUITS.....	21

BULLYING LAWSUITS – MINIMIZING LIABILITY

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Bullying definitions are not all the same

1. Ohio's Model Anti-Bullying Policy Definition:
 - i. "Harassment, intimidation or bullying" means either of the following: Any intentional written, verbal, graphic, or physical act that a student or group of students exhibited toward other particular student *more than once* and the behavior both causes mental or physical harm to the other student; and is sufficiently severe, persistent or pervasive that it creates an intimidating, threatening or abusive educational environment for the other student.
 - ii. Bullying includes dating violence.
 - iii. Bullying includes harassment through electronic means (cyber-bullying). An "electronic act" is defined as an act committed through the use of a cellular telephone, computer, pager, personal communication device, or other electronic communication device.
2. Office for Civil Rights:
 - i. Harassing conduct may take many forms, including verbal acts and name-calling; graphic and written statements, which may include use of cell phones or the Internet; or other conduct that may be physically threatening, harmful, or humiliating. *Harassment does not have to* include intent to harm, be directed at a specific target, or *involve repeated incidents*. Harassment creates a hostile environment when the conduct is sufficiently severe, pervasive, or persistent so as to interfere with or limit a student's ability to participate in or benefit from the services, activities, or opportunities offered by a school.
 - ii. When such harassment is based on race, color, national origin, sex, or disability, it violates the civil rights laws that OCR enforces.

B. General v. Protected Category Bullying

1. Generic bullying involves general mean things that kids say to each other - clothes, boyfriends, weight, etc.

2. Bullying based on protected status is harassment based on: race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, ethnicity, color, citizenship status.

II. RELEVANT LAW

A. The Fourteenth Amendment

1. **Due Process:** This clause guarantees that the government will not take away an individual's rights without due process, such as a hearing or trial.
 - i. Bullying lawsuits relying on this clause are not typically successful because the government does not have any general obligation to protect individuals from 3rd party harm.
 - ii. Exceptions include:
 - a) Special relationship: When the state has a special relationship with an individual such that the state controls his or her daily life (ex. prison or foster care).
 - b) State-created danger: When a government actor takes affirmative action creating or increasing the risk of danger to an individual above and beyond the risk that this person would have encountered had the government actor done nothing.
 - (1) School Example: After a child complains she is being bullied, her teacher requires her to work with the bullies on a long-term project in the hopes that the students resolve their differences. Then the bullies harassed the victim above and beyond their previous interactions.
 - (2) This does not apply to counselors who work with students in an effort to help them resolve their issues, and the like.
 - (3) School district did not violate Due Process clause when they dismissed a special education student to her uncle who later raped her. *Doe v. San Antonio Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 197 Fed. Appx. 296 (5th Cir. Tex. 2006)
2. **Equal Protection:** This clause guarantees that the government will not discriminate against any individual based on race, national origin, citizenship status, and religion. These characteristics are called "protected categories."

- i. Protected and Quasi-Protected Categories: race, national origin, citizenship, religion, sexual orientation, and gender.
- ii. Non-Protected Categories: all other characteristics, including disability and poverty. Other federal and state laws protect people with disabilities.
- iii. Decisions under this clause:
 - a) In the past: In the past, courts found violations only when the victim claimed not only that she was bullied, but also that the school took bullying less seriously when the victims were minorities (not members of a protected group).
 - b) Current trend: Some courts, including those in the Sixth Circuit, allow bullying claims to go forward, assuming that a district's deliberate indifference to bullying shows an intent to discriminate.
 - (1) Deliberate indifference is defined as a clearly-unreasonable response to harassment in light of the known circumstances.

Example of deliberate indifference. *Patterson v. Hudson Area Schools*, 551 F.3d 438 (6th Cir. 2009): In a Title IX claim, the court held that a school district was deliberately indifferent when it did nothing but verbally reprimand bullies and removed student from his resource room where he was not bullied.

Example of no deliberate indifference found. *Williams v. Port Huron School District*: the Sixth Circuit found that a superintendent and principal were not deliberately indifferent to race-based bullying. The principal: set up video surveillance where bullying was prominent, reported serious incidents to the police, ordered student to remove Confederate flags from clothing and vehicles, presented regarding inappropriate behavior, expelled children, hired management consultants to study the school, held grade level assemblies, etc. The superintendent approved diversity training seminars, held parent conferences, and arranged for others to assist the principal.

- (2) Some courts find deliberate indifference even when a district does address the bullying problem, but its

efforts are pro forma or are obviously unsuccessful. For example, if bullying continues (even if the bullies are new students), the district's previous responses may be seen as ineffectual and simply repeating them can be seen as deliberately indifferent. Ex. *Patterson v. Hudson Area Schools*, 551 F.3d 438 (6th Cir. 2009).

- c) Court's decisions based on not only the law, but on severity of allegations.
3. **First Amendment:** The Free Speech clause prohibits the government from abridging citizens' freedom of speech.
- i. On-Campus Speech: Schools may categorically prohibit:
 - a) Lewd, vulgar, or profane language, on school property; *Bethel Sch. Dist. No 403 v. Frazer*, 478 U.S. 675 (1986).
 - b) School-sponsored speech (*i.e.*, speech that a reasonable observer would view as the school's own speech) on the basis of any legitimate pedagogical concern; *Hazelwood Sch. Dist. v. Kuhlmeier*, 484 U.S. 260 (1988)
 - c) speech that substantially disrupts school operations or interferes with the rights of others (or if there is a reasonable and particularized fear of a disruption or interference); and
 - d) speech that is a true threat, defamatory, drug-promoting, and fighting words.

Note: Speech created on school grounds (*e.g.*, internet used at school) is usually seen as on-campus speech.

- ii. Off-Campus Speech: The First Amendment creates unique problems for districts seeking to regulate off-campus bullying, including cyberbullying.
 - a) Courts usually uphold discipline for off-campus behavior if schools show the conduct substantially disrupted learning, interfered with school discipline, or was a true threat (serious expression of intent to cause present or future harm).
 - b) To discipline a student, the district must show that the student's conduct violated a law or school rule. Make sure your rules are not "vague" and "overbroad."
 - (1) A rule is "overbroad" when it punishes protected activities as well as non-protected ones.

- (2) A rule is "vague" if it fails to give adequate warning that particular conduct is prohibited or fails to set out adequate standards to prevent arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement.
- c) In determining how to handle off-campus cyber speech, districts should consider:
 - (1) Location of the speech: is there a viable nexus or connection to the district network or system?
 - (2) The disruptive effect, if any, on the educational environment;
 - (3) The nature or type of speech (personal, violent, lewd, vulgar, pro-drug, threatening); and
 - (4) The manner in which the speech was distributed – how did the speech make its way onto the campus?
- d) When a district cannot discipline, always consider other alternatives:
 - (1) ask student to remove web posting and speak to his or her parents;
 - (2) mediation with bully and victim;
 - (3) contact the website and request removal;
 - (4) contact police if a crime may have been committed;
 - (5) offer counseling to the victim;
 - (6) see other examples in Section V – Special Education.

B. Federal Statutes

1. **Title IX:** Forbids gender-based exclusion, denial of benefits, or discrimination in educational programs.
 - i. Schools can be held liable if they are deliberately indifferent to sexual harassment.
 - a) They must have actual knowledge of harassment, but exact details are unnecessary, as long as they could have responded with remedial measures.
 - b) Harassment must be so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it deprives the victim of access to educational

opportunities or benefits. *Davis v. Monroe County Bd. of Educ.* 526 US 629 (1999)

- c) They must be deliberately indifferent, meaning that their response was clearly unreasonable in light of the known circumstances.
 - d) Gender-based discrimination will usually include bullying based on sexual orientation.
 - e) *Ex. Logan v. Sycamore Cmty. Sch. Bd. of Educ.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 77474 (S.D. Ohio June 5, 2012). In this famous sexting suicide case, a school district was found to have been deliberately indifferent because although counselors and principals knew the student was being harassed, they failed to address it.
 - f) *Ex. Pahseen v. Merrill Cmty Sch. Dist.* 668 F.3d 356 (6th Cir. Feb 3, 2012). A school district was not liable in a rape case because it monitored the perpetrator and required an adult to supervise him for 30 days when he was initially enrolled.
2. **Title VI:** Prohibits discrimination based on race, ethnicity, or national origin in federally-funded programs.
- i. Same standards as for Title IX claims- actual knowledge, deliberate indifference, severe, pervasive and objectively offensive harassment.
 - ii. *Vidovic v. Mentor City Sch. Dist.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13301 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 30, 2013)- School district was not deliberately indifferent when the school knew of general problems but did not know these issues were based on national-origin bullying.
 - iii. *Zeno v. Pine Plains Cent. Sch. Dist.*, 702 F.3d 655 (2d Cir. Dec 3, 2012): The district was deliberately indifferent because, despite suspensions, the race-based bullying continued. Importantly, the district refused offers from the NAACP to provide racial sensitivity training and a shadow for the student.
3. **Section 504/ADA:** These laws prohibit discrimination based on disability. As with the other statutes, the plaintiff must show she:
- i. has a disability and was harassed based on that disability;

- ii. the harassment was sufficiently severe or pervasive that it altered the condition of his or her education and created an abusive educational environment;
- iii. the school knew about the harassment but was deliberately indifferent towards it.

Examples:

- a) *Galloway v. Chesapeake Union*: Teachers and principals were deliberately indifferent to disability based bullying when they ignored (and even participated in) the harassment.
 - b) *Ex. S.S. v. E. Ky. Univ.*, 532 F.3d 445, 456 (6th Cir. Ky. 2008): School district was not deliberately indifferent to disability-based bullying because it held mediation sessions with students, arranged for outside speakers, monitored the victim, had police speak with the offending students, communicated with parents, and disciplined bullies.
4. **IDEA:** The IDEA requires districts to provide special education students with a free appropriate public education (“FAPE”). Some courts have entertained bullying claims, finding that harassment can be so severe and pervasive that it denies a child a free appropriate public education.
- i. *Shore Reg'l High Sch. Bd. of Educ. v. P.S.*, 381 F.3d 194 (3d Cir. N.J. 2004): Court upheld a tuition reimbursement award when parents unilaterally removed their son from the district, alleging that the school district could not provide him with a FAPE because it failed to prevent or stop harassment.
 - ii. *Stringer v. St. James R-1 Sch. Dist.*, 446 F.3d 799, 803 (8th Cir. Mo. 2006): Parents failed to state an IDEA claim for harassment because their allegations did not show how the bullying deprived the child of access to the basic educational benefits.
5. **Regulatory Agencies and Decisions:** Regulatory agencies, such as OCR and ODE, develop regulations and enforce the aforementioned federal laws.
- i. **OCR:** The Office for Civil Rights uses its own standard in investigating bullying complaints. These standards are stricter than those used by the courts. Dear Colleague Letter (October 26, 2010):

- a) Actual knowledge v. OCR’s “known or should have known.” OCR will find that the district knew or should have known if it would have learned of the harassment had it exercised reasonable care or made a reasonably diligent inquiry.
 - b) Severe, pervasive, AND /OR objectively offensive. Courts require all three, OCR requires only one.
 - c) Affectively bars access v. OCR’s “interferes or limits participation”
 - d) Respond in a manner not clearly unreasonable v. OCR’s requirement to “take prompt and effective steps reasonably calculated to end the harassment, eliminate any hostile environment, and prevent its recurrence.”
 - e) OCR will review a district’s global approach- staff training, systematic approach, review of school climate, prevention programs, investigation policies, etc. Most districts will agree to implement various corrective measures through a resolution agreement rather than risk a finding that it violated the student’s rights.
 - f) Example: Monroeville (OH) Local School District (April 14, 2006). OCR required the district to implement extensive corrective measures after a parent filed a complaint alleging that the district failed to address disability-based harassment. Among other changes, OCR required the district to: (1) develop and send home grievance procedures; (2) train officials in civil and criminal laws relevant to civil rights violations; (3) create a Peer Mediation Council to address continuing bullying concerns; (4) implement age-appropriate activities for elementary school students to prevent or reduce conflict; (5) form a parent support group; (6) implement a positive reinforcement system; and (7) offer mentoring for bullied students.
- ii. **ODE:** ODE can review bullying allegations, either through a Due Process hearing or an investigation.

C. State Statutes

1. **Anti-Bullying Statutes:** Ohio statutes do not prohibit bullying. Instead, they require districts to develop specific anti-bullying policies.

- i. R.C. § 3313.666: Districts must develop a policy prohibiting bullying, harassment, and intimidation. Policy requirements are detailed below in Section III. A. Prevention and Policies: The Law.
 - ii. Model Policy from ODE available at <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Other-Resources/School-Safety/Safe-and-Supportive-Learning/Anti-Harassment-Intimidation-and-Bullying-Model-Po>
 - iii. R.C. § 3313.667: districts should use federal funds to provide training, workshops, or courses related to the above policy.
 - iv. Neither statute allows for private lawsuits.
2. **Anti-Hazing Statutes:** R.C. § 2307.44 and R.C. § 2903.31 prohibit hazing and allow a civil action for damages.
- i. Hazing is defined as “doing any act or coercing another, including the victim, to do any act of initiation into any student or other organization that causes or creates a substantial risk of causing mental or physical harm to any person.”
 - ii. To sustain a hazing claim, the plaintiff must allege a dangerous act of initiation and desired membership in a particular group.
2. **Negligence/Malice, Bad Faith, etc.:** Bullying suits can also be filed as state-law negligence claims. In other words, plaintiffs can allege the district had a duty to protect the student and was negligent in failing to do so.
- i. Districts are typically immune from these lawsuits under R.C. § 2744.02, Ohio’s Political Subdivision Tort Liability Act.
 - ii. District employees are typically immune unless the plaintiff alleges facts showing that the employees acted with malice, in bad faith, recklessly, or wantonly. R.C. § 2744.03 (6)(b).

III. PREVENTIVE STRATEGIES

These policies and practices should be in place before bullying is reported. Courts and agencies tend to look favorably on districts that are proactive in their efforts to address bullying.

A. Prevention and Policies – The Law

1. Revised Code 3313.666 requires Boards of education to establish anti-bullying policies:

Boards of Education of all city, local, exempted village, and joint vocational school districts must establish individual policies prohibiting harassment, intimidation, and bullying on school property, on a school bus, or at school-sponsored events and expressly providing for the possibility of suspension of a student found responsive for harassment, intimidation, or bullying by an electronic act. The policy must be developed in consultation with (1) parents; (2) school employees; (3) school volunteers; (4) students; and (5) community members. The policy must include the following:

- i. A statement prohibiting harassment, intimidation, or bullying of any student on school property or at school-sponsored events;
- ii. A definition of harassment, intimidation, or bullying in accordance with the language in the statute (as laid out above);
- iii. A procedure for reporting prohibited incidents;
- iv. A requirement that school personnel report prohibited incidents of which they are aware to the school principal or other administrator designated by the principal;
- v. A requirement that custodial parents or guardians of any student involved in a prohibited incident be notified and, to the extent permitted by R.C. § 3319.321¹ and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g², have access to any written reports pertaining to the prohibited incident;
- vi. A procedure for documenting any prohibited incident that is reported;
- vii. A procedure for responding to and investigating any reported incident;
- viii. A strategy for protecting a victim or other person from new or additional harassment, intimidation, or bullying, and from

¹ R.C. § 3319.321 is the Ohio law that prohibits the public release of personally identifiable student information other than directory information, subject to certain limited exceptions. Directory information includes information such as a student’s name, address, telephone listing, date and place of birth, participation in officially recognized activities and sports, weight and height of members of athletic teams, dates of attendance, date of graduation and awards received.

² FERPA is the federal law that protects the privacy of student educational records. Under FERPA, all but directory information regarding a student is prohibited from public release, subject to certain limited exceptions.

retaliation following a report, including a means by which a person may report an incident anonymously;

- ix. A disciplinary procedure for any student guilty of harassment, intimidation, or bullying, which does not infringe on any student's rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;
- x. A statement prohibiting students from deliberately making false reports of harassment, intimidation, or bullying and a disciplinary procedure for any student responsible for deliberately making a false report of that nature; and
- xi. A requirement that the administration semiannually provide the board president a written summary of all reported incidents and post the summary on its website, if the district has a website, to the extent permitted by R.C. § 3319.321 and FERPA.

- 2. Anti-bullying policies must be included in student handbooks and must include cyberbullying information:

The policy must be included in student handbooks and any other publications that set forth the comprehensive rules, procedures, and standards of conduct for schools and students in the district. The policy and explanation of the seriousness of bullying by electronic means shall be made available to students in the district and to their custodial parents or guardians. Information regarding the policy should also be included in employee training manuals.

- 3. Boards must explain the anti-bullying policy and consequences for violations:

To the extent that state or federal funds are appropriated for this purpose, each board shall require that all students enrolled in the district annually be provided with age-appropriate instruction, as determined by the board, on the board's policy, including a written or verbal discussion on the consequences for violations of the policy.

- 4. Boards must forward the anti-bullying policy to parents annually:

Each board shall require that once each school year a written statement describing the policy and the consequences for violations of the policy be sent to each student's custodial parent or guardian. The statement may be sent with regular student report cards or may be delivered electronically.

B. Prevention and Policies – Practical Suggestions

1. General Policy Training and Review

All staff members who work with children should be familiar with your district's anti-bullying policies and guidelines. Courts and administrative agencies examine not only the district's policies and guidelines, but also the staff's understanding of, and compliance with, these policies.

- i. *Example:* If your district's policy requires all informal reports to be reduced to writing and submitted to the superintendent, each staff member must understand what an informal report is and how to forward this to the superintendent.
- ii. *Example:* If your district's guidelines direct teachers to forward bullying complaints to a Civil Rights Coordinator, your staff must know the contact information for that individual and understand what types of complaints, and in what format, should be forwarded.
- iii. Review policies annually and with new staff.
- iv. Consider having your employees sign that they read and understood the materials:

2. Cyberbullying Policies

Cyberbullying has become an area of unique concern because:

- i. Cyberbullies can spread hurtful messages to a very wide audience with remarkable speed. Unlike traditional rumors that eventually die out, rumors in cyberspace can be cut, pasted, printed, and forwarded ad infinitum.
- ii. Cyberbullies do not have to own their own actions or fear punishment, because it's very difficult to identify them if they use screen names.
- iii. Home may no longer be a haven from bullying.
- iv. Cyberbullying can sometimes be outside the legal reach of schools and school boards because the behavior often happens outside of school on home computers or cellular phones.

3. Policy Suggestions

- i. As noted above, the recently-amended R.C. § 3313.666 requires District policies to explicitly include cyberbullying in its anti-bullying policy.

- ii. Illegal or inappropriate internet-related conduct should be considered grounds for disciplinary action.
- iii. Acceptable Use Policy:
 - a) Acceptable Use Policies ("AUPs") can help educate students, parents, and staff about internet use and issues of online privacy and safety, and to seek parental consent for their children's internet use.
 - b) Make cyberbullying a punishable offense.
 - c) Require students to sign a statement agreeing to comply with district rules on network or internet use and have parents sign a consent form and a release authorizing their child's use of the school network.
 - d) In the release, the authorized student user and his/her parent (if the student is under age 18) should agree to indemnify and hold the school system harmless from all claims that result from the student's activities while using the school's network and that cause direct or indirect damage to the user, the school system, or third parties.
 - e) The release should also prohibit e-mails that include malicious gossip and slander, "hit lists" via e-mail or other methods of electronic communication naming specific students and/or teachers, and changing other students' e-mail or personal settings.

C. Prevention and Forms

1. Your policies require reporting and documenting bullying incidents. Make sure your forms are up-to-date and are easily available to parents, staff, and students.
2. For clarity, use separate forms to describe the bullying incident and to document the investigation, and results.
 - i. **Bullying Incident Form:** These should be available online, and in each principal's office, at a minimum. To aid in retrieval, consider printing these on colored paper.
 - a) Reduce all bullying complaints, even verbal ones or those sent by e-mail, to writing. Your staff should fill out this form whenever any parent, child, or other staff member reports a bullying incident. Not only is documenting bullying

complaints required by your policies, but reducing even informal complaints to writing creates a clean record that shows your district is not deliberately indifferent to bullying.

- b) Do not assume a computer program, such as Public School Works, suffices to document investigations or bullying claims because such programs may categorize infractions by the offender and not by the victim.
 - c) Notify parents, children, and staff about these forms and encourage their use.
- ii. **Bullying Investigation and Results Form:** The administrator or teacher responsible for investigating bullying should complete this form to document the investigation details: who witnessed the event, who was interviewed and when, what the results of the investigation were and whether the offender received any consequences. Attach any witness statements to this document.
2. **Document Retention:** Emails and phone conversations are not enough to document the incident or follow-up with parents.
- i. Store your bullying report and investigation forms by victim and in a way that your staff can retrieve them easily.
 - ii. Do not shred forms or discard e-mails on a yearly basis, unless required by your district's records retention policy. Be especially careful to retain documents when litigation or an administrative charge is pending or threatened.

D. Anti-Bullying Curricula

There is a plethora of anti-bullying programs.

- 1. A general "leadership" or "citizenship" program with a "good friend" module is not enough. The ideal anti-bullying program is:
 - i. evidence-based;
 - ii. tailored to grade levels;
 - iii. includes regular hands-on activities or presentations;
 - iv. has a parent and/or staff training component

E. Communication

Districts should examine whether staff communicate about bullying issues across buildings and identify students who have a history of bullying or being bullied.

IV. ADDRESSING BULLYING COMPLAINTS

A. Steps administrators or teachers should take immediately when a parent, child, or staff member reports bullying

1. **Reduce the complaint to writing.** A bullying report form should be completed for every complaint, even one sent by e-mail or discussed over the phone.
 - i. Do not assume minor infractions are not bullying. Disability-based bullying, for example, can be as simple as one child calling a student with an IEP “stupid.”
 - ii. Remember, computer programs that store disciplinary reports are not enough to document bullying complaints and your district’s response to them.
2. **Document and Investigate.** Every step of your investigation should be documented.
 - i. After reducing the complaint to writing, call the alleged victim’s parent and let them know of the incident and your district’s follow-up procedures. Document this call.
 - ii. Conduct a thorough investigation. Interview the victim, the bully, and any witnesses. Witnesses should give statements when possible. Document these steps on your district’s Investigation and Results form.
 - iii. Determine whether the complaint is substantiated and if so, what consequences the bully will receive. Use your district’s disciplinary policies as a guide. Document any discipline the bully receives: verbal reprimand, recess suspension, detention, in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, etc.
 - iv. Contact the victim’s parent and let them know, in general terms only, the results of your investigation. FERPA does not permit you to inform the victim’s parents about any specific discipline given to another child, so take care to be general in your conversation. Ex. *Our investigation substantiated your daughter’s complaint and appropriate disciplinary consequences have been administered. Please let us know immediately if the bullying continues.* If possible, provide this information in writing.
 - v. Follow up with the victim, as necessary. Encourage the child to report any additional harassment and assign a staff member to check-in with the student regularly.

B. Responsive Interventions

1. Consider a class-wide or school-wide intervention, especially if the bullying is based on a protected category such as race or religion. For example, when a child complains of race-based bullying, consider whether diversity training may be useful for the class or school as a whole.
2. Consider group or individual interventions.
 - i. **Mediation:** A formal mediation session for the bully and victim indicates that your district took the complaint seriously. An adult facilitator typically meets with the children and develops an agreement, sometimes memorialized by a written contract.
 - ii. **Social Skills Groups:** Many school psychologists, social workers, and guidance counselors run social skills groups with children who have identified social difficulties. Both bullies and victims benefit from additional social skills training.
 - iii. **Counseling:** Offer individual counseling to bullying victims, as needed.

C. Consultants and Surveys

1. **Consultants:** Districts with extensive bullying problems should consider engaging a consultant for specific and relevant suggestions. Courts mention this approach as an example of a reasonable response to bullying.
2. **Surveys:** Developing and administering a formal survey to students and/or parents is generally a good way to assess a school's "climate" and begin addressing harassment or bullying.
 - i. Follow up on any survey results that indicate a child is being bullied. Treat survey results just as you would any other bullying complaint.
 - ii. General survey results should be reviewed and used to develop or enhance anti-bullying programs. Do not leave your survey results in a box in the closet.

V. SPECIAL EDUCATION AND BULLYING

A. Red Flags

Bullying incidents can indicate the need for special education services:

1. An evaluation if the bully is not on an IEP.

2. A reevaluation if the bully is suspected to be misidentified.
3. An evaluation or reevaluation for the victim to address emotional difficulties or social skill deficits.

B. Deadlines

Intervention Assistance Teams (“IAT”) and IEP teams should pay particular attention to victims already receiving special education services, because complainants may allege IDEA and Section 504 violations by claiming the victim has been deprived of educational benefits as a result of the bullying.

1. **Child Find:** Districts are required to identify, locate, and evaluate students who are suspected of having a disability that may require specialized instruction. If your district does not consider evaluating bullies or victims, it may be violating Child Find.
2. **Evaluations:** Once a district determines that a bully or victim should be evaluated, the district has 60 days from the date of the parent’s written consent to complete an ETR and hold the ETR meeting.
 - i. Any assistance the IAT implements related to social skills (*e.g.*, RTI) should be undertaken contemporaneously with the evaluation process, and should not be used to delay an evaluation.
3. **FBA and BIP:** If a student exhibits ongoing or extensive behavioral concerns, his or her evaluation may need to include a Functional Behavior Assessment (“FBA”) leading to a Behavior Intervention Plan (“BIP”). If a student has a behavior goal on his or her IEP, the IEP team may examine whether that goal is appropriate given the ongoing bullying behavior.
4. **Victims with an IEP:** OCR recently issued a Dear Colleague Letter (8/20/13) noting that some districts attempt to solve bullying problems by removing the bullied child to a different setting. If the student has an IEP, OCR cautions districts to consider whether a more restrictive placement may violate FAPE.
 - i. “Placement in a more restrictive 'protected' setting to avoid bullying behavior may constitute a denial of the IDEA's requirement that the school provide FAPE in the LRE,”
 - ii. Districts cannot attempt to resolve bullying by unilaterally changing the frequency, duration, intensity, placement, or location of the student's special education services.

- iii. If the district believes such a change is necessary, it must convene a IEP team meeting-- including the parent -- and discuss a possible change in services or placement.
5. **Bullies with an IEP /Manifestation Determinations:** When a child with a disability violates the student code of conduct, the team may consider changing the student's programming or his or her placement. To do so, the IEP team must conduct a manifestation determination hearing within 10 days of the decision to change placement.
- i. If the team determines the behavior was, in fact, a manifestation of the student's disability, the district may not change the student's placement without parental consent, unless a 45- day emergency removal exception applies (weapons, drugs, serious bodily harm).
 - ii. If placement cannot be changed, consider these options:
 - a) convene the IEP team to revise the student's IEP and or BIP;
 - b) separate the bully and victim (proceed with caution);
 - c) provide counseling or mediation services for both victim and bully;
 - d) increase monitoring or supervision
 - e) if all else fails, consider filing a Due Process complaint to change the bully's or victim's placement. Consult with counsel before taking this step.
6. **Documentation:** As always, documenting IEP team suggestions and decisions under these circumstances is critical. IEP teams should send Prior Written Notices (PR-01) to parents whenever any decision is made, regardless of whether the parents are in agreement with the outcome. Teams should also document attempts to reach parents, parent refusals to sign consent to evaluations or services, and any relevant parent conversations.

VI. CONCLUSION

Bullying lawsuits and agency complaints are on the rise, especially as related to protected status bullying and harassment. To protect students and limit liability, districts need to develop comprehensive policies; implement preventive programs; document all reports, investigations, and outcomes; and address all special education issues.

DOs AND DON'Ts
ADDRESSING BULLYING COMPLAINTS

Do:

- Do ensure administrators and staff know your anti-bullying policies, including details.
- Do include cyber-bullying in your anti-bullying and Acceptable Use policies.
- Do document every step your administrators and staff take in response to each bullying complaint.
- Do make bullying reporting forms easily available to parents, students, and staff.
- Do reduce all informal complaints to writing.
- Do implement data-based anti-bullying program in all buildings.
- Do consider, when possible, scheduling classes and seating to keep bullies away from victims.
- Do offer mediation, unless the conflict involves sexual assault.
- Do recognize and address patterns, such as “whack-a-mole” bullying.
- Do encourage staff to communicate across buildings.
- Do consider outside consultants and surveys.
- Do consider First Amendment concerns in disciplining bullies:
 - Location: Is there a connection to the district system or network?
 - Disruptive effect
 - Nature of speech
 - Manner in which speech was distributed
- Do consider special education concerns in disciplining bullies:
 - Special education evaluation or re-evaluation
 - Functional Behavior Analysis for bullies or victims with IEPs
 - Manifestation Determination if consequence is a change of placement.
- Do take action even if you cannot mete out discipline: increasing monitoring/supervision, offer counseling, mediation.

DON'T:

- Don't emphasize the infraction title or code to the victim/parent.
- Don't insist behavior can't be bullying or harassment just because it happens only once, especially for egregious conduct.
- Don't issue consequences or solve problems in ways that force victims and bullies to work in close proximity to each other.
- Don't mandate mediation, especially in sexual assault cases.
- Don't accept a "kids-will-be-kids" approach to student conflicts.
- Don't ignore or downplay the repeat complainer.
- Don't assume emails suffice to document investigations or parent contact.
- Don't forget to follow up with a parent, but don't divulge personal student information.
- Don't address bullying exclusively on an individual basis; always consider whether a group/school/district-wide program or intervention is needed.
- Don't treat bullying survey responses merely as aggregate data; always follow up and investigate every allegation.
- Don't separate the bully and victim in a way that punishes the victim.

SELECT CASE LAW – BULLYING LAWSUITS

Deliberate Indifference: Courts find that school districts are deliberately indifferent when they respond to harassment in a clearly-unreasonable manner in light of known circumstances. Although courts traditionally avoid evaluating districts' disciplinary decisions, some have begun to consider the effectiveness of a district's response to the harassment as a factor in determining liability.

Galloway v. Chesapeake Union Exempted Vill. Schs. Bd. of Educ.

2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 152080 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 23, 2012)

Facts or Allegations:

- A high school student with Asperger's Disorder, ADHD, and seizure disorder sued a school district, and several teachers and administrators, alleging they failed to prevent disability-based bullying and harassment.
- The plaintiff alleged that other students called him names, threw water on themselves to mimic his incontinence during seizures, stole and destroyed his belongings and projects, punched him, encouraged him to commit suicide, and sexually assaulted him.

District's Response /Alleged Response:

- The student alleged one teacher repeatedly quizzed him in front of the class about whether he really had seizures, and told his parents that he was lazy and that it was a nuisance to teach him.
- Another teacher reportedly signed a petition to remove the plaintiff from the classroom.
- A principal allegedly told the plaintiff to "work it out" when he complained that other students told him they wanted him to "hang himself, let us watch, we will tighten the noose, dig your grave, cut the rope after you're dead and cover you up with dirt."

Outcome:

The Court held that the district, as well as the individual administrators and teachers, could be liable for the plaintiff's Section 504, and ADA claims. Additionally, the court allowed the student's Title IX claim to proceed against the district, and his Equal Protection and state-law claims to continue against the individual defendants. The student alleged enough facts to suggest the district knew its staff was deliberately indifferent to the bullying, because the administrators and teachers purportedly ignored disability-based bullying and treated the student differently based on his disability.

*Patterson v. Hudson Area Schools*551 F.3d 438 (6th Cir. 2009)**Facts or Allegations:**

- A high-school student was shoved into lockers and called “queer,” “faggot,” and “pig,” and “Mr. Clean,” based on his purported lack of pubic hair. The bullies defaced the student’s planner with sexual phrases such as “I HEART penis” and concomitant drawings.
- In eighth grade, the student received an IEP and was educated in a resource room setting, where he was safe from bullying. Despite his parents’ pleadings, the principal refused to continue the resource room placement for ninth grade.
- Bullies broke into the student’s locker, urinated on his clothes, and covered the locker with sexually-oriented words spelled out in shaving cream. On another occasion, the students used permanent markers to draw a penis being inserted into a rectum, defaced the locker with more derogatory phrases of a sexual nature.
- In the final incident, a bully sexually assaulted the student by forcing him into a corner and rubbing his penis over the victim’s face and neck. A second student blocked the exit.

District’s Response /Alleged Response:

- Each time an incident was reported to administration (and the identity of the perpetrator was known), the administrator disciplined the perpetrator, generally with a verbal reprimand. The reprimand usually ended the bullying by that particular student, but another harasser would typically take his place and begin bullying the victim once again.
- Although the sexual assailant was formally expelled, he was allowed to attend a sports awards ceremony at which the victim was present.
- After the sexual assault, the baseball coach addressed the team, including the victim, and advised the players that they should "not joke around with guys who can't take a man joke."

Outcome:

The appellate court held that Title IX claim could proceed against the district. The school district's response, although effective in ending harassment with individual bullies, was never effective in preventing subsequent harassment by new perpetrators. The court implied that the district should have employed more severe discipline to discourage other bullies, and was deliberately indifferent because it knew that the resource room was an effective solution for this victim but refused to employ it.

Williams v. Port Huron Sch. Dist.
455 Fed. Appx. 612 (6th Cir. 2012)

Facts or Allegations:

- Racial bullying was widely prevalent at the district. Examples included: racial slurs, racist posters, death threats, graffiti, swastika images, hit lists, and physical violence.
- Fifteen African-American students left the school during the 2006-2007 school year.

District's Response /Alleged Response:

- The previous principal failed to discipline or investigate any incidents. He was promoted to assistant superintendent, and a new principal took his place. The district also hired a new superintendent.
- The new administration promptly took action. The principal:
 - set up video surveillance where bullying was prominent;
 - reported serious incidents to the police;
 - ordered student to remove Confederate flags from clothing and vehicles;
 - video-presented regarding inappropriate behavior;
 - expelled children;
 - hired management consultants to study the school culture;
 - offered anonymity to reporters; and
 - held grade level assemblies promoting tolerance and diversity.
- The superintendent:
 - approved diversity training seminars for the teachers and students;
 - held parent conferences; and
 - arranged for experts to assist the principal.

Outcome:

The appellate court found that the principal and superintendent were not deliberately indifferent to bullying. Although the parents sued because they thought the administration should have done more, the court explained that the parents do not have a right to particular remedial demands.

Mathis v. Wayne County Board of Education

496 Fed. Appx. 513 (6th Cir. 2012)

Facts or Allegations:

- A group of eighth-grade boys subjected seventh graders to locker room pranks. For example, in the “lights-out” game, the older boys turned off the lights and proceeded to hump and gyrate on the younger children. In the “blind-folded sit-up” game, older students placed their naked buttocks in front of a seventh grader who was convinced to do sit-ups blind-folded, thereby smacking his face on their behinds.
- Another seventh grader was forced to the ground and anally penetrated with a marker. Upon learning of the rape, the coach failed to report it to the principal or to the victim’s parents.
- After the rape victim’s parent informed the principal, the district suspended the assailants from school for 11 days and from the team for one month. The district also reprimanded the coach for failing to report the incident.
- Following the rape, the victim was further harassed at school and multiple students commented on his sexuality.

District’s Response /Alleged Response:

- The district verbally reprimanded the remaining bullies, and attempted to prevent recurrences by:
 - requiring the seventh and eighth graders to use the locker room at different times;
 - requiring an extra coach to monitor the locker room;
 - requiring the door to the locker room to be kept open;
 - requiring the coach to monitor the team more closely;
 - offering instruction on bullying; and
 - providing counseling.
- After a trial, the jury awarded \$100,000 to each plaintiff.

Outcome:

The court upheld the jury’s award, finding the district was deliberately indifferent to the harassment. Specifically, the jury reasonably decided that the assailants should have been punished more severely, and permitting them to return to the team and interact with the victims in close quarters was unreasonable. Likewise, the district

failed to investigate the additional locker-room pranks and did not mete out discipline to those bullies at all. The school district's response, noted the court, was "too little too late."

S.S. v. E. Ky. Univ.

532 F.3d 445, 456 (6th Cir. 2008)

Facts or Allegations:

- A middle-school student with cerebral palsy, pervasive developmental disorder, ADHD, and post-traumatic stress syndrome was bullied by his peers.
- The student claimed that the bullies called him names such as “retard” and “gay,” threw wet paper towels at him, slammed his head into his desk, kicked him, grabbed his genitals, hit him with a drum stick, threw bleach on him, mocked his speech patterns, extorted money from him, and pushed him through a glass sneeze-guard in the cafeteria.

District’s Response /Alleged Response:

- When school officials were told about the incidents, they:
 - conducted individual and group interviews with students to determine who was at fault;
 - arranged for outside speakers to talk to students about name-calling;
 - monitored the victim;
 - separated the victim from other students;
 - held a mediation session between the victim and the other student;
 - disciplined students who were found to be at fault;
 - contacted the police and had officers speak to offending students; and
 - called the bullies’ parents to discuss their children’s conduct.
- The student left the district after eighth grade and sued the district and administrators for violating the Constitution, the ADA, and Section 504. The student also alleged that the district discriminated against him when it monitored him and separated him from the others.

Outcome:

The Sixth Circuit held in the district’s favor, finding that it was not deliberately indifferent and did not have a permissive attitude amounting to discrimination. The court specifically noted that the district met with the students, disciplined when necessary and communicated with parents. The court also noted that the district did

not violate the Constitution because (1) the Fourteenth Amendment does not generally require school districts to protect children from third-party harm, and (2) when the district disciplined the student, it did not do so discriminatorily.

Vidovic v. Mentor City Sch. Dist.
921 F. Supp. 2d 775 (N.D. Ohio 2013)

Facts or Allegations:

- After a high-school student from Bosnia killed herself, her parents sued the school district, several administrators, and a guidance counselor, alleging that the district and its employees ignored nationality-based bullying.
- The parents alleged the bullies pushed their daughter down the stairs, and called her a lesbian, a slut, and a whore. Many incidents related to general adolescent conflicts about boys and friendships.
- The student also experienced unrelated difficulties at school, and was disciplined for skipping class, fighting, and excessive tardiness. During these years, the student sought private therapy and was also hospitalized for suicidal ideations.
- Eventually, she left the school and began a virtual education program at home. Shortly after the beginning of that school year, the student killed herself. Her suicide note referred to bullying and social challenges, as well as various family conflicts.

District's Response /Alleged Response:

- Although the district was never told that the harassment was based on the student's nationality, it took prompt action when bullying was reported, including:
 - providing in-school counseling;
 - investigating allegations;
 - arranging for closer monitoring by the security guard; and
 - allowing the student to leave the classroom and meet with her counselors when she was upset.

Outcome:

With few exceptions, explained the court, school districts are not obligated to protect students from their peers. The court dismissed the case, noting also that the district was not deliberately indifferent to nationality-based bullying because neither the

student nor her parents ever informed school employees that the bullying related to the student's nationality. Further, school officials took reasonable action in response to reported harassment.

Zeno v. Pine Plains Cent. Sch. Dist.

702 F.3d 655 (2d Cir. N.Y. 2012)

Facts or Allegations:

- After almost four years of bullying, a biracial high school graduate sued the school district for failing to protect him from racial harassment.
- The student was assaulted and threatened numerous times. He was called racial epithets, threatened with lynching, death, and his sister's rape. His property was defaced, he was beaten, and the school's bathroom graffiti featured death warnings addressed to him.
- Because of academic difficulties and perceived social challenges, the student was placed on an IEP. When the student had difficulty completing the requisite graduation credits, he chose to accept an IEP diploma, because he did not want to remain in the school district any longer.

District's Response /Alleged Response:

- Although some students were suspended or moved to another school, the bullying continued.
- In response to the student's request, the local NAACP chapter leaders met with the superintendent and principal, offering to implement racial sensitivity programming and provide a shadow for the student free of charge. The district, however, declined the offer. Instead, the district offered sporadic and optional sensitivity training sessions for students, touching superficially on racism and prejudice.

Outcome:

A jury awarded the student 1.25 million dollars, and the school district appealed, arguing that it did not violate federal law, and that the damages were excessive. The second circuit affirmed the jury's award, finding that the school district did not sufficiently address the harassment, thereby depriving the student of several educational benefits. Specifically, the court noted that as time went on, the bullying grew increasingly severe; the district, therefore, should have realized suspending the offenders was not effective. These disciplinary approaches, the jury found, were not reasonably calculated to end the harassment. The student, therefore, was deprived of a harassment-free educational environment, and had to leave school with a substandard diploma, one less likely accepted by employers and colleges.

Doe v. Big Walnut Local Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ.
837 F. Supp. 2d 742 (S.D. Ohio 2011)

Facts or Allegations:

- A middle-school student with a cognitive disability was bullied by his classmates.
- The bullies beat the student in the school parking lot, taunted him about the death of his household pet, and threatened to murder him in his home.

District's Response /Alleged Response:

- In response, the school board:
 - wrote reports;
 - disciplined the bullies;
 - involved the police;
 - altered the student's schedule to help him avoid contact with the bullies;
 - provided him with a hall monitor to keep track of his whereabouts; and
 - permitted him to use the office bathroom.
- Despite all of these safeguards, the harassment continued.

Outcome:

The court found that the district had not been deliberately indifferent to the student's plight, and whether it could have done more to protect him was irrelevant. Additionally, because he was bullied by other children, the victim could not successfully allege that the district itself violated his Constitutional rights.

Logan v. Sycamore Cmty. Sch. Bd. of Educ.

S.D. Ohio No. 1:09-CV-00885, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 77474 (June 5, 2012)

Facts or Allegations:

- A high-school student committed suicide after a sexting incident.
- Her peers began to harass the student after a nude photograph of her was circulated around the school, calling her "porn queen," "slut," and "whore."
- The victim first informed her counselor about the harassment and then appeared in a television interview about sexting.

District's Response /Alleged Response:

- The parents alleged that even though the superintendent watched the interview and the principal knew about the photograph, they did not take any specific

action in response to the harassment.

- The school officials, in turn, alleged that only the counselor and resource officer knew about the harassment.

Outcome:

The court decided that a reasonable jury could find that the school board knew about the sexual harassment, and that the district disregarded the victim's complaints. The court allowed this case to proceed to trial, but it was ultimately settled for \$154,000.00.

This case ultimately led to the passage of the Jessica Logan Act, legislation requiring school districts to include cyberbullying in their anti-harassment policies.

Schroeder v. Maumee Bd. of Educ.

296 F. Supp. 2d 869 (N.D. Ohio 2003)

Facts or Allegations:

- After finding out that his brother was gay, a middle-school student became a vocal proponent of gay rights.
- In return, his peers assumed he was gay and called him names, beat him, and threatened his life.

District's Response /Alleged Response:

- The student reported the incidents to his mother and the school principals, but the perpetrators were not disciplined.
- On one occasion, a principal allegedly asked the student if he was a fag like his brother, and instructed him to try out for the football team and to learn to like girls. That principal also allegedly explained that if the student would "shut his mouth about gay rights, he would stop getting into so many fights."
- The district had no written record of the plaintiff's bullying complaints.
- The student eventually left the school, and was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder, bipolar disorder, and obsessive-compulsive disorder.

Outcome:

The court held in the student's favor, finding that the principal's remarks could be seen as a sign of animus towards homosexuals. A jury, therefore, could conclude that the administrators were deliberately indifferent to the student's plight because he was perceived to be gay. The board of education and its superintendent, however, could not be held liable because a board of education can be held liable if, and only, if the

board's policy or practice causes the harm. Here, the principals' failure to address the harassment did not reflect the board's policy or practice.

Shively v. Green Local Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ.

2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 37581 (N.D. Ohio Feb. 28, 2013)

Allegations:

- Parents alleged high school students bullied their daughter because of her Jewish faith.
- Examples included allegedly being called a "dirty Jew," and "Hitler."
- Parents also contended the bullies physically assaulted their daughter, and also included her name on a hit list.

District's Alleged Response:

- Parents claimed the administration did not help their daughter, ignored their phone calls, and failed to discipline perpetrators appropriately.
- Parents also alleged one administrator told the student to fight a bully, and that others retracted an expulsion a bully received.

Outcome:

Although the court dismissed the parents' personal claims and the student's First Amendment claims, it held that the student's other claims, including her Fourteenth Amendment and Title IX claims could go forward to discovery and trial. The court held that the parents adequately alleged deliberate indifference and that the district could be held liable for these violations. An appellate court later dismissed the individual defendants from the substantive due process claim.

Peterson v. Northeastern Local Sch. Dist.

2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68992

Facts or Allegations:

- Two African American students alleged they suffered prolonged racial harassment.
- Harassment included a hand-written note with a picture of one victim with a noose around her neck, and included the phrase (unedited here and in the court case): "Imma hang yo ass dum ... n[-word]" and "get ready [illegible symbol] die!! Sincerly, your friend."

District's Response /Alleged Response:

- The school district eventually entered into a consent decree with the U.S. Department of Justice to try and resolve the matter, but even this did not solve the problems.
- The district ultimately expelled not the perpetrators – but the victims.

Outcome:

The school district asked the court to dismiss this lawsuit at the preliminary stages, but the court refused. The harassment allegations, noted the magistrate, were quite serious and continued for years. Further, expelling the victims may indicate retaliation and deliberate indifference. Parents met the requisite minimum standards to claim deliberate indifference and their suit could move forward to discovery and trial.

Waters v. Perkins Local Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ.
2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 44415 (N.D. Ohio Mar. 31, 2014)

Facts or Allegations:

- Two brothers suffered bullying during their elementary and middle school years.
- The younger brother had several physical altercations with a special education student who was impulsive and had trouble keeping his hands to himself.
- Several students called the older brother names, including (quoted verbatim by the court's decision) nerd, bookworm, faggot, bitch, homo, gay wad, queer, n[...],r, Castro, and dirty, hairy-ass Cuban.
- The bullies also body-checked and punched the older boy, and posted derogatory comments on Facebook.
- The older brother opted to take swim as an extracurricular and not basketball, because one bully played basketball.

District's Response /Alleged Response:

- Teachers and principals communicated with parents about their concerns.
- The elementary school principal assigned a second aide to help on the playground in response to parents' complaints about their younger child's conflicts.
- The elementary school teacher changed the bully's seat and tried to separate him from the victim.

- The middle school administrators interviewed witnesses, changed schedules, issued detentions, and suspended bullies.
- Administrators responded to parents' phone calls and met with them frequently.

Outcome:

The court found that the district and its administrators were not deliberately indifferent. Although some bullying may have continued, districts are not obligated to purge their schools of harassment. The court granted the district's motion for summary judgment in full.