STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION – ADMINISTRATIVE RULE SUMMARY		
Title/OAR #:	Corporal Punishment / OAR 581-021-0061	
Date:	March 5, 2015	
Staff/Office:	John Inglish, Student Services	
New Rule	Amend Existing Rule Repeal Rule	
Hearing Date: Hearings Officer Report Attached		
Prompted by: 🔀 State law changes 🗌 Federal law changes 🗌 Other		
Action Requested:		
First Reading/Second Reading Adoption Adoption/Consent Agenda		

## PROPOSED/AMENDED RULE SUMMARY:

Aligns Oregon administrative rule definition of corporal punishment to be consistent with current statute/regulations for restraint and seclusion.

## **BACKGROUND:**

- HB 2939 (now codified at ORS 339.291) was passed in 2011. This bill defined restraint and seclusion, and restricted the use of such practices to situations where: 1) the student's behavior imposes a reasonable threat of imminent, serious bodily injury to the student or others; and 2) less restrictive interventions would not be effective.
- HB 2192 (now codified at ORS 339.250) was passed in 2013. This statute revised Oregon's school discipline code, and reaffirmed the prohibition of corporal punishment in Oregon schools. The statute defines corporal punishment as the "willful infliction of, or willfully causing the infliction of, physical pain on a student."
- OAR 581-021-0061 defines corporal punishment in a manner that is inconsistent with ORS 339.291. Specifically, it states, "Corporal punishment does not include the emergency use of reasonable physical force by a school administrator, teacher, school employee, or volunteer as necessary to *maintain order* or to prevent a student from harming him/herself, other students, and school staff *or property*." (OAR 581-021-0061(2), emphasis added).

## ISSUES/CONCERNS THAT SURFACED DURING RULE WORK:

ODE has received input from the field that the language in OAR 581-021-0061 could be construed by school personnel as allowing restraint and seclusion in broader circumstances than those set forth in ORS 339.291. Revising the rule to be consistent with the aftorementioned statutes would likely eliminate unnecessary confusion, and ensure restraint and seclusion is used only when appropriate.

## **CHANGED SINCE LAST BOARD MEETING?**

<ul> <li>N/A; first read—hasn't been before board</li> <li>No; same as last month</li> <li>Yes − As follows:</li> </ul>
FISCAL IMPACT: It is not anticipated that this rule change would have a fiscal impact. The rule merely aligns administrative regulation to ensure consistency with the restraint/seclusion and school discipline statutes.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: