**Supplementary Materials**

Supplemental Table 1

*Descriptive Characteristics of the 18 Included Studies.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Study* | *Sample Size* | *Grades/Ages* | *Sample* | *Disabilities* | *Discipline Outcome* | *Research Design* | *Nationally Representative?* | *Infraction Reasons/Behavioral Assessment Included* |
| Anderson et al., (2007) | Grade 6: *n*=211Grade 7: *n*=201Grade 8: *n*=172 | Middle school | African Americans males in grades 6-8 from a large metropolitan school district in the southeastern region of the United States, 2001-2004  | Unspecified | suspension (unspecified) | Cross-sectional | No | NA  |
| Anderson & Ritter (2017a) | Number of observations = 1,243,555Student *n* = 240,999 | K-12 | All K-12 schools in Arkansas (2008-09 through 2014-15) | Unspecified | ISS, OSS, expulsion, referral to an ALE, corporal punishment, no action, and other, number of days punished | Cross-sectional | No | 17 categories (indicators for different groups of infractions: guns, drugs and alcohol, truancy, major violence or weapons, minorviolence or weapons, and major non-violent) |
| Anderson & Ritter (2017b) | *n*=590,750  | K-12 | All Arkansas K-12 Schools (2010-11 through 2012-13) | Unspecified | ISS, OSS, expulsion, referral to an ALE, corporal punishment, no action, and other, number of days punished | Cross-sectional | No | Disorderly Conduct, Insubordination, Other (Non-specified), Fighting, Truancy, Bullying, Student Assault, Tobacco, Drugs, and Miscellaneous (including Vandalism, Knife, Staff Assault, Alcohol, Gangs, Guns, Club, Explosives) |
| Anyon et al. (2016) | Student *n*=9,921School *n*=180 | K-12 | All students in Denver Public Schools who were issued one or more ODRs in the 2012–2013 school year  | Unspecified; ED | OSS | Cross-sectional | No | Bullying, Destruction of school property, Disobedient or defiant, Other code of conduct violation, Detrimental behavior, Third-degree assault, Unlawful sexual behavior, Drug possession or distribution, Dangerous weapon |
| Anyon et al. (2014) | Student *n*=10,705School *n*=183 | K-12 | All students in Denver Public Schools who were referred to the office for discipline problems during 2011-12 academic year | Unspecified; ED | OSS, expulsion | Cross-sectional | No | Bullying, Destruction of school property, Disobedient or defiant, Other code of conduct violation, Detrimental behavior, Third-degree assault, Unlawful sexual behavior, Drug possession or distribution, Dangerous weapon |
| Camacho (2016) | Data from middle schools (*n*=219), high schools (*n*=200), and combined middle and high schools (*n*=20)  | Middle and high school | Maryland Report Card &Maryland Public School Suspensions by School and MajorOffense Out of School Suspen-sions and Expulsion 2012-2013  | Unspecified | OSS | Cross-sectional | No | NA  |
| Cholewa et al. (2017) | *n*=11,860 | 11th grade | Public high school students who participated in HSLS:09’s data collection in 2012 | Unspecified | ISS | Longitudinal | Yes | NA  |
| Cornell et al. (2018) | *n*=1,836  | Elementary through high school | Threat assessment cases conducted in Virginia public schools during the 2014–2015 school year | Unspecified | OSS | Cross-sectional | No | Weapon, Higher level threat |
| Huang (2018) | *n*=8,604 | 10th grade | 10th-grade students who attended publichigh schools in 1990 using Public-use NELS | Unspecified | OSS | Longitudinal | Yes | Attitudes supporting deviant behavior, Disregard for rules, Early substance use, Discriminatory attitudes, Misconduct, Fought with another student, Drank alcohol, Cigarettes/packs smoked, Smoked marijuana, Used cocaine |
| Kinsler (2011) | Schools: elementary school *n*=568 middle school *n*=226, high school *n*=208Suspended Students: elementary school *n*=6,718 middle school *n*=18,999, high school *n*=20,902 | Elementary through high school | Public schools in North Carolina | LD; Physical disability | OSS, Days suspended | Cross-sectional | No | Rule violation, Other offense, Undisciplined, Theft, Fighting, Truancy, Property Damage, Possession of controlled substance, substance abuse, possession of weapon |
| Krezmien et al. (2006) | not specified | Elementary through high school | All public-school students in Maryland from 1995 to 2003 | Unspecified; LD, ED, Autism; MR/ID; SLI; OHI; Other | Suspension (unspecified) | Cross-sectional | No | NA  |
| Krezmien et al. (2017) | not specified | Elementary through high school | All White and African Amer-ican public-school students inMaryland from 2004 to 2015 | ASD; AUT; MR/ID | Suspension (unspecified) | Cross-sectional | No | NA  |
| Morris & Perry (2016) | number of observations: *n*=25,221student *n*=16,248 | Grade 6-10 (middle and highs school) | Students who were enrolled in a district public school over a three-year period from August 2008 to ending in June 2011 | Unspecified | OSS | Cross-sectional | No | NA  |
| Roch & Edwards (2017) | 778 traditional middle schools and high schools | Middle and high school | Public schools in the state of Georgia for the 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years | Unspecified | OSS | Cross-sectional | No | Five categories (Personal, Property, Weapons, Misdemeanors, Other minor) including 27 types of incidents |
| Sullivan et al., (2013) | *n*=17,837 | Elementary and secondary schools | One diverse urban school district in Wisconsin | Unspecified | Suspension; Duration/Freq. Discipline | Cross-sectional | No | School-level: % incidents drug/weapons, % truant |
| Theriot et al. (2010) | Student *n*=9,706School *n*=28 | Middle and high school | All middle and high school students with at least one repor-ted disciplinary incident during the 2004–2005 school year in one medium-sized school district in the southeastern United States | Unspecified | Exclusion (OSS, expulsion) | Cross-sectional | No | Violent infraction, Zero-tolerance infraction |
| Vincent et al., (2012) | Disciplinary cases *n*=147,850 student *n*= 64,088 school *n*=1,195 | Prek-12 | 2009-2010 data on exclusionary discipline practices from one state in the Pacific North-west of the United States  | Unspecified | Disciplinary exclusions | Cross-sectional | No | NA  |
| Wright et al. (2014) | *n*=4,101 | 8th grade | Public school students in the 8th grade wave of ECLS-K: 1998-1999 dataset  | Unspecified | OSS | Longitudinal | Yes | Prior problem behavior using Social Skills Rating Scale (SSRS) |

*Note:* OSS = Out of School Suspension; ISS = In-School Suspension; ALE = Alternative Learning Environment

Supplemental Table 2

*Characteristics of Studies Finding Students with Disabilities are More Likely to Experience Exclusionary Discipline.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Study Characteristics* | *Studies Included* |
| Individual-level estimatesonly | Anderson & Ritter (2017a) – 1/1Vincent et al. (2012) – 1/2*Total: 2/3 (67%)* |
| Both individual and aggregate data (e.g., multilevel models or school fixed effects) but no adjustment for infraction type or behavioral assessments | n/a |
| Includes aggregate-level but not individual-level controls for infraction types | Anderson & Ritter (2017a)­­ – 0/8*Total: 0/8 (0%)* |
| Includes individual-level controls for infraction types but not individual-level behavioral assessments | Anderson & Ritter (2017a)a­­ – 4/4Anderson & Ritter (2017b) – 0/9 Theriot et al. (2010) - 0/1*Total: 4/14 (29%)* |
| Includes individual-level behavioral assessments | n/a |

Supplemental Table 3

*Characteristics of Studies Finding Students with Disabilities are Less Likely to Experience Exclusionary Discipline.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Study Characteristics* | *Studies Included* |
| Individual-level estimates only | Anderson & Ritter (2017a) – 0/1Vincent et al. (2012) – 0/2*Total: 0/3 (0%)* |
| Both individual and aggregate data (e.g., multilevel models or school fixed effects) but no adjustment for infraction types or behavioral assessments | n/a |
| Includes aggregate-level but not individual-level controls for infraction types | Anderson & Ritter (2017a)­­ – 1/8*Total: 1/8 (13%)* |
| Includes individual-level controls for infraction types but not individual-level behavioral assessments  | Anderson & Ritter (2017a)a­­ – 0/4Anderson & Ritter (2017b)a – 6/9Theriot et al. (2010)a - 0/1*Total: 6/14 (43%)* |
| Includes individual-level behavioral assessments | n/a |

*Supplemental Figure 1.* PRISMA flow diagram of studies reviewed for the best-evidence synthesis.
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