

Lynn University

SPIRAL

Student Theses, Dissertations, Portfolios and
Projects

Theses and Dissertations Collections

12-6-2006

In-School Suspension: A Qualitative Study of High School Programs

Joseph M. Boone
Lynn University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://spiral.lynn.edu/etds>



Part of the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Boone, Joseph M., "In-School Suspension: A Qualitative Study of High School Programs" (2006). *Student Theses, Dissertations, Portfolios and Projects*. 280.

<https://spiral.lynn.edu/etds/280>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations Collections at SPIRAL. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Theses, Dissertations, Portfolios and Projects by an authorized administrator of SPIRAL. For more information, please contact liadarola@lynn.edu.

In-School Suspension: A Qualitative Study of High School Programs

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Lynn University

By

Joseph M. Boone

2006

**LYNN UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

Order Number: _____

**IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF
HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS**

Boone, Joseph M., Ph.D.

Lynn University, 2006

Copyright 2006, by Boone, J. M. All Rights Reserved

U.M.I.
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

DEDICATION

I am dedicating this doctoral dissertation to my mother, Margaret R. Boone. She has supported me in every endeavor I have ever undertaken. Any success I have attained can be directly attributed to her through the ethics and values she has instilled in me. I can honestly say I would not be completing a doctoral program if it had not been for her help and support in earlier times.

My mother has sacrificed a great deal so that I would have the opportunities to achieve what I am capable of achieving. Without going into details, it is safe to say the quality of my life would have been considerably less without her efforts and sacrifices. I realize there is no possible way I could possibly repay her for her efforts and sacrifices.

The completion of this dissertation, which will result in the conferral of a doctoral degree, will be the single most significant accomplishment in my life. I want my mother to know that, although I may not have always shown it, I sincerely appreciated all of your help and sacrifices. As a small token of my gratitude and appreciation I dedicate this dissertation to you, Margaret R. Boone.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to the schools in which I conducted my research. The administration and teachers who allowed me access to their programs and assisted me in doing my research were very cooperative and truly interested in improving their programs. I just hope my findings will allow them to do this.

I would like to thank Dr. Alison Adler, Chief of The Safe Schools Department, and a member of my dissertation committee, who proved to be an invaluable resource for me. In doing this research for her department, it allowed me to have access to the ISS programs in the school district. Mrs. Ann Faraone, assistant director of this department, assisted me in scheduling my school visits. I was invited to the meetings of schools that had ISS programs and came away with valuable insight into the programs. Thank you so much Ann for gaining me access to the schools

I would also like to express my appreciation to my father, Joseph E. Boone, and my sister, Patricia Boone. In addition to their support they served as inspiration for me to achieve goals as they have in their illustrious careers.

My wife, Sheila, has encouraged and supported me throughout this very long process. After late night classes or meetings, as part of the doctoral program, it was always nice to come home to her and our two wonderful dogs (even though I may have not shown it). I am sure you will be as happy as I am when this process is over.

The faculty and staff I came in contact with at Lynn University were always supportive and helpful. I would like to thank Dr. William Leary for volunteering to fill in on my committee when another member left the university. I can honestly say I thoroughly enjoyed Dr. Leary's classes. They were very thought provoking and

enjoyable. Mrs. Joy Ruhl, the office manager, helped me out numerous times and was always friendly. She is a parent and School Advisory Council member at the school I work at where we would see each other every morning. Mr. Gary Adubato assisted with the formatting of the tables and other technical aspects of my dissertation. His expertise was invaluable and I appreciate the time he put in assisting me.

Dr. Carole Warshaw, my dissertation chair, helped me through the dissertation process. She was always patient and encouraging. I want to thank her for staying on after her retirement to make sure I completed my dissertation. I don't know if I was the reason she retired but I truly appreciate all her time and effort in seeing me through this dissertation.

ABSTRACT

In-School Suspension (ISS) is the temporary placement of a student experiencing behavior problems in an alternative location within the school or school district. ISS is designed to offset the negative effects of exclusion and external suspension from school. In the ideal situation students assigned to ISS are under school supervision with an academic component provided (Stiefer, 2003).

There are various forms of ISS including: the punitive format which employs strict rule enforcement, the discussion format which includes activities designed to improve self-esteem, communication, and problem solving skills, and the academic model, which focuses on improving skills required to improve academic achievement. Other models, which are similar or include characteristics of these designs, are also in existence (Southard, 2002).

This study will be important in determining policies districts could adopt which might have beneficial effects for schools and society in general. The purpose of an ISS program is to keep students in school and academically engaged. This leads to the opinion of many administrators and scholars that there is little doubt that keeping students in school in an environment that is conducive to learning would have beneficial results (Skiba & Reece, 2003).

The schools studied were examined to see if recommended components such as a clear statement of purpose, written procedures in place for those involved, designation of an administrator responsible for determining appropriate assignments, a provision for an academic component, daily resources and materials provided for students, a counseling component, and notification and engagement of parents are included in their ISS

programs. Alternatively, the researcher looked to see if components not recommended such as any program evaluation and splitting roles of the personnel administering the program are included (First & Mizell, 1980).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Overview: Discipline in K-12 Schools	5
Research Questions: Principles of First and Mizell	12
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
Driving Forces Behind ISS	13
Categories/Forms of ISS	14
Effectiveness of Programs	14
Effective Practices	15
Ineffective Practices	16
Other Students' Rights vs. Disruptive Students	18
Antisocial Behavior	27
Instructional Strategies	31
Peer Tutoring	33
Implementation Recommendations	35
Decision-Making in Assessment	35
Prevention as an Overarching Goal of School-Based Suspension	36
Interventions in the Elementary and Middle School Grades	38
The Positive Behavior Support (PBS) Program	38
The Effective Behavior Support (EBS) Program	39
School Approaches to Managing Problem Behavior	40
Management of Student Agitation Levels	42

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued)

	Page
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN	
Purpose	46
Methodology and Procedures	46
Research Questions	49
School Selection Criteria	50
Observations	53
Data Analysis	54
Validity	56
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	
Introduction	59
Rubric Based on First and Mizell's Principles	60
Organization of Data Analysis	62
Program Observation	63
School "A" Background	63
School "A" ISS Room Observations	64
School "A" Interview Discussion	67
School "B" Background	76
School "B" ISS Room Observations	76
School "B" Interview Analysis	78
School "C" Background	87
School "C" ISS Room Observations	87
School "C" Interview Analysis	89
Across-Site Analysis	98

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued)

	Page
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	
Findings	122
Adoption Recommendations	133
Recommendations for Further Study	141
Conclusions	142
REFERENCES	145
BIBLIOGRAPHY	150
APPENDICES	
A. Interview Questions	152
B. Authorization for Voluntary Consent	154
C. School District Consent Letter	159
D. IRB Approval Letter	161
E. Safe Schools Email to Principals	163
F. Researcher's Resume	165

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
1.1	Suspension Statistics	6
4.1	Within Site Analysis of Rubric for School "A" on the Principles of First and Mizell	73
4.2	Within Site Analysis of Rubric for School "B" on the Principles of First & Mizell (1980)	84
4.3	Within Site Analysis of Rubric for School "C" on the Principles of First & Mizell (1980)	95
4.4	Across Site Analysis of Schools for the Principles of First & Mizell (1980)	116

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

While discipline in schools is often perceived as a contemporary problem (Morris, 2003), the dunce cap, named for the 13th century philosopher and theologian John Duns Scotus, was a common punishment in United States classrooms in the 1880s (Graves, as cited in Chambliss, 1993). By the 20th century, Dewey (as cited in Chambliss, 1993) recognized that while discipline could be imposed on students, merely following rules was far from an appropriate preparation for students who would become citizens of a democracy. Dewey (as cited in Chambliss, 1993) suggested that student discipline problems are the result of schools that do not engage their students.

More recently, however, discipline in schools has come to resemble that described by Foucault (1977). The changing social context of the past century, and especially of the past two decades, has served to redefine discipline as the power needed to maintain order in an institution. In education, this new view of discipline has come to define the struggle for power between teacher and student, one supported by a series of punitive actions that too often exacerbate rather than address the misconduct.

The number of at-risk students, whose misconduct in school is a precursor to more serious personal educational problems, supports the need to reexamine the complex relationship between misconduct, disciplinary measures, and student achievement (Walker, Ramsey & Gresham, 2004).

Currently a wide range of disciplinary measures is an integral part of the educational culture of the South Florida school district selected for this study. These include:

- Parental contact
- Behavioral contracts
- Loss of privileges (either in school or extracurricular)
- Conferences with students, parents, teachers, or administrative staff
- Interventions by school guidance personnel
- School service work or student work detail
- Removal of student from class
- Loss of bus privileges—parents are responsible for transportation
- In-school alternative assignments or intervention programs
- Detentions (before, during, after school, or on Saturday)—parents are responsible for transportation
- Restitution—paying for or replacing any damaged property
- Assignment to a tobacco, alcohol, drug, or student misconduct alternative program in lieu of suspension days
- Suspension—removal of student from school for up to 10 days
- Assignment to an alternative educational facility
- Expulsion—removal of student from school for remainder of year plus one year

The above listed consequences are shown, not to use each of them or to use them in the order listed, but rather to show the range of consequences from which the most

appropriate for a student may be chosen (The School District of Palm Beach County Student and Family Handbook, 2003-2004). Suspensions of eligible disabled students shall follow their Individual Educational Plan (IEP) and applicable laws. Suspension and expulsion of students determined as disabled under Section 504 or The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 shall follow Section 504 Modifications and applicable laws. The School District of Palm Beach County Student and Family Handbook (2003-2004) states:

Normally, suspension shall occur only after corrective measures, such as parent contact or other interventions have been tried without success. The school shall provide the student's parent(s) with a written explanation of the reason for suspension. A student charged with a major offense may be suspended immediately without the necessity for prior consideration of alternative disciplinary measures. However, prior to the suspension action, the student will be given an opportunity to explain their actions and the student will be given a written explanation of the reason for the suspension. (p. 3)

When students receive in-school suspension they remain in the school but are removed from the class. "In-school suspension is an in-house program to which a student may be assigned for a short period of time in lieu of out-of-school suspension (OSS)" (Gushee, 1984, p. 2). It is designed to counteract many of the negative effects of suspension. Instructional time can continue without interruption and special academic help can be provided as needed. Counseling services for students experiencing personal, academic, or behavioral difficulties can result in behavioral changes such as an improved self-image and greater self-image and greater self-discipline (Gushee, 1984). Wheelock (1986) cautions optimism, saying, "In-school suspension programs are a step in the right

direction in that the purpose is to keep students in school. However, in-school suspension programs, unmonitored and viewed only in terms of the narrow goal of keeping students in the school building, can create an illusion of progress where little exists” (p. 4).

This research study examined programs for in-school suspension. The researcher chose this area using current statistics taken from the school district’s Gold Report (School District of Palm Beach County, 2004), an annual report published online and available to anyone seeking information on district statistics. For example, in the 1999-2000 school year in the selected county, there were 428 in-school suspensions in the elementary schools, which increased to 735 in the 2003-2004 school year. In middle schools there were 1310 in-school suspensions in the 1999-2000 school year increasing to 3739 in the 2003-2004 school year. High schools had 2678 in-school suspensions in the 1999-2000 school year increasing to 6038 in the 2003-2004 school year according to the Gold Report (School District of Palm Beach County, 2004).

These numbers need to be examined in context since there were also an increased number of students in the county school system. From the 1999-2000 school year to the 2003-2004 school year (Gold Report, School District of Palm Beach County, 2004) the percentage of elementary school in-school suspensions stayed at one percent, middle school went from four percent to eight percent and high schools went from seven percent to twelve percent from the 1999-2000 school year to the 2003-2004 school year (Gold Report, School District of Palm Beach County, 2004).

When examining the statistics for in-school suspension one might suspect a natural correlation to out-of-school suspensions. The number of out-of-school

suspensions increased, but the percentages did not change significantly due to the increased enrollment.

This study is important in determining policies schools could adopt which might have beneficial effects for students and society in general. The purpose of an ISS program is to keep students in school and academically engaged, which, in the opinion of many administrators and scholars, there is little doubt that keeping students in school in an environment that is conducive to learning would have beneficial results (Skiba & Peterson, 2003).

The findings for this study were used to develop a list of successful disciplinary strategies and describe how the strategies can be used as the foundation for development of a disciplinary program that provides protective factors for at-risk students. The study prepared the researcher to identify these strategies in selected county high schools, where the efficacy of their in-school suspension programs were assessed, exploring and describing both positive and negative outcomes of the various programs.

Overview: Discipline in K-12 Schools

Discipline is a continuing problem in public schools (Vogel, 2004). It concerns parents and teachers as a growing lack of discipline serves to “derail learning in schools across the country” (Vogel, 2004, p. 2). “Teaching Interrupted: Do Discipline Policies in Today’s Public Schools Foster the Common Good” (Public Agenda, 2004), found that the majority of the middle and high school teachers they surveyed described their day-to-day classroom activity as merely dealing with student misbehavior with little trust from the parents.

Public Agenda (2004) discovered that 78% of the teachers report “persistent troublemakers” in their classrooms. Parents (73%) and teachers (85%) believe that these persistent troublemakers negatively impact educational experiences. The impact is widespread:

- Teaching effort must focus on discipline rather than academics
- Teaching efficacy declines and academic achievement drops
- Fear of lawsuits has created a documentation burden for teachers who try to discipline students
- Discipline problems lead to teacher “burnout” and many capable teachers leave teaching

Discipline problems are a part of the county school district analyzed in this study.

Although few of the discipline problems end as did the publicized tragedy of the 2000 death of a teacher at the hands of a student (Kalajian, 2000). With more than 10,000 teachers and 173,900 students, attending 163 schools in the district, the Gold Report notes instances and percentages of disciplinary problems in March 2004(School District of Palm Beach County, 2004):

Table 1.1

Suspension Statistics

Grades	In-school suspension	Out-of-school suspension
K-5	735 (1%)	1912 (2%)
6-8	3739 (8%)	5787 (14%)
9-12	6038 (12%)	5941 (12%)

The focus of this study was to investigate strategies currently in use, in the in-school suspension programs, and develop a best-practices model. The study may have significant implications for district budgeting, if it can be shown that implementation of a successful model can lead to fewer disciplinary problems and better educated students, the district may chose to reallocate funds for implementation of the model.

This research will be of particular significance to the researcher's current institution and to other practitioners. As an elementary assistant principal, the researcher is the primary disciplinarian at the school. By devising a research-based best-practices model, decisions about disciplinary issues and their consequences can lead to more successful educational experiences for students.

The schools studied, as recommended by the Safe Schools Department Chief, were identified as follows:

1. High School "A"
2. High School "B"
3. High School "C"

These schools were chosen based on the perceived quality of their ISS programs. The researcher had no prior knowledge of these schools but based the selections on the recommendations of the Safe Schools Chief.

A qualitative format was used to conduct this research. The research involved interviewing subjects and making observations of the programs being studied.

First and Mizell wrote a book in 1980 entitled, *Everybody's Business: A Book About School Discipline*. This book suggested nine principles of a good In-School Suspension. The researcher found these nine principles to be inclusive of many

principles espoused by later researchers on the topic of In-School Suspension. While later research included many of these principles, the research did not include all nine of these principles.

Personnel interviewed were the teachers referring the students, teachers administering the program, and the administrators responsible for the program. The personnel were interviewed to determine which of First and Mizell's (1980) principles were being incorporated in the programs. They also were interviewed to determine the principles being incorporated other than those recommended by First and Mizell (1980).

Observations were done in classrooms where students are housed during ISS. Interaction of teachers with students and administration of both staff and students were observed. Guided observation questions were used in the interviews.

Wheelock (1986) wrote, "In-school suspension: Some Research Could Improve Your Program." In which, "she did a detailed analysis a number of years ago on suspension patterns and practices in Boston middle schools for the Massachusetts Advocacy Center" (Wheelock, 1986, p. 2). Among her findings were that African American students were disproportionately suspended in Boston Public Schools. It was discovered that this was a national trend.

Different schools with similar populations had vastly different suspension patterns. Suspension rates were much higher in some middle schools than in others with virtually identical enrollments. It was determined that some Boston Public Schools merely did not report these statistics accurately while others were very meticulous about their suspensions (Wheelock, 1986).

It appeared that school environments and structural arrangements contributed to high suspensions. It was learned that at most schools approximately twenty percent of the teachers were responsible for eighty percent of the suspensions. When principals were alerted to this fact, they were able to work with the teachers and as a result the suspensions were lowered (Wheelock, 1986).

Specific school practices were related to the number of school suspensions. Many students were old for their grade, having been held back a number of times. Also, many of the suspended students were in classes for low achieving students (Wheelock, 1986). Finally, it was learned that the reasons for suspension were very diverse, ranging from truancy, to talking back to a teacher, or fighting with another student (Wheelock, 1986).

Wheelock (1986) stated that after looking at the data, interviewing students and school staff, visiting schools, and reading the academic literature, she concluded that in-school suspension did not necessarily solve the problems. The report noted, "In-school suspension programs are a step in the right direction in that their purpose is to keep students in school. However, in-school suspension programs, unmonitored and viewed only in terms of the narrow goal of keeping students in the school building, can create an illusion of progress where little exists" (Wheelock, 1986, p. 4).

All too often, in-school suspension programs, like out-of-school suspensions, fail to address the root causes of a disorderly school climate. In-school suspension programs, which are designed to reduce the number of out-of-school suspensions, may hide the fact that large numbers of students are being excluded from their classrooms. In some schools, an in-school suspension room can become a "dumping ground" for students who are referred by teachers who are unskilled in classroom management. Several students

interviewed reported just that situation (Wheelock, 1986). Said one: “First you get sent to the detention room for a few hours or maybe a day. But if you get sent there too many times, pretty soon you don’t get out. Maybe they give you a little work to do, but they don’t really care” (Wheelock, 1986, p. 7). Another student reported being required to complete pages of “punishment papers” of multiplication tables in in-school suspension, a practice which promises to communicate only negative messages about learning. These “suspensions” are typically not counted in reporting the official suspension rate so they cannot be considered in assessing a school’s effectiveness.

In-school suspension programs can also hide other problems. Just as black students are disproportionately represented in out-of-school suspensions, the same disproportion may be reflected in in-school suspensions as discussed in the Gold Report (School District of Palm Beach County, 2004). However, because such suspensions are not counted or analyzed, possible race discrimination may continue unaddressed or unnoticed (Wheelock, 2002).

Finally, as with out-of-school suspensions, in-school suspension may represent a short-term solution to student misbehavior. In-school suspension, however, does not correct specific school conditions, which contribute to misbehavior. When such problems go unaddressed, the number of students losing out on their education is not likely to decline. Indeed, some in-school suspension programs may create additional problems for students (Wheelock, 1986).

Principles of First and Mizell (1980) on in-school suspension programs taken from their book, *Everybody’s Business*, about school discipline are the basis for the study.

The book was written for parents, teachers, school board members, and other citizens to help reduce disruptive behavior in schools (First & Mizell, 1980).

First and Mizell's (1980) guidelines state that any in-school-suspension program should have a clear statement of purpose. This is necessary in order to know if they are being successful. There should be written procedures developed with teachers, students and parents clearly stating how students are referred and assigned to in-school suspension. There should be a designation of an administrator responsible for determining if the assignment is appropriate and who has the authority and the resources to pursue actions if the referral is not (First & Mizell, 1980).

A provision should be made for an academic component so those students keep up with their classes. It is imperative that students not fall behind while in the program (First & Mizell, 1980).

There should be requirements that teachers continue to provide daily resources and materials to referred students. A provision for a counseling component needs to be provided to help referred students. There should be provisions for notifying and engaging parents along with procedures for monitoring and follow-up of individual student progress. Provisions need to be made for collecting information that summarizes the numbers of students assigned to in-school suspension for each quarter by race and referring teacher and regular reporting of this information to the school community (First & Mizell, 1980).

Finally, it is also recommended that there be alternatives for improving school climate. These included involving students in developing school rules and peer mediation programs (First & Mizell, 1980).

Research questions answered in this study were as follows:

1. Which of First and Mizell's principles for a successful In-School Suspension program are being implemented and which are not in the schools being studied?
2. What other influences might be contributing to the success or failure of the ISS program?

The researcher observed the programs to determine if First and Mizell's (1980) principles are being implemented. Also, the participants involved in the administration of the program were interviewed to determine their opinions of the success or lack of success with regard to First and Mizell's (1980) principles or any other components of the program. Participants included school administrators, teachers administering the program, and teachers referring students to the program.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As defined in his article, Gushee (1984) states that, “In-School Suspension (ISS) is an in-house program to which a student may be assigned for a short period of time in lieu of out-of-school suspension” (Gushee, 1984, p. 1). It is designed to counteract many of the negative effects of suspension. Instructional time can continue without interruption and special academic help can be provided as needed. Counseling services for students experiencing personal, academic, or behavioral difficulties can result in behavioral changes such as an improved self-image and greater self-discipline (Gushee, 1984).

Driving Forces Behind ISS

The driving force behind in-school suspension is that ISS overcomes the major shortcoming of traditional suspension because it does not deprive students of an educational experience. It can help reduce the daytime juvenile crime rate, which has been highly correlated with out-of-school suspensions. ISS is a response to the increasing numbers of out-of-school suspensions, truancies, and the general public’s perception of discipline laxity in schools. It can help reduce the effects suspensions have on the dropout rate by providing a disciplinary consequence within the learning environment (Southard, 2002).

Categories/Forms of ISS

There are several forms of in-school suspension programs. They may be classified into the following categories (Southard, 2002):

1. Punitive model—assumes punishment will reduce the deviant behavior.
2. Discussion format—assumes that active discussions with staff and activities to improve self-esteem, communication, and problem-solving skills will develop and influence appropriate behavior.
3. Academic model—assumes behavior is a direct result of academic frustration and improved basic skills will help improve student behavior.
4. Individual model—assumes reasons for misbehavior vary from student to student and combines models 1 to 3 with an evaluation component. This is a strict model in which there is a pencil sharpener, scrap paper, dictionary, and adult supervisor. Students bring their work from their regular classes and complete it throughout the day. Students remain in the room throughout the day with lunch in the room. The supervisor only converses with the students about their work.
5. Enhanced model—could include review of the ISS rules, counseling, and discussion of strategies.

Effectiveness of Programs

Program evaluations are needed to measure the benefits and analyze the effects of ISS. Guindon (1992) conducted a review of literature that reported out-of-school suspensions were counterproductive and alternatives such as ISS work better. A review

of thirty-one articles written from 1970 to 1994 recommends the use of in-school suspension accompanied by assistance and support in lieu of out-of-school suspension (Guindon, 1992).

A study done by Guindon (1992) in which an in-school suspension program was implemented in an elementary school in New England for four months revealed the following:

- All program objectives were met.
- ISS students received counseling.
- There was no drop in grades.
- Accurate records were maintained.
- Parents were notified.
- 14 out of 19 students suspended in ISS were returned to the classroom with few or no problems. (p. 39)

The program continued and was considered successful. Program administrators concluded from the data that student discipline improved and felt they were meeting their objectives. In a literature review on ISS programs Guindon (1992) lists the following effective and non-effective practices used in the programs.

Effective Practices

- Shared decision-making is needed in establishing the program.
- A philosophy with clear rules, policies, and procedures should be developed.
- Providing adequate resources and funding is a necessity. Staffing ISS with existing teachers is effective but the primary need is the ability to work well with all groups.

- Continuous program monitoring by the ISS teacher, counselor, and social worker is essential.
- It is best to utilize ISS for up to 10 days, starting with full, not partial suspension.
- Students should be referred for more serious, not minor, infractions.
- A consistent referral process that includes student demographics, length of stay, and infraction is needed.
- Consistent counseling is provided emphasizing problem solving.
- Evaluation components are used to measure and analyze program benefits through accurate record keeping. A committee can be formed to review the data and makes recommendations for program improvement.
- One staff member consistently monitors the referral process.
- The principal is supportive.
- Academic work is constantly provided for continuity of learning.
- Parents are involved immediately. (p. 40)

Ineffective Practices

- Without a program evaluation, an analysis of the effects/benefits of ISS cannot be measured.
- Splitting the roles of personnel can cause inconsistency in the program delivery.
- Referring students for minor offenses can cause ISS to become a dumping ground for any student misbehavior.

- The lack of uniformity in the use of a school-wide behavior system can create an overloaded, ineffective ISS program.
- Inconsistent counseling will have little or no impact on changing student behavior.
- Time constraints in schools do not allow for adequate follow-up with students returning to regular classes and/or any family therapy.
- Students still miss direct instruction, class discussions, and projects while in ISS.
- The use of ISS will sometimes result in overrepresentation of minority students. (p. 41)

These ineffective practices were included to determine if schools being studied were including them and if they were experiencing positive or negative results due to their inclusion. The possibility exists that certain combinations of practices deemed as ineffective may yield positive results when included with certain pairings of effective practices (Guindon 1992).

The on-line article “In-school suspension” (Southard, 2002) on-line includes a discussion of considerations for implementing an In-School-Suspension program. The research suggests that five important questions should be considered. The questions are:

- What do schools hope to accomplish through the implementation of an ISS program?
- How will implementation of ISS affect student achievement, student discipline, school climate and the learning environment?

- What are the effects on academic achievement of at-risk students, ESE students, and the remainder of the student population?
- What conditions are necessary to effectively implement an in-school suspension program?
- What skills are needed by the staff? (p. 6)

The answers to these questions would be helpful in assisting schools to improve student achievement.

Other Students Rights vs. Disruptive Students

Lancette (1997) addresses the problem of unruly students interfering with the rights of other students to learn in Georgia Public Schools. Teachers and parents have frequently stated that it is not right for a few unruly students to disrupt the education of the rest of the students in the class. The public is ready to stomp out discipline problems in schools, but the people making decisions in Georgia, recently voted down a provision that would have temporarily removed disruptive students from classrooms.

Williams (R-Snellville, GA) (as cited in Lancette, 1997) states that a lax approach to disruptive students in elementary school is sending the wrong message to students. “If we allow students to be in elementary school without enforcing rules before they get to middle school, we’re ingraining certain things in their behavior,” says Williams (as cited in Lancette, 1997, p.3). Williams believes that such neglect will lead to problems beyond a lack of respect for teachers and education. “If we don’t pay for additional support now, we’re going to pay in other ways later. We’re going to pay through crime and through more people on welfare,” said Williams (as cited in Lancette 1997, p. 3).

It was argued that less-conscientious teachers would use the program as a place to put students who were troublesome in their classes. Mondani (Georgia) (as cited in Lancette, 1997), Georgia Association of Education interim Executive Director, refutes this idea. “I don’t think teachers are quick to dump their problems. I think there is a myth floating around that teachers don’t want to work with kids. I think the in-school suspension is a great idea if it’s an extensive program—that kids with behavior problems receive the appropriate instruction and are phased back into the regular program” (as cited in Lancette, 1997, p. 2).

There is much support for an in-school-suspension program in Georgia. The only opposition has come from the Georgia School Boards Association. GSBA Executive Vice President Gary Ashley (Georgia), “It’s not that we disapprove of the program but that we think the issue should be a matter for the local school boards,” said (as cited in Lancette, 1997, p. 3). It has been discussed to make the program an option instead of a mandate.

Senator Joey Brush (R-Applying, GA) said, “We want to use state money to encourage this. We want to give some help to counties that need it” (as cited in Lancette, 1997, p. 3). The program would cost approximately \$15 million, a relatively small portion of the \$4.6 billion state education budget.

The American Civil Liberties Union gave their tentative support to the plan. Teresa Nelson, Executive Director of the ACLU said, “It’s a two-sided issue. On one side, teachers need support when they have students who are disrupting class. No one disagrees that children need to be responsible for their actions. On the other hand, we are concerned that children may not get the special care they need. We also want to know if

students will carry an in-school suspension on their permanent records” (as cited in Lancette, 1997, p. 3).

A program that supports ISS, Positive Alternatives to School Suspension (P.A.S.S.) (Hamilton Fish Institute, Working to Make Schools and Communities Safer for Learning, Evaluation 1985-1986, last updated February 23, 2001), is a program that utilizes a self-contained in-school classroom as an alternative to out-of-school suspensions and an adjunct to existing school discipline procedures. At-risk students are the focus of the program, which is made up of student-focused preventive and curative strategies like counseling and learning challenge screening. Staff focused on classroom visitations and teacher conferences, parents focused on outreach to build parents’ understanding of schools’ routines, and the community focused efforts to use community resources to supplement each student’s need for added educational and support services are also part of the program. The schools using the P.A.S.S. program demonstrated a decrease in the number of suspensions (Grice, 1986).

On Campus Intervention Program (OCIP) (Armstrong, 2002) provides students a positive alternative to out-of-school suspension. This program, developed by Suspension Solutions Incorporated, provides students with academic guidance, life skills training, and counseling through assessment, individual, and group, and aftercare sessions to middle and high school students who would have been otherwise suspended from school. OCIP goals are to reduce out-of-school suspensions, to modify the precursor attitudes and behaviors of disruptive students, to keep participants on track academically, to increase the attendance rates and reduce the drop out rate, to promote a classroom environment conducive to teaching and learning, to enhance student achievement for all students in the

school, and to provide staff training on alternative methods of discipline and conflict resolution (Armstrong, 2002).

The setting for this program is on school grounds and requires a staffing unit of four people. A teacher and teacher's aide are provided by the school. A master's level counselor and an intern are provided by a local college. Parental permission is required for participation in the program (Armstrong, 2002). The program is designed for students who would otherwise be suspended from school. Students who are in the program are given assessments to determine underlying issues contributing to their disruptive behavior (Armstrong, 2002).

This is a therapeutic alternative to out-of-school suspension, which addresses health and safety issues. The total impact on student achievement is very important. The usual placement in the OCIP program is five days, which is longer than most out-of-school suspensions. For this reason the classroom, from which the student came, is free from the students' distractions for a longer period. When the student returns to his/her regular class it is hoped that the student will have better coping skills, and, not only will the suspended student be better off, but also, the other students will be in an environment which is more conducive to learning (Armstrong, 2002).

One final benefit to having the OCIP program on a campus is that it is a valuable resource to faculty and staff in dealing with troublesome students. OCIP staff can work with school staff on techniques and strategies that are successful with these students (Armstrong, 2002).

Stiefer (2003) conducted a study that examined the perceptions of nine students who were served by a specific punitive ISS program. Stiefer (2003) defines in-school

suspension as the temporary placement of a misbehaving student in an alternative location within a school or a school district. A punitive ISS program is defined as a type of ISS that employs strict rule enforcement, punitive activities, and isolation to eliminate student misbehavior. Reportedly these practices were put into place under the assumption of being an ideal ISS.

It is presumed that the benefits of ISS include continued academic learning time, assistance with assignments, counseling for behavioral problems, and improved self image (Sheets, 1996; Sullivan, 1989). It has also been suggested that ISS may help reduce the daytime juvenile crime rate by having students in school where they are accounted for and supervised, rather than out-of-school suspension (OSS) in which they are removed from the school setting.

According to Stiefer (2003), ISS is a site-based program designed to offset the negative effects of long-term exclusion and external suspension from school. These negative effects include behavior suppression, an increase in untargeted maladaptive behaviors, and student avoidance of school staff (Costenbader & Markson, 1998). Students placed in ISS would ideally have academic learning time and help as needed (Sheets, 1996). Counseling services are a critical component of ideal ISS programs (Knopf, 1991). Placement in ISS may result in behavioral changes that are associated with improved self-image and greater self-discipline (Gushee, 1984). ISS students are able to experience a learning experience that makes up for the lost classroom learning opportunities by engaging in academic assignments from regular classroom teachers (Turner, 1998). Gushee (1984) cited the positive aspect of ISS in that it helped to reduce

the negative effects that OSS could have on dropout rates by providing disciplinary consequences within the learning environment.

In the most simplified form, called the Individual Model, ISS requires a room that has a pencil sharpener, scrap paper, a dictionary, and adult supervision (Radin, 1988).

The basic assumption is that students in ISS work all day on assignments, which are provided by their regular teacher(s). Students in ISS remain together for lunch.

Discussion in ISS is limited to information related to schoolwork in which students are engaged.

External suspension is ineffective and may be counterproductive according to Constenbader and Markson (1998). In contrast, ISS is a cost-effective alternative to external suspension as a disciplinary method. In creating a setting such as ISS that offers provisions for continuity of the educational experience, school officials seek to avoid some of the disadvantages of external suspension.

One of the problems of ISS is that students may need help with assignments from a different area of the curriculum in which the ISS teacher has no expertise. Mendez and Sanders (1981) stated that the staff of a typical ISS program consists of a single teacher who could not provide expertise in all academic areas. Due to this circumstance, students who are in ISS may fall behind other students, which may be directly attributable to their exclusion from the regular class.

The assumption that ISS helped reduce juvenile crime by keeping the students in school (Stiefer, 2003) where they are unable to engage in criminal mischief where they are being monitored was contested by Mendez and Sanders (1981) who wrote:

Forces of social (schools) often identify nonconforming individuals as deviants, and initiate social reaction to behavior, which then produces greater misconduct because of the formation of a deviant identity. ISS programs, when used for indiscriminant forms of misbehaviors, can serve as a labeling agency. When a student is assigned to ISS, all the teachers who instruct the student are informed of the student's misbehavior. (p. 68)

Some research has great deal has been written about the use of effective site-based programs such as ISS for students who engage in off-task behaviors or who lack self- discipline (Billings & Enger study, 1995. study as cited in Stiefer 2003, 1995: Pemberton, 1985). However, according to a study of 40 schools from across the United States, Mendez and Sanders (1981) expressed concern regarding the effectiveness of ISS programs and their criteria, specifically recidivism and dropout rates, used to determine effectiveness. Constenbader and Markson (1994) pointed out that high recidivism rates in existing ISS programs and the associated high dropout rates are critical indicators of problems that affect not only students, but which have grave and long-term consequences for society. Morgan-D'Atrio, Northup, Lafluer, and Spera (1996) questioned the effectiveness of ISS. They indicated that repeat behavior problems for many students serviced by ISS were not reduced significantly. According to them, ISS may have exacerbated the behavior problems. The long-term impact these programs have on students and society have not been addressed (Gushee, 1984; Mendez & Sanders, 1981)

Constenbader and Markson (1994) cited the need for further research on ISS programs and the need to understand the impact these programs have on children. Hyman and Snook (2000) cite that specific programs such as punitive ISS are lacking in

research. There is also a gap in the literature in regard to student perceptions of ISS programs. Stiefer (2003) points out that studies dealing with student perceptions of ISS programs are sparse if not nonexistent. Instead, the topic of ISS in the literature has been written primarily for school administrators and fails to make the distinction between ideal ISS and punitive ISS (Constenbader & Markson, 1998). On the other hand, Sheets (1996) delineated four different models of ISS programs, which were the punitive model, the decision format model, the academic model, and individual models. Further research on ISS should be specific about the particular model of interest. Sheets (1996) pointed out that the punitive model is the most frequently used. The individual model is the closest to ideal and the least frequently used. It may be that school officials are simply confused or uninformed and put into place punitive ISS without realizing that academic/rehabilitative ISS models exist (Stiefer, 2003).

Haley (2000) devised an in-school suspension program that was literacy-based as opposed to punishment-based. All too often, students are assigned to punitive in-school suspension as an alternative to out-of-school suspension. These programs usually foster isolation and confinement and discourage students from reflecting on their actions and changing their behavior (Ames & Miller, 1994). In contrast, Haley's (2000) in-school suspension program was non-punitive and required students to spend their time on academic tasks. She used this time to utilize writing to reflect on their actions and improve their writing skills.

Students were assigned to Haley's (2000) program due to inappropriate behaviors including fighting, disrespect, vandalism, misconduct, cutting class, use of tobacco products, or leaving school without permission. The referrals were from 1 to 3 days. The

room had from one to 12 students assigned to it. Haley's (2000) research findings established reasons for their assignments to ISS. The students in the program were angry, hostile, indifferent, and disillusioned with school. Most were at risk for failure in their classes. Some were verbally abusive and confrontational. Some of the students denied the behavior for which they were removed from class. Commonalties among students included patterns of unemployed parents, encounters with court officers, living in homeless shelters, and limited parental control. Many of the students were responsible for younger siblings.

The in-school suspension model was designed as a program to improve writing literacy. The students focused their writing on academic work and came to an understanding of why their behavior got them suspended. The program was designed to include collaboration with the students on the prewriting strategies, identification of appropriate behavior, and strategies to improve their behavior. The class objectives were as follows:

- to strengthen their abilities to apply prewriting strategies and
- to provide students with an opportunity to reflect on their behavior (Haley, 2000).

In the beginning of the suspension, students were to complete a form to request assignments from their classroom teachers. They then engaged in prewriting utilizing five prewriting strategies, which were brainstorming, clustering, free writing, listing, and outlining. They, then, told of their view of the incident or reason, which resulted in in-school suspension. Haley (2000) listened without interruption and then acknowledged

their feelings. She let them know that she appreciated their willingness to share (Haley, 2000).

Antisocial Behavior

Walker, Ramsey, and Gresham (2004) give an informative view of students struggling to adapt to the responsibilities placed on them by schools and society. It cites the responsibility being placed on schools yet they are given very little support.

The classroom teacher in today's schools has an important role in our society. This role is particularly critical in pre-school and primary years of children's education. Students who are successful in school are much more likely to be successful in life. Hawkins, Catalano, Kosterman, Abbot and Hill indicate that this is a major factor in not only school success but also protecting students from health-risk behaviors including delinquency, heavy drinking, and teenage sex and pregnancy (as cited in Walker, Ramsey & Gresham, 2004). Walker et al., 2004 indicate:

Schools have enormous potential to achieve these important societal goals, but they have been largely unsupported for doing so. We are strong believers in early identification and screening and in intervention approaches that enable true prevention and that catch problems early on in their development in the lives of children and youths. Achieving these outcomes will yield value-added, positive benefits for everyone, but they require that the bureaucratic and philosophical objections to addressing problems early be addressed systematically and that the resistance that so often emerges around this issue abates. (p. xxiv)

More and more society looks to schools to solve problems with the youth, which are not of the school's making. These problems are more a result of society's

diminishing capacity to raise children and to socialize them into acceptable standards of responsibility, conscientiousness, achievement, self-regulation, caring, and empathy.

Walker et al. (2004) state:

As a rule, educators are not well trained to deal with moderate-to-severe levels of antisocial behavior. The farther along the educational track these students progress, the more serious their problems become, and the more difficult they are to manage. To make matters worse, school personnel generally do not have a thorough understanding of the origins and development course of such behavior, which further complicates their reactions to it. (p. 2)

Antisocial behavior is defined as involving the repeated violation of social norms across a range of contexts such as home, school, and community. By this definition, antisocial behavior is trait-like in nature. Antisocial is the polar opposite of pro-social, which refers to cooperative, positive, and mutually reciprocal forms of social behavior (Walker et al., 2004).

Antisocial behavior is a destructive and hard disorder to manage. Most experts agree that antisocial behavior requires the earliest possible intervention that focuses on three settings which are the home and parents, the classroom and teachers, and the playground and peers (Dodge, 1993).

Walker, Ramsey, and Gresham (2004) list several facts on antisocial behavior. There are two types of antisocial behavior: overt and covert. Overt involves acts against people; covert involves acts against property or self-abuse. Overt would appear to be the more serious of the two but different circumstances for either behavior would appear to be serious (Walker et al., 2004).

Antisocial behavior early in a child's school career is the single best predictor of delinquency in adolescence. It appears that a child who exhibits this type of behavior in their early years is more prone to continue or repeat it. The vast majority of antisocial children are boys although there is no specific reason given (Walker et al., 2004).

Three years after leaving school, seventy percent of antisocial youths have been arrested at least once. This is a startling statistic in that there is a high correlation between antisocial behavior and future criminal behavior (Walker et al., 2004).

Antisocial children can be identified very accurately at age three or four. If children can be identified at this early age it would appear not all children should undergo mandatory screening before entering a formal educational program whether it be a kindergarten or pre-kindergarten program (Walker et al., 2004).

The more severe the antisocial behavior pattern, the more stable it is over long term and across settings. This provides a better argument for screening children and placing them in programs to meet their needs (Walker et al., 2004).

By the end of grade three if an antisocial pattern does not change, it should be treated as a chronic condition. Children, who have not been treated for this specifically, need to undergo ongoing treatment and be monitored for progress or further deterioration (Walker et al., 2004).

Early intervention in the home, school, and community is the single best way of diverting children from the path of antisocial behavior. Children who grow up antisocial are at severe risk for a host of long-term, negative developmental outcomes, including school dropout, vocational adjustment problems, drug and alcohol abuse, relationship problems, and higher hospitalization and mortality rates (Walker et al., 2004).

Using three measures of school-related adjustment in grade five, the arrest status of a high-risk sample can be correctly predicted in 80% of cases five years later. The measures are: a five-minute teacher rating of social skills, two 20-minute observations of negative-aggressive behavior on the playground involving peers, and the number of discipline contacts with the principal's office that are written up and placed in the child's permanent school record (Walker et al., 2004).

Antisocial behavior is about aggression, whether physical, gestural, or verbal. This aggression is characteristic of youth and is directed at multiple targets, which may include social agents, such as peers, siblings, and parents, or property, including vandalism or theft and self-abuse, including substance abuse (Walker et al., 2004).

Dealing with the antisocial student population in today's pressurized school environment is difficult and frustrating, and often there is no identifiable reward. However, of all those who suffer from conditions and disorders that impair school performance, these students are among the most capable, with the greatest capacity for change. Walker et al. (2004) suggests that antisocial students deserve access to the best practices and model programs—ones that have proven to be effective in prior research. Schools are an important setting for intervening with antisocial students. The schools, however, are complex and fragile organizations that require sensitivity, tact, and careful attention to detail when implementing interventions for antisocial behavior (Walker et al., 2004). Furthermore,

Policymakers and legislators view schools as the ultimate vehicle for accessing children who need services, supports, and interventions that can impact their physical and mental health. Schools are also important settings for identifying

children who suffer from various forms of neglect and abuse at home. As families continue to abandon their parenting responsibilities on a broad scale, schools must assume the role of protector, socializing agent, and caregiver. (p. 42)

Many areas, which were traditionally parental responsibilities such as sex education, drug awareness, socializing agent, and caregiver, are now responsibilities of the school. Despite all of these additional responsibilities schools now assume, there has been a reduction in our financial investment in schools, requiring schools to restructure and reform themselves to achieve higher academic standards, and becoming more critical of school systems for their failure to compensate for our failures as a society. As a country, Americans invest less in our educational system and infrastructure than other modern, industrialized nations, as well as leading in incarcerating our citizens (Walker et al., 2004).

Instructional Strategies

Algozzine and Ysseldyke (1992), described effective instructional practices called, “Strategies and Tactics for Effective Instruction.” Strategies, tactics, and activities are provided to support the application of the following ten principles governing effective instruction and classroom management:

Strategy one: goals and expectations for performance and success are stated clearly and understood by the student. This strategy is a basic strategy, which is included in most if not all education courses and programs.

Strategy two: classroom management is effective and efficient. This is an outcome, which is a very desirable result for any classroom. Teachers and administrators should strive to get these types of results from all of their classrooms.

Strategy three: there is a sense of positiveness in the school environment.

A positive approach and attitude will be a much more conducive environment for students to achieve their ultimate potential and feel a sense of belonging and worthiness.

Strategy four: there is an appropriate match between student skills and the demands of classroom tasks. The demands of the classroom must match the student's ability. If it does not, there exists fertile ground for problems both academically and behaviorally. Students who feel overwhelmed by the demands of the class or are not capable of achieving in a particular class due to an overwhelming curriculum will become frustrated and possibly become discipline problems or experience other difficulties.

Strategy five: lessons are presented clearly and follow specific instructional procedures. This is again a very basic objective of any instructional program, which educators should strive for.

Strategy six: instructional support is provided for the individual student. Each student learns at a different pace and through use of different strategies. When students are not grasping a concept they can become frustrated and display inappropriate behavior.

Strategy seven: allows sufficient time allocated to academics, and instructional time is used efficiently. Again, this is a very basic goal of any educational program.

Strategy eight: student opportunity to respond is high. Students need to be comfortable in the educational setting and not be afraid to respond to a question or become involved in a class discussion.

Strategy nine: the teacher actively monitors student progress and understanding.

Teachers need to be aware of the understanding students have of the material being presented. Just because the teacher taught a concept does not necessarily mean all of the students grasped an understanding of it.

Strategy ten: states that student performance is evaluated appropriately and frequently. To evaluate students as well as teachers, there must be some sort of meaningful evaluation. Without evaluation, it is not possible to determine the effectiveness of the instruction. Having said that, the evaluation needs to be meaningful and not intimidating.

Peer Tutoring

Strayhorn, Strain, and Walker (1993) have advocated for the use of peer tutoring strategies in teaching social interaction skills to facilitate positive mental health and social competence outcomes among general student populations. The model they propose is based on the assumptions that positive, friendly, kind, and cooperative interactions are highly relevant to the prevention of psychiatric disorders and antisocial behavior. Academic competence is also an important psychological health skill for children. Prevention attempts encounter a major obstacle when they depend on programs into which only a fraction of the target population will ever enter. One of the most promising ways to overcome these obstacles is a transformation and restructuring of schools so that the nurturing and academic training of younger students by older students is part of the daily experience of each student and a training ground in which important psychological skills can be modeled, instructed, practiced, monitored, and reinforced (Strayhorn, 1993).

Gunter, Denny, Jack, Shores, and Nelson (1993) have said there is not any one single intervention strategy that will be a cure-all that will solve all the problems that are encountered by antisocial individuals and no technique will change their behavior to within normal limits. There are generic strategies, which may be helpful.

1. Attempt to build a positive, trusting relationship with the antisocial student as a first step in positively influencing his or her behavior and development.
2. Establish the best universal intervention procedures possible for improving academic performance and social adjustment before resorting to selected interventions.
3. Be sensitive to the behavioral efficiency of the responses aimed at being reduced and replace in comparison with those they are being replaced with.
4. Begin intervention approach or strategy with positive procedures only.
5. Involve the antisocial student's primary caregivers in the intervention process while recognizing that, in some cases, little cooperation or interest will be derived from them in this regard.
6. Systematically screen and begin intervening as early as possible in the school careers of any student at risk for antisocial behavior patterns.
7. Be sure to teach empathy and socially responsible decision making as part of the intervention. Be aware that the academic demands and ordinary classroom management procedures that most teachers and students take for granted, as a normal part of schooling, may be highly aversive events for the antisocial student (Gunter, Denny, Jack, Shores & Nelson, 1994).

Antisocial students are at an elevated risk of school failure and dropout. They display behavioral characteristics that are aversive to others and directly conflict with teacher expectations associated classroom management (Hersh & Walker, 1983).

Implementation Recommendations

The following recommendations have been found to be effective in addressing behavioral problems of antisocial students in kindergarten through sixth grades (Walker et al., 2004). These include:

1. Adult praise. This is a form of focused attention that conveys approval and positive regard.
2. A provision should be made for individual and group reinforcement contingencies. This contingency refers to the relationship between a positive consequence and the target behavior of an individual or a group of individuals (Walker et al., 2004).
3. Social skills training will be included. There are guidelines for effective training in this area. Time-out is sometimes a necessary tool for use with disruptive, aggressive students.
4. A response cost or cost contingency should be included to the student. Unlike time-out, cost contingency removes a privilege or earned points for a behavioral infraction of some sort (Walker et al., 2004).

Decision-Making in Assessment

Decisions on screening are made based on the total population. (Severson & Walker, 2003) The screening is used to determine if more specialized assessment procedures are required. An essential component of effective prevention effort is early

screening and identification of children at risk for antisocial behavior. The longer these children go without effective interventions, the more intense and resistant their problem behavior will be later in their school careers (Severson & Walker, 2003). The policymakers have the responsibilities of setting standards, selecting goals, monitoring the quality of the interventions, encouraging best practices, and formulating policies (Severson & Walker, 2003).

Prevention as an Overarching Goal of School-Based Suspension

Kellam, of the American Institutes for Research (AIR), is an authority on achieving high-quality prevention outcomes within applied social contexts (as cited in Walker et al., 2004). Kellam has studied barriers and obstacles in the implementation of community and school-based interventions. Kellam's observations include the development of the field of preventive science over the past three decades, which has resulted in a growing body of prevention programs that have been rigorously tested for their efficacy and effectiveness within a range of community and other social contexts (as cited in Walker et al., 2004).

Effective prevention requires addressing those specific features of social contexts that either help or hinder development of individuals and their capacities for meeting the demands of social adaptation. Prevention research and programming are best viewed from a public health perspective as promoting social adaptation and psychological well being and reducing social maladaptation and the development of mental or behavioral disorders over the life course. According to Kellam, prevention is based on acquiring knowledge regarding risk factors and then directing appropriate intervention(s) resources

at specific risk factors to promote positive outcomes and to forestall or deter adverse outcomes (as cited in Walker et al., 2004).

Aside from their presence within and across social contexts, risk factors reside in the physical environment and within the individual. They are also manifested in the interactive demand-response dynamics that come into play when individuals respond to the ordinary demands of the environment (Lancette, 2000).

Severson and Walker (2003) suggest that to be successful and cost effective the intervention must include addressing known risk factors and the precursors to destructive outcomes. It should be applied as early as possible in a child's life and school career. It should be carefully coordinated and delivered with integrity. It must be adequately funded and it should establish benchmarks and outcomes to gauge progress.

The non-school experiences of children and youths have everything to do with how they perform in school and how they react to the general experience of schooling (Steinberg, 1996). The more risks they are exposed to outside of school and the longer the exposure lasts, the more damaging are their effects and the greater the negative impact on school performance (Reid, Patterson & Snyder, 2002). Too often, these experiences and conditions impair school performance, contribute to school failure, and set the stage for destructive forms of behavior within and outside the school setting. Schools can play important roles in buffering and offsetting the damaging effects of this kind of exposure to intractable risks. However, to do so, they must be adequately funded and be willing to enter into true collaborative partnerships with families, police, juvenile courts, and social service agencies (Severson & Walker, 2003).

Interventions in the Elementary and Middle School Grades

It is critical that children be evaluated at the point of school entry on two important dimensions that have much to do with a successful school career. They are the presence of challenging forms of behavior and a lack of school readiness associated with learning to read (Severson & Walker, 2003).

Children who manifest aggressive, coercive behavior patterns suffer terribly in school and often victimize peers, teachers, and other adults in their reactions to the schooling experience. Frequently, they are pushed out of school in later middle school or beginning high school because their problems are so intractable and their overall behavior is so aversive and noxious. Severson and Walker (2003) stated:

Children who fail to learn to read to the best of their abilities constantly receive the message that they are a failure in school. The cumulative effect of this negative feedback over time often results in their disengagement from schooling; they come to view it as a punishing experience, which eventually causes them to drop out. Further, those students who experience reading failure and challenging behavior have a low overall quality of life. (pp. 134-135)

The Positive Behavior Support (PBS) Program

Positive Behavioral Support (PBS) (Annushko & Hunter, 2002) is a systemic intervention approach that school leaders have embraced enthusiastically in recent years as a means of creating disciplined, orderly, positive school environments that promote social competence among all students. PBS is defined as consisting of a systemic and individualized strategies to achieve important social and learning outcomes while

preventing problem behavior (Anushko & Hunter, 2002). PBS approaches are system wide.

One of the vital components of PBS is that a positive school environment is created in which all staff follows the same set of behavioral expectations. Total implementation of this program takes two years (Annushko & Hunter, 2002).

A school wide, positive behavior support approach addresses four behavioral challenges facing schools. They consist of intense behavior patterns of individual students, group behavior patterns in classrooms, group behavior patterns in non-classroom settings, and school wide behavior patterns that define the school culture (Horner et al., 2001).

The Effective Behavior Support (EBS) Program

EBS provides a supportive, systemic context for addressing each of these challenges. The EBS developers recognized that, for schools to become more effective, school leaders must adopt evidence-based, proven practices that are adapted to the school's characteristics and unique features and a strong support system must be developed to support and sustain them over the long term. "The hallmark of an effective support-and-delivery system for PBS is a three-tiered model of prevention in which different intervention approaches are used to achieve primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention goals and outcomes" (Horner et al., 2001, p. 137).

Nine steps for the teaching of school-wide skills are to define three to five school-wide behavioral expectations. You must provide a "defining rule" for each expectation. You will build a culture of competence by teaching the school-wide expectations to all students. Teaching behavioral expectations in an array of school settings is the third step.

Follow this up by teaching specific social behaviors that are examples of the behavioral expectations. You will also teach behavioral expectations with “negative” examples. The teacher will give the students the opportunity to practice appropriate behaviors and reward appropriate behavior. Finally you will acknowledge appropriate behavior on a regular basis after the skill is learned (Horner et al., 2001).

School Approaches to Managing Problem Behavior

Schools are expected to ensure that all students make adequate progress. This is an unfair situation schools are put in for two reasons. First, some children come to school unprepared to learn due to circumstances in the child’s home. Secondly, schools are expected to solve problems that students bring with them to school (Walker et al, .2004).

Typical approaches for student misbehavior that are used by school personnel include blaming. The school personnel sometimes blame others, such as the parents, for student problems. The school personnel say the student needs medication—when students experience behavior problems schools sometimes refer the student to doctors for drug therapy to lessen the problem. Students are sometimes referred for counseling and psychotherapy, which are popular interventions for coping with disruptive behaviors in the classroom (Walker et al., 2004).

There are also ineffective ways of coping with antisocial behavior. These include social attention which many times not only does not have the desired effect of reducing the behavior, but also, also, in some cases strengthens and maintains the inappropriate behavior (Walker et al., 2004). Teachers sometimes ignore the behavior with the notion that the student will discontinue the behavior once the attention is removed.

Inappropriate behavior is mainly sustained by peer attention. Therefore, a lack of teacher

attention does nothing to deter the behavior. Teachers find it very difficult to ignore inappropriate behavior and, the longer the teacher ignores it, the more escalated the misbehavior becomes. Also, in some cases the student's negative behavior sometimes leads the student to being able to avoid academic tasks (Walker et al., 2004).

Another mistake teachers make is by escalating prompts. Escalating prompts involve the teacher trying to overcome the behavior by becoming more forceful. By trying to become more forceful in the face of misbehavior it does very little or nothing to control the behavior (Walker et al., 2004).

Practices or strategies with a proven track record of providing a more positive climate are to establish a positive ecology for the classroom setting that is inclusive and supportive of all students, irrespective of their behavioral and academic characteristics. Schools should continually be aware that teachers and other adults could unknowingly form and express negative impressions of low-performing, uncooperative students to which such students are quite sensitive. They should establish and communicate high expectations in achievement and behavior for all students. Schools should create a structured learning environment in which students know what is expected of them. They need to provide sharp demarcations between academic periods, but hold transition times between periods to a minimum. Also, consider using cooperative learning strategies that allow diverse groups of students to interact, problem solve, collaborate, and develop skills in working together. They will systematically teach social skills that incorporate instruction in anger management and conflict resolution skills. Academic programming and task difficulty should be commensurate with the skill level of low-performing students. Students should be taught how to be appropriately assertive rather than

aggressive. Teachers should use difficult situations as teaching opportunities, find ways to praise and encourage acting-out students at the same or a higher rate than that for appropriately behaving students. They should communicate a genuine interest in the progress of acting out students, enhance the performance of acting-out students by using individualized instruction, cues, prompts, task analysis of academic tasks, etc, and avoid criticizing, ridiculing, verbally punishing, or arguing with any student (Walker et al, 2004).

Management of Student Agitation Levels

Antisocial students are quite adept at behavioral escalation. When teachers give a command with which they do not want to comply, they escalate their behavior until the command is withdrawn. Students sometimes engage in delaying tactics to provoke parents and teachers, engage them in negative interactions, and assert their control and independence (Walker et al, 2004).

A teacher who gives time frames to force compliance will seldom be successful with antisocial students. Waiting a reasonable time for compliance while not attending to the lack of compliance will sometimes generate a more favorable response (Walker et al., 2004). Teachers can use the escape strategy if they find themselves in an escalating situation. This can be done by answering questions, providing assistance, or clarifying instructions. The teacher should attempt to disengage with the student as soon as possible (Walker et al, 2004).

Walker and Walker (1991) gave these three rules to avoid becoming engaged in escalated interactions.

1. The rules do not make demands on or otherwise initiate contact with a student when he or she appears to be agitated.
2. Teachers should not allow themselves to become engaged through a series of questions and answers initiated by the student.
3. They should not attempt to force the student's hand.

“Teachers should be following these guidelines in giving commands to maximize their effectiveness and allow for more effective classroom management” (Walker, 1995, p. 171). Teachers should use only as many commands as needed in order to teach and manage the classroom effectively. Do not overload students with commands and tasks. Focus on specific tasks that need to be followed in order to conduct the class in an efficient manner.

The teacher should try to limit the number of terminating commands given in favor of initiating commands. This could go a long ways in creating a positive classroom environment. Only one command should be given at time. The purpose is not to overload students with commands that they may not remember. The teacher should be specific and direct. Tell the students exactly what is requested. A reasonable amount of time should be given for the student to respond to the command. It may take students varying amounts of time to process the information. Just because all students respond immediately it does not mean they are not being cooperative and/or not on task. Teachers should not repeat the command more than once if the student does not comply. If they heard you the first time and did not comply there is no reason to believe they will thereafter (Walker et al., 1991).

Teachers should give commands in close proximity to the student instead of from a distance. This gives the teacher a presence in the classroom. If commands are given from a distance the students may not hear or hear clearly (Walker & Walker, 2001).

Guindon (1992) did a study on ISS (In-School Suspension) and reported results. He lists effective and ineffective practices he determined through his review of literature. An online article, "In-School Suspension (2002)," lists considerations for ISS programs. This research suggests five important questions to be asked when considering whether to implement an ISS program.

Also addressed in this chapter were other student's rights versus disruptive students (Lancette, 1997). Lancette (1997) cites parents and teachers saying over and over it is not right for a few unruly students to disrupt the education of the other students.

Benefits of ISS programs cited continued learning time, assistance with assignments, counseling for behavioral problems, and improved self-image. It was also suggested that ISS might help to reduce daytime juvenile crime. The reasoning given for this is students are in a supervised setting in ISS as opposed to OSS where they are removed from the school setting (Sheets, 1996; Sullivan, 1989).

Constenbader and Markson (1998) cite external suspension as ineffective and counterproductive. In contrast ISS is a cost-effective alternative. ISS offers provisions for continuity of the educational experience while avoiding the negative effects of external suspension.

Anti-social behavior is cited as a source of unrest in schools. According to Simcha-Fagan, Langner, Gersten, and Eisenberg, anti-social behavior is defined as, "The repeated violations of social norms across a range of social contexts such as home,

school, and community” (as cited in Walker et al., 2004, p. 3). Anti-social behavior is very destructive and a disorder which is very hard to manage (Dodge, 1993).

In summary this review of literature touched on various topics relating to issues on advantages of in-school suspension (ISS) over out-of school suspension. It discussed the issue of antisocial behavior as relating to students experiencing difficulties in school. Also discussed were school approaches to dealing with students with behavior problems.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN

Purpose

A qualitative methodology was used to determine the best practices of an in-school suspension program, by examining existing in-school suspension programs in high schools that have high incidences of suspensions and discipline referrals, in a South Florida school district. The study looked at best practices recommended by First and Mizell (1980) for an in-school suspension programs (ISS) and compared those with the ones that are employed by the high schools being studied in this qualitative research program.

This study will be important in determining policies schools could adopt which might have beneficial effects for students and society in general. The purpose of an ISS program is to keep students in school and academically engaged. In the opinion of many administrators and scholars, there is little doubt that keeping students in school in an environment, that is conducive to learning, would have beneficial results (Skiba & Peterson, 2003).

Methodology and Procedures

In the review of literature, there were no references to how personnel of ISS felt about the programs. They were not asked how they felt the programs were serving the students assigned to them. "Empirical studies can numerically inform the reader about increasing or decreasing rates of recidivism in ISS. But, empirical studies do not explain how students live and experience ISS" (Stiefer, 2003, p. 39). A strength of qualitative

data is that it focuses “on naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural settings, so that we have a strong handle on what “real life” is like” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10). This study examined more than the raw numbers of how schools are doing in terms of rates of recidivism. It looked deeply into what schools are doing to help students assigned to ISS be able to return to the regular classroom and conform their behavior so that it is acceptable.

Researchers who conduct qualitative research face three challenges:

- a. developing a conceptual framework for the study that is thorough, concise, and elegant;
- b. planning a design that is systematic and manageable, yet flexible; and
- c. integrating these into a coherent document that convinces the proposal readers—funding agency or dissertation committee—that the study should be done, can be done, and will be done (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 9).

The question of “should-do-ability” requires the researcher to build the argument that the research will contribute to theory and research in the selected field. In other words the question of “so what?” needs to be answered (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). This study addressed the problem of at risk students, whose misconduct in school is a precursor to more serious educational problems, supporting the need to reexamine the complex relationship between misconduct, disciplinary measures, and student achievement (Walker et al., 2004).

According to Marshall and Rossman (1999) a second challenge is demonstrating the “do-ability” of the study. One factor is the availability of resources and funding. This study was conducted with very little expenditure of funds. The researcher drove to

the schools, all within a twenty-five mile radius of his home. The researcher was granted access to all of the schools due to the fact that the district is very interested in the results of the research. The district's Safe Schools Department supported the research in hopes of improving their ISS programs.

The third area addresses the area of, "want-to-do" ability (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). The researcher's current position is that of an assistant principal in an elementary school. He has seen students display misbehavior that warrants removal from the classroom. In some cases the students are suspended from school and other cases they are removed from the class. In-school suspension can help reduce the effects suspensions can have on the dropout rate by providing a disciplinary consequence within the learning environment (Southard, 2002). The researcher concurs with Stiefer (2003) that ISS is a site based program designed to offset the negative effects of long-term exclusion and external suspension from school.

Out-of-school suspension (OSS) is an urgent issue, given current understandings of the association between OSS and student disengagement, academic failure, non-promotion, and ultimately, student choices to drop out of school (Hot Topics: Usable Research, 1990). This research also stated that, out-of-school suspensions and expulsions could contribute to school failure and decisions by students to drop out.

Factors cited were:

- Suspension and expulsion from school promote failure because they are counted as unexcused absences.

- A student faced with automatic school failure, regardless of subsequent efforts in the semester or year has no incentive to attend school or put forth academic effort.

In light of the preceding information it is logical to study In-School Suspension programs for an alternative to these unsuccessful OSS programs. The research studied several programs employing various practices, experiencing different levels of success, assessing programs to see what is common, and uniquely different, in their approach.

The researcher also drew on personal experience from his current job as an assistant principal at an elementary school in Southeast Florida. He has been at this position for the past nine years. In this time, he has been the primary disciplinarian at the school. As a result of this experience, he has seen many students display inappropriate behavior on a continuing basis. He has seen the impact that out-of-school suspension, as well as in-school suspension, has had on these students. The primary reason for completing this study is to recommend practices for ISS to help students achieve success in an academic setting, that is conducive to their needs.

Research Questions

The research questions that were addressed are:

1. Which of First and Mizell's (1980) principles for a successful ISS program are being implemented and which are not in schools being studied?
2. What other influences might be contributing to the success or failure of the ISS program?

School Selection Criteria

The Gold Report (2004) was used to gather information on school suspension rates on the three schools selected to be a part of the study. The School District's Safe Schools Director, who supervises the county ISS programs, recommended the schools to be studied based on her knowledge of the ISS programs at these schools. As part of the background reported on the schools that were studied is a letter grade the school received from The Florida Department of Education (FDOE). This letter grade is based on student performance on The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT).

Once it was determined which schools were to be studied contact was made with the principals of the respective schools through the Safe Schools Department. The principals of the three schools all complied with the request and granted the researcher access to their schools. A questionnaire consisting of open-ended questions was devised to interview the administrator in charge of the program, selected teachers, and the ISS teacher.

Subgroups to be Interviewed

The researcher conducted interviews of the following subgroups:

1. The teachers of the students referred to the ISS program.
2. The teachers in the actual ISS program who are serving the ISS students.
3. The administrator in the school who oversees the ISS program.

The questions asked of the previous subgroups can be found in Appendix B.

The interviews were audio taped with the permission of the participants and transcribed.

They were asked to sign an informed consent form shown in Appendix C.

Rubric Based on First and Mizell's (1980) Principles

In designing this study, a rubric based on First and Mizell (1980) principles was used. The principles and rubrics are as follows:

1. A clear statement of purpose to know if the ISS (In-School Suspension) program is successful.

No Statement of Purpose 0	Statement of Purpose 1	Clear Statement of Purpose 2
------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------

2. Written procedures developed with teachers, students, and parents clearly stating how students are referred and assigned to in-school suspension.

No Written Procedures 0	Written Procedures 1	Clearly Written Procedures 2
----------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------

3. A designation of an administrator responsible for determining if assignment is appropriate and who has the authority and the resources to pursue actions if the referral is not.

No Designation of Administrator Responsible 0	Administrator Designated but Lacking Authority and/or Resources 1	Designated Administrator Has Suggested Authority and Resources 2
---	--	---

4. A provision should be made for an academic component so those students keep up with their classes.

No Academic Component 0	Inadequate Academic Component 1	Academic Component Ensures Students Will Keep Up with Their Classes 2
----------------------------	---------------------------------------	--

5. There should be requirements that teachers continue to provide daily resources and materials to referred students.

Teachers Not Required to Provide Daily Resources	Teachers Provide Daily Resources but Inadequately	Teachers Provide Daily Resources and Materials to Students
0	1	2

6. A provision for a counseling component needs to be provided to help referred students.

No Counseling Component Provided	Inadequate Counseling Component Provided	Adequate Counseling Component Provided
0	1	2

7. There should be provisions for notifying and engaging parents along with procedures for monitoring and follow up of individual student progress.

No Provisions for Notifying Parents or Monitoring and Follow up	Parent Notification, Monitoring, and Follow Up Is Done but Not Consistently	Parent Notification and Engagement Along with Procedures for Monitoring and Follow Up Is Done on All Students in Program
0	1	2

8. Provisions need to be made for collecting information that summarizes the numbers of students assigned to in-school suspension for each quarter by race and referring teacher and regular reporting of this information to the school community.

No Provisions Are Made For Collecting Information That Summarizes The Number Of Students Assigned To In-School Suspension By Race And Referring Teacher And Regular Reporting Of This Information To The School Community	Provisions Are Made For Collecting Information That Summarizes The Number Of Students Assigned To In-School Suspension By Race And Referring Teacher And Regular Reporting Of This Information To The School Community But They Are Not Consistent	Provisions Are Made For Collecting Information That Summarizes The Number Of Students Assigned To In-School Suspension By Race And Referring Teacher And Regular Reporting Of This Information To The School Community
0	1	2

9. It is recommended that there be alternatives for improving school climate.

These include involving students in developing school rules and peer mediation programs.

There Are No Alternatives for Improving School Climate	The Alternatives for Improving School Climate Are Inadequate	There Are Alternatives for Improving School Climate
0	1	2

These nine areas were used to evaluate the schools on whether they are applying First and Mizell's principles (1980) and if so how closely are they following them.

Observations

The researcher also did observations of the ISS programs. These observations consisted of visiting the classrooms where the ISS programs were being conducted. In observing, the researcher was looking for indicators of First and Mizell's (1980) principles being implemented.

The researcher used the rubrics developed that align with First and Mizell's (1980) principles in the observations. A statement of purpose was looked for in the observations.

- Was the statement of purpose displayed in the ISS classroom?
- Was there a statement of purpose in an ISS handbook?
- Did the teachers know the statement of purpose?
- Was there a written statement of purpose at all?

The observations looked for evidence of written procedures stating how students are referred and assigned to ISS. Teachers were asked how the written procedures were developed.

- Did they have any input?
- Who did have input?

The researcher observed the ISS rooms to determine how orderly the ISS classes were. The interactions in the room were observed. This included interactions among students, students and teachers, teachers and others, and students and others.

The researcher tried to understand the climate of the ISS room. The researcher assessed if there appeared to be a climate in which everyone was working collaboratively or were they are all doing their own work on their own.

Data Analysis

The researcher looked for themes in the ISS classrooms. Through the observations and interviews it was determined if there were patterns within classrooms, from classroom to classroom within a school, or patterns between schools. In analyzing

the data the researcher coded behaviors and responses to questions from interviews to determine the themes, which are prevalent within the programs.

The audiotapes were used and transcribed by the researcher to better identify themes in the responses. In the transcriptions, themes were identified from the responses from the various groups and compared between the referring teachers, the ISS teachers, and the administrators of the programs. The themes were identified by comparing responses across groupings such as administrators and ISS teachers. This cross-case analysis was used to enhance generalizability. Although it can be argued that this is an inappropriate goal for a qualitative study, it is desirable to get an adequate sampling to help answer the question of whether these findings make sense beyond this specific case (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

The sets of data by themselves may not be strong enough to support the findings. To counteract this threat to validity the researcher used the triangulation method as a validation strategy. Shank (2002) stated:

Triangulation is the process of converging on a particular finding by using different sorts of data and data-gathering strategies. Each set of data or strategy, on its own, might not be strong enough to support the finding. When these different “strands” are taken together, though, there can be stronger evidence for the finding. (pp. 134-135)

Triangulation methods utilized involved the use of interviewing, observation to gather data, and member checking to validate the findings. By using these two techniques the researcher was able to validate the data collected. An example in this research would be asking an interview question relating to an academic component being

included in the ISS program and then observing the program in action to determine if the academic component was indeed included and to what extent it is incorporated (Shank, 2002). Furthermore, Shank stated:

Observation often enables you to draw inferences about someone's meaning and perspective that you couldn't obtain by relying exclusively on interview data.

This is particularly true for getting at tacit understandings and theory-in-use, as well as aspects of the participants' perspective that they are reluctant to state directly in interviews. (p. 76)

The use of observation in conjunction with interviewing lead to more valid findings. As the participants may not be as willing to divulge information in an interview whereas if the data were observed in an observation it would be verifiable. Finally, the researcher returned to those interviewed and checked to make sure that what he surmised was true (Shank, 2002).

Once the data were compiled, the researcher solicited opinions from peer groups of administrators. This was done by conferring with other school-based administrators in the system to get their input on the data that was compiled. They were asked if the data seemed valid and what their perception of the data was.

Validity

“The exact nature of ‘validity’ is a highly debated topic in both educational and social research since there exists no single or common definition of the term” (Winter, 2000, p. 3) Winter (2000) found it essential to review a range of definitions from leading authors. Hammersley defined validity as, “An account is valid or true if it

represents accurately those features of the phenomena, that it is intended to describe, explain, or theorise (sic)” (as cited in Winter 2000, p. 4).

Qualitative research involves three types of validity. Descriptive validity refers to the accuracy of the account provided by the researcher. Interpretative validity is the understanding by the researcher of the facts provided from the participants’ viewpoints, thoughts, intentions, and experiences. The third type of validity is theoretical validity in which the theoretical explanation fits the data and is therefore credible (Maxwell 1996).

“The main threat to valid description, in the sense of describing what you saw and heard, is the inaccuracy or incompleteness of the data” (Maxwell 1996, p. 89). Recording of interviews and observations counteracts this threat, which is a strategy that was used in conducting this research.

The threat to a valid interpretation is imposing one’s own views and biases rather than understanding the perspective of the people being studied and the meanings of their words and actions (Maxwell, 1996). This could be a result of not listening to the participant or asking leading, closed, or short answer questions that do not allow the participants to express their own perspective. The solution to this threat was the use of member checks. Member checks involve soliciting feedback from the data studied to see if what is being interpreted is actually what the participant meant (Maxwell, 1996).

To counteract the threats to the validity of data collected the researcher conducted peer reviews. This entailed utilizing peers working in similar situations and soliciting their opinions on the validity of the information obtained and its interpretation. The researcher contacted three other assistant principals working at different schools throughout the district. Among the triangulation methods used were the comparing of

within case and across case responses. This was done by comparing the answers given by the respondents to each other in their subgroup and across subgroups to look for similarities and differences in their responses. The researcher identified themes in the responses given within group and across group.

The number of schools involved in the study was three. Due to this small sample of schools being studied and the isolated geographic location being used, the results of this research may not be generalizable to other schools in other locations.

The threat of anyone experiencing any mental or physical harm in the course of this study was low. The participants signed informed consent documents outlining their risks and right to withdraw from this study at any time. Should the participant(s) have chosen to withdraw, their data would have been eliminated from the study and destroyed. The participants' data was coded to protect their identity and confidentially, and will be kept in a locked security box for a period of five years. After five years, the data will be destroyed. There was no financial remuneration for participating in this study.

To summarize, this was a qualitative study done in three high schools. The researcher interviewed the ISS teacher, a referring teacher, and the administrator of the program from each school. The data were compiled to see how close they followed First and Mizell's (1980) principles; if there were any principles being followed not recommended by First and Mizell (1980); if there were additional principles identified, how successful were they.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the data collected and details the treatment of the data. What will be reported are the findings from the schools visited and observed, and also the data gathered from the interviews conducted.

The purpose of the study was to answer the following questions:

1. Which of First and Mizell's (1980) principles for a successful In-School Suspension Program were implemented and which were not in the schools being studied?
2. What other influences might contribute to the success or failure of the ISS program?

The data are presented through an analysis of the interviews and observations in which the researcher compares and contrasts the results received from in-case school data and across-case school data. The responses received from administrators were compared to the responses received from referring teachers and ISS (In-School Suspension) teachers within the same school. Also compared were responses from administrators at the three different schools, referring teachers at the different schools, and ISS teachers among the various schools. The researcher also compared responses across case from school to school.

The same interview instrument was used to determine placement on the rubric, which was developed by the researcher. These questions were developed by the researcher to ascertain whether the programs being studied were following the principles espoused by First and Mizell (1980). The researcher tried to determine the level of adherence through observation and interview questions. The rubric used is as follows:

Rubric Based on First and Mizell's (1980) Principles

1. A clear statement of purpose to know if the ISS (In-School Suspension) program is successful.

No Statement of Purpose	Statement of Purpose	Clear Statement of Purpose
0	1	2

2. Written procedures developed with teachers, students, and parents clearly stating how students are referred and assigned to in-school suspension.

No Written Procedures	Written Procedures	Clearly Written Procedures
0	1	2

3. A designation of an administrator responsible for determining if assignment is appropriate and has the authority and the resources to pursue actions if the referral is not.

No Designation Of Administrator Responsible	Administrator Designated But Lacking The Authority And/Or Resources	Designated Administrator Has The Suggested Authority And Resources
0	1	2

4. A provision should be made for an academic component so students keep up with their classes.

No Academic Component	Inadequate Academic Component	Academic Component Ensures Students Will Keep Up With Their Classes
0	1	2

5. There should be requirements that teachers continue to provide daily resources and materials to referred students.

Teachers Not Required To Provide Daily Resources	Teachers Provide Daily Resources But Inadequately	Teachers Provide Daily Resources And Materials To Students
0	1	2

6. A provision for a counseling component needs to be provided to help referred students.

No Counseling Component Provided	Inadequate Counseling Component Provided	Adequate Counseling Component Provided
0	1	2

7. There should be provisions for notifying and engaging parents along with procedures for monitoring and follow up of individual student progress.

No Provisions For Notifying Parents Or Monitoring And Follow up	Parent Notification, Monitoring, And Follow Up Is Done But Not Consistently	Parent Notification And Engagement Along With Procedures For Monitoring And Follow Up Is Done On All Students In The Program
0	1	2

8. Provisions need to be made for collecting information that summarizes the numbers of students assigned to in-school suspension for each quarter by race and referring teacher and regular reporting of this information should be made to the school community.

No Provisions Are Made For Collecting Information That Summarizes The Number Of Students Assigned To In-School Suspension By Race And Referring Teacher And Regular Reporting Of This Information To The School Community	Provisions Are Made For Collecting Information That Summarizes The Number Of Students Assigned To In-School Suspension By Race And Referring Teacher And Regular Reporting Of This Information To The School Community But They Are Not Consistent	Provisions Are Made For Collecting Information That Summarizes The Number Of Students Assigned To In-School Suspension By Race And Referring Teacher And Regular Reporting Of This Information To The School Community
0	1	2

9. It is recommended that there be alternatives for improving school climate. These include involving students in developing school rules and peer mediation programs.

There Are No Alternatives For Improving School Climate	The Alternatives For Improving School Climate Are Inadequate	There Are Alternatives For Improving School Climate
0	1	2

Organization of Data Analysis

The three schools are described through characteristics gleaned from the Gold Report (2004). The program descriptions were taken from observations done by the researcher of the programs and are based on interviews conducted with key personnel involved in their ISS (In-School Suspension) program. The personnel interviewed were the administrator responsible for the program (usually the assistant principal), the ISS teacher, and a referring teacher.

Observations of the programs were done for time periods ranging from one to two hours. These observations were made prior to the interviews. This allowed the researcher to have an unbiased perspective for observation. The researcher did not want to be influenced by any of the answers given by the interview subjects pertaining to the conditions to be observed. These observations allowed the researcher to ascertain how each school ranked on the continuum of each rubric used to evaluate how they employed the principles of First and Mizell (1980).

These observations were followed by interviews of the administrator responsible for the program, ISS teacher, and referring teacher. An analysis of the three interviews was then conducted. Each school's personnel were grouped together, analyzing the

administrator responsible for ISS, the ISS teacher, and the referring teacher. Each interview was then compared and contrasted across groupings to see similarities and differences within each school.

After comparing and contrasting the interviews from within each school, the interviews from people in similar positions between the three schools were compared and contrasted.

Program Observation

The schools will be referred to as School "A", School "B", and School "C". The programs are described through observations and rankings on the rubric designed to compare the adherence to the program qualities suggested by First and Mizell (1980).

School "A" Background

According to the November 2005 Gold Report, School "A" has a student population of 2,536. In the 2004-2005 school year, this school earned a school grade of B from the FDOE (Florida Department of Education). The school was made up of fifty-two percent male students and forty-eight percent female students. The student population is forty-five percent white, twenty-eight percent black, and twenty percent Hispanic. Twenty-three percent of the students receive free or reduced lunch.

The suspension statistics percentages to be discussed are all unduplicated, i.e., when a student receives multiple suspensions it is only counted as one for the year in terms of percent. In effect, the percentage recorded is the total percentage of the student population. The total number is the number of suspensions including repeat offenders.

In the school year 2005, 273 (ten percent of the student population at School "A" received In-School Suspension and 254 (nine percent received Out-Of-School

Suspension. In the previous school year (2004) 517 (eighteen percent) received ISS and 333 (eleven percent) received OSS. This indicates that fewer students are being assigned to ISS from the previous year, but also of equal importance, just as importantly, is the fact that the numbers receiving OSS declined from 333 to 254. This reflects a decrease of 323 occurrences of students being assigned to a suspension. There was a decrease in students of 429 from 2,965 to 2,536, but based on the percentage of students assigned to a suspension, ISS decreased by eight percent and OSS decreased by two percent.

School "A" ISS Room Observations

The researcher entered the ISS classroom at 8:10 a.m. on May 15, 2006. There were five male students in the room at the time. The room had no windows and was set up in the traditional seating arrangement with rows of desks all facing the front of the room. The teacher was seated at his desk, which was located at the front of the room. There was a bulletin board in the back of the room entitled, "Career Chart Toppers." On the board were posters of various career fields. The career display was seen, by the researcher, as an incentive for the students to focus on what they would like to eventually do with their lives.

At 8:20 a.m. a female student entered the room and took a seat. She left ten minutes later when the class change bell rang. One boy was reading a paperback book while another was sitting at a desk with nothing on it and doing nothing. The other three students had books or papers on their desks, but were not actively engaged in any work.

The teacher began conversing with one of the students at 8:40 a.m. They were talking about cars. The student appeared to be enjoying the conversation with the teacher. The rest of the students carried on passively without any misbehavior.

The female student, who had left the room, returned at 8:55 am. She walked in the room and sat down and began working on what the researcher assumed to be an assignment from another class. It was not apparent to the researcher why she had left or returned.

The researcher left the room from 9:20 to 9:50 a.m. A new teacher had come into the room during this time. There were now six students. There were the original four males and now two females, one white and one black.

While the teacher was leading a discussion of current events, a student was not attending to anything. The teacher told a student she needed to do something. She could not just sit there doing nothing. He asked what her career goal was. She responded that she wanted to be a pastry chef. The teacher then engaged her in a discussion about what she was doing to realize her dream of becoming a pastry chef. He asked her if she wanted to open up her own business someday. She responded affirmatively. The teacher then questioned if she had any business courses which would enable her to run a successful business. She said she did not have any business background, but she had training as a pastry chef. The teacher pointed out that to run a successful business she would need to know how to handle finances and budgets. She would also need to know how to hire and manage a staff of employees.

The teacher then went to the computer and was looking at websites on various careers. He discussed a site on the web that dealt with designing rocket ships. The teacher said the students could make up to two- million dollars a year doing this.

At 10:03 a.m. two students entered the room. They had work for a student who was already there. The student took the assignment and began working quietly. The

teacher was carrying on a conversation with several students regarding technology. The teacher seemed to have a wonderful rapport, as he led the conversation and was able to actively engage them to think about the topic. The teacher encouraged the students to live the American Dream and to do that they would have to take responsibility for their actions.

The teacher continued the discussion emphasizing the future importance of salary. He discussed such things as health insurance and retirement plans. The students appeared to become enthralled with the conversation. He engaged a student who appeared to have a keen interest in cars. The teacher took an economics slant on the subject by pointing out that money was required to maintain a vehicle.

The teacher moved a student away from other students due to talking without permission. He stressed that the only conversation going on in the room would be the one he is leading. All seven students in the room were involved in an individual conversation with the teacher regarding what their future plans involved.

An assistant principal brought a student, a black male, into the room at 10:31 a.m. He stated that he was using a cell phone. The phone in the classroom then rang. The teacher answered and asked the new boy what his name was. He told the person on the phone then hung up. The researcher saw this as a way of the ISS teacher communicating with the office staff. The researcher left the ISS room at 10:45 am.

Most of the points on the rubric were not observable in this class visit. Principle number four regarding teachers providing daily resources and principle number five provisions for an academic component were not evident. Only one of the students was

actively engaged in academic work with the possible exception of a student reading a paperback book.

Principle seven states there should be a counseling component as part of the ISS program. There were no trained counselors involved with the students in the room; however, the second teacher of the day was actively engaging the students in conversations regarding their future plans and aspirations. This teacher was not a trained guidance counselor

These three areas were the only ones that might have been observed by the researcher, but were not. This is not to say that the other rubric components were not present, but they were not observed. Several of the components of the rubric would not be observable; however, they could be discussed during the interview process.

School "A" Interview Discussion

The assistant principal at School "A", who supervises the ISS program, stated that the purpose of the ISS program is to be an alternative to out-of school suspension. "Our goal is to keep students in school as much as possible, rather than send them out, that's what most students want anyway." The AP went on to explain that when students are in ISS they are allowed to make up work. The teachers send work to them and they are not counted as absent. They are still getting a consequence for their actions but they are in school.

The ISS teacher explained the purpose of ISS was to educate the students, but he asked to come back to the question later on. However, he continued to talk about keeping students out of trouble. He also referred to keeping the students in school instead of sending them home.

The referring teacher interviewed explained the purpose of ISS was getting the student out of a destructive environment. He gave an example of a student "being in trouble or maybe they were about to have an altercation." The teacher discussed that the students were still on campus and getting their work.

The assistant principal responded to the question regarding written procedures developed with members of the school community that "they had quite a bit of input." He explained that they incorporated practices from other schools that already had the program and modified it to meet their needs. They had an idea of what they wanted to do by incorporating other schools procedures. They were able to tailor the program to fit their needs.

The ISS teacher talked of the program being up to his discretion. He discussed students refusing to do the work assigned to them and his response was that while some people would send them home, he would not, because he felt that was what the student wanted. The ISS teacher stated his philosophy as, "I'm not going to send a kid home, because he wants to go home. I'm going to make him sit here and he'll do his time, which is more torturous on a kid than going home where he can do what he wants to do."

The referring teacher did not think teachers have any input for the ISS program. He felt that it was handled by the administration.

The AP explained that all of the assistant principals have the authority to send a student to ISS. While teachers can make a recommendation for ISS, they cannot place a student in ISS directly. The ISS teacher added that it is a grade level decision made by the AP in charge of the grade from which the student comes. For example, if a student is a sophomore, he or she is sent to the AP in charge of that grade level and the

determination is made by that AP. The referring teacher contradicted this point by stating that it goes by the administrative dean and is divided by the alphabet. For example, one dean may have all students whose last name begins with the letters A-E and so on.

Teachers are required to provide resources and materials to students assigned to ISS according to the AP. The ISS teacher puts out a list of students assigned to ISS and teachers are supposed to give assignments to those students to complete. When students return to class after ISS they are required to turn the work in to the classroom teacher. The ISS teacher explained he gives students a pass to return to their class to pick up work, or he sends an email stating that the student is in ISS, the duration of the stay and asks that work be sent. The referring teacher stressed that students in ISS are still entitled to their assignments. They must be given their work and allowed to complete it and turn it in for credit. There are no penalties and you must give them the same assignment they would have received in the classroom.

The AP explained it is the responsibility of the student to keep up with their assignments. "This puts the responsibility back on the student as well. There is a problem in that the type of student who is referred is usually not always responsible for their assignments." The ISS teacher simply responded he notifies teachers through email. The referring teacher explained if the ISS teacher requests makeup work, he makes sure the student completes it, but it is then up to the student to turn it in to the teacher. Students have until the next day to turn in their assignments.

The AP explained that when referrals come to an AP if the student is sent to ISS they must make a phone call home to notify the parent that the student has been assigned to ISS. He stated that most parents are appreciative since they would rather have their

children in school being supervised than at home. The practice is that if a student is assigned to ISS a call is made to the home. It is not always possible to contact the parent but in that case a copy of the referral is sent home. If it is not returned by the time the suspension is up, the student is told that if parent contact is not established the student will be given an OSS. When this occurs, the AP noted that parents always call back.

The ISS teacher reiterated that the administrator makes contact with a parent of the student assigned to ISS. He added that, on occasion, he will call the parent and discuss the situation with them. "But as far as regular follow up on the student, there is none." The referring teacher also agreed that parents are automatically contacted by the administration when any disciplinary action is taken. He was not sure if parents were notified when students are sent for "tardies," which refers to a student who is late for school or a class.

Rubric eight deals with collecting information that summarizes the number of students assigned to ISS by race and referring teacher and also whether this information is reported to the school community. The AP stated that he was not sure of the ISS teacher's record keeping, but he did know he turns the information into the data processor every semester. He was also not sure if the information is recorded by referring teacher. The AP did say the computer printouts of their discipline statistics goes to The Safe Schools Department where they break the data down and categorize the offense into different areas. He stated, "We don't really take it to the community, but it's used in the school here as our school tries to make improvements. We see where strengths and weaknesses are."

The ISS teacher discussed a survey given to every student who was in the ISS program. When they complete their time in ISS, they complete a survey. The survey consisted of questions regarding their time in ISS. The referring teacher was not sure if any information was collected from the ISS program and did not know if the information was reported to the school community.

When questioned about alternatives for improving school climate the AP explained, "We're always brainstorming, trying to figure out what we can do to make it safer, make it more amicable for everybody and we try to get student council involved as much as possible." He went on to discuss a program in which they try to encourage students to become involved in school activities such as sports and extracurricular activities to "pull students out of their shell." The AP explained they have a student council which gives input on school policies and procedures. They recently had elections for student council and voting was based on what a candidate said they would do and how they would satisfy student needs if they were elected. The ISS teacher did not offer too much in the way of improving school climate although when questioned on the role students have in developing school rules and peer mediation, he responded that students have no input and "it should be that way."

The referring teacher discussed Single School Culture as a way of making sure, "all teachers are on the same path because sometimes it's not the students fault." He stressed that all teachers need to enforce the rules fairly and consistently so as not to confuse the students. The referring teacher mentioned the same rules and regulations should be in force throughout the school so students know that wherever they are the rules and consequences are consistent. "The students can't blame the teachers." The

student role in developing rules and policies is done through student council and The National Honor Society. The important aspect is that although they may not like everything that is done, they do have ownership in some of the rules.

The following table is a within site analysis of School "A". It contains First and Mizell's Principles and comments by the participants along with their rating based on a scale of zero to two with zero being negative for the principle, one being neutral for the principle, and two being positive for the principle.

Table 4.1

Within Site Analysis of Rubric for School "A" on the Principles of First and Mizell

First & Mizell's Principles	Comment	Rubric Rating
Statement of Purpose	The purpose is of course an alternative to suspension.	2
	Our goal is to keep students in school as much as possible rather than send them out, that's what most students want anyway.	2
	They don't get counted absent.	2
	They're still getting consequences.	2
	It is set up to try to keep kids out of trouble.	2
	Keep them in school instead of sending them home.	2
	The purpose of ISS is to put the student out of a destructive environment.	2
	Instead of suspending them off campus where they're out of their education ground, they can still be on campus getting their work	2
Written Procedures	In the beginning I'd say we had quite a bit of input.	2
	We incorporated some material from other schools that already had this program.	2
	We wanted it to be what other schools had already inputted and proven and put them together for the kids.	2
	As far as what goes on here, it is my discretion.	1
	There are certain guidelines that you can't do things in school that are inappropriate.	1
	I'm going to make him sit here and he'll do his time which is more torturous on a kid than going home here he can do what he wants to do.	1
	I don't think that teachers do give any input.	0
I think it is more of an administrative thing.	0	
Designation of an Administrator	All of the other assistant principals, we all have the authority to send a student to ISS.	2
	The teachers cannot do it directly, although they can make a recommendation but it is handled by administration.	1
	Well, that's based on grade level. They're with different administrators in different grade levels.	1
	It depends on the last name and it goes by the administrative dean, so it's broken up by their last name and whatever dean they have to report to.	2
Academic Component	They are required to provide resources and materials on a daily basis.	2
	Our instructor puts out a list every morning of who is in ISS and says the students need work.	2
	The teachers have to send work down by other students, and then the kids turn it in when they go back to their classes.	2
	The teachers are supposed to (provide academic assignments), yes.	2
	How we do that is by one, sometimes I give them a pass to go to class to pick up work, or I send an email once kids are in here in the morning stating who is here and how long.	2
	We have to have class assignments because although they are in ISS they are still not absent so you cannot withhold work from them.	2
	Now, if for some reason there's a substitute in the classroom and a child in ISS then obviously when that student comes out of ISS they're still entitled to makeup work without any late penalties.	2
	You cannot just give them a zero when they go in there.	2
	You have to give them the same assignment that they're doing in the classroom.	2
Daily Resources	It is up to the students to keep up with their work.	1
	It's up to the students to turn in the work when they go back to class.	1
	The kids, who don't do the homework, don't do the assignments, and then the teacher actually goes to the parent.	2
	The teacher will put on the computer that the student has missing assignments.	1
	This puts the responsibility back on the student as well.	1
	There is a problem in that the type of student who is referred is usually not the always responsible for their assignments.	0
	I notify teachers through email (when their students are in ISS).	2

Table 4.1 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Principles	Comment	Rubric Rating	
Counseling Component	Our guidance counselor is right next door.	1	
	They're (the guidance counselors) available at any given time.	2	
	Some students want to speak with a counselor.	2	
	There are no entry or exit requirements for a student to see a guidance counselor.	0	
	We have another guy who comes in here and he's our guidance counselor.	2	
	He gives, you know, little speeches as far as goals, aspirations, achieving, and wages.	2	
	Ah, that one I'm not so sure about because I basically do counseling before they put certain students in ISS because certain students don't need to be there.	1	
	Notification & Engagement of Parents	When referrals come to the AP and a student is assigned to ISS we make a phone call to the parent	2
		We tell them the infraction and that their child is being placed in-school suspension as an alternative suspension.	2
		Most parents are very appreciative because they'd rather have them here than home because they don't know what they're doing.	2
We try to call parents, not that we always get them, but in that case, what I do is I make a copy, I keep the original and I put their parent must call me.		2	
I put my number on there and if I don't hear back from the parent by the time that student has ISS time is up, then I'll say OK I'm going to suspend you.		2	
But they always call back.		2	
As far as following up, OK, I'd say that's the administrator.		1	
Sometimes the administrator calls home.		1	
As far as me, I don't have too much contact with the parent.		0	
But as far as a regular follow up on the student there is none.		0	
If they are sent to ISS on a discipline referral then the parents are automatically called.		2	
As soon as the referral comes in, if there's any discipline action is done, the parent is called.		2	
I think the parents are only called if a referral is actually written and they are in ISS for a whole day.		1	
Information Collection	I'm not sure about Mr. R's (ISS Teacher) record keeping.	1	
	I know he has all the forms and it all gets through to data processing.	1	
	I'm not sure how he turns that in on a nine week basis or if he turns it in by semester.	1	
	I'm not sure, but I have seen the printout.	1	
	He has sign in sheets and he turns it in to data processing.	1	
	I'm not real sure about referrals on referring teachers (whether referrals are kept track of by referring teacher).	0	
	I'm not sure if they do that at all.	0	
	Safe schools takes all our computer system and prints out documentation	2	
	We don't really take it to the community.	0	
	But it's used in the school here, as our school in the community to make improvements.	2	
	We see where strengths and weaknesses are.	2	
	I send it (ISS numbers) to them in a packet and give it to them and what they do with it I don't know.	1	
	They just have me collect the data on the form, fill it out, I send it back.	1	
	Oh, I don't know that.	0	
Not to my knowledge, but I do know that in the computer on the screen I'm sure they have their discipline things there and it could be brought up.	1		
Alternatives for Improving School Climate	We're always brainstorming, trying to figure out what we can do to make it safer, make it more amicable for everybody and we try to get student counsel involved as much as possible.	2	
	We meet with other students.	2	
	We have little clicks of students, little subcultures that we try to work with them.	2	
	We have safe school bachelor program which is all about 35 students at this time, and that's not all students that are in the higher echelon of grade, it's students from all walks.	2	
	We try to involve students, pull students out of their shell.	2	

Table 4.1 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Principles	Comment	Rubric Rating
Alternatives for Improving School Climate (cont.)	Encourage sports, extracurricular activities.	2
	Just like an ongoing type of thing that we do what we see the need and try to pull something together.	2
	The student counsel, like we just had elections here towards the end of the season and the students pretty much put their input to whose running for office.	2
	They're really responsive here.	2
	The kids here, the kids voice their opinions.	2
	If they don't like something, they'll come and tell you.	2
	Students have no role in developing school rules and it should be that way.	0
	Such as making sure that all teachers are on the same path because sometimes it's not the students' fault.	2
	So right now we're working on single School Culture, making sure that all teachers are following the same rules and regulations.	2
	So that no matter what classroom you go to, you already know that if you're late, you're late. Whatever discipline infraction is going to be set on then that's what it's going to be.	2
	I know that student counsel and National Honor Society have a lot of say in deciding what rules kind of go.	2
	You know, so, if the students don't speak up then, of course they're not going to like everything but they still, if they have ownership in some of the rules that are there, then they'll respect that.	2
	Note: User's assessment	2 - positive for principle 1 - neutral for principle 0 - negative for principle

School "B" Background

According to the November 2005 Gold Report (2005), School "B" has a student population of 2,189. In the school year 2004-2005 this school earned a grade of A from FDOE. The school was made up of 49% male students and 51% female students. The student population is 75% white, 4% black, and 15% Hispanic. Seven percent of the students receive free or reduced lunch.

In the school year 2005, 444 students or 18% of the student population had received ISS and 242 students or 10% of the student population had received OSS. In the previous year (2004), 648 students or 20% of the student population received ISS and 415 or 13% received OSS. This marks a decrease of 204 In-School Suspensions and 173 Out-Of-School Suspensions. The percentage of students receiving ISS decreased by two percent and students receiving OSS decreased by three percent.

School "B" ISS Room Observations

The researcher arrived at the school at 7:45 a.m. After checking in with the office and meeting with the assistant principal he was taken to the ISS room at 8:15 a.m. The room was a traditional classroom with the desks set up in four rows of seven. There were no windows in the room. The room had bulletin boards with schedules on them, but no themes or academic material. There were three computers set up in the front of the room.

Upon arrival, the researcher encountered four male students in the classroom. One of the students was white; the other three were Hispanic. Three students were working on assignments and one was on a computer. The students worked quietly on their assignments.

At 9:35 a.m. a white female student entered the room and was greeted by the teacher. She said she needed to get caught up and went to a computer. The student proceeded to work on the computer without any disturbance.

A male Hispanic student left to go see a teacher at 9:37 a.m. At 9:43 a.m. the student returned and went to work on a computer upon his return.

At 9:46 a.m. a student approached the teacher's desk for help with a math problem. The teacher explained the problem to the student. The student then returned to his seat.

The students were all actively engaged in their assignments. The teacher had materials to check on the students and their assignments.

The observation led to the belief that teachers provide daily resources to the referred students. All students were actively engaged and appeared to be working on assignments. Since the students were working on various assignments, the researcher assumed the students were provided this work by their individual teachers and there was an academic component included in the program.

The teacher walked back and forth in the classroom actively monitoring the assignments the students were working on to see how they were progressing. The students also came to the teacher for help with their assignments. The teacher seemed to enjoy a good rapport with the students and gave them encouragement.

No actual counseling was observed, therefore it is assumed that there is no provision for counseling. No other principles of First and Mizell (1980) were observed. The researcher left the room at 10:15 a.m. and no disturbances were observed.

School “B” Interview Analysis

The AP and the ISS teacher were in agreement on the statement of purpose for their ISS program although they explained it in their own unique way. The AP explained, “the ISS program at our school is to give students an opportunity to remain in school even though they were involved in a disciplinary action or cause for something more serious than a lunch detention or a breakfast detention, but we feel like we give them opportunity and some, what we call behavior modification worksheets and actions to help them understand what they did was wrong.” As a result of this infraction they do need discipline, but they do not need to be suspended out of school. The AP also discussed Exceptional Student Education (ESE) students are limited in the number of days they can be suspended from school, but if they are in ISS they must be receiving the services of a certified ESE teacher. The ISS teacher echoed the sentiments of the AP and also stated his main goal is to “get the students back on track academically.” He explained that he reviews the students’ academic history to see how they are doing in their coursework. The referring teacher said he believed it was in the handbook. He said he thought the purpose was to “keep up their work in their classes, not to endanger their success in class.”

The AP discussed the procedures developed at the school for students in ISS and how they were referred. As an administrative team, they discussed what they wanted in addition to what the Safe Schools Department required. They wanted to make sure students were allowed to do their work, get credit for it, and not be marked absent while they were in ISS. The AP also discussed her role as the lead AP for the ISS program. She was responsible for ensuring that the program runs smoothly, and, also, if they

encounter a situation that has no specification for a procedure, she will contact the department at the school district for clarification.

The ISS teacher discussed the procedures he follows in the ISS room. He called them guidelines and basically they are a set of rules that he set up and follows. He explained he has guidelines for drinks and food in the room. Also, he pointed out he does not allow the students to sleep in his ISS room. The referring teacher stated teachers are asked to give input in a year end survey. He explained the teachers' input is reviewed and utilized by the school.

The AP discussed how administrators are assigned students based on the alphabet. When a student is sent to the AP, a matrix is utilized to determine the consequence the student will receive for the offense. The AP explained how the different offenses received various consequences based on the matrix. The ISS teacher concurred with the AP on how students are dealt with, based on the name of the student, and, which AP that student would report to for an infraction. The referring teacher agreed with the AP and ISS teacher but was not sure if one person was in charge of the overall ISS program.

Every textbook is in the ISS room. As the textbook coordinator, the AP ensures there is a copy of each book in the room. They also have FCAT (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test) materials in the room. Each teacher is notified that one of their students is in the ISS program and a request is made for them to send work for that student. If work is not sent for a student, an email is sent to the teacher requesting it. "It could be a lot of circumstances (why students are in ISS), but we don't want students sitting there three days without work."

The ISS teacher explained when teachers get an email that one of their students is in ISS, it is their obligation to send work. He went on to explain if he does not get student work from the teachers he starts emailing the teachers right away. The ISS teacher stated the teachers are “real responsive” at providing the work for the students. The referring teacher stated it is a requirement and the teachers follow the requirement.

The AP discussed the counseling component of their ISS as “we talk to them.” One of the teachers who goes into the class for a portion of the day, to relieve the ISS teacher, talks with the students. As part of the observation, the researcher saw this occurring. His talks consisted of what the student might have done differently. The researcher also observed a discussion of various careers and what is involved as far as education and what students can expect for opportunities and salary. When queried on formal meetings with a trained guidance counselor the AP responded, “We don’t have that kind of manpower. At a school this size—no way. In an ideal situation, in a perfect world that would be wonderful, but we don’t have it.”

The ISS teacher talked about the guidance counselor going over the student’s academic history. He stated, “you’re in here to graduate, that’s the number one component. The number two component is to go over and see what is causing their downfall, whether it be their behavior, what types of behavior they’re doing, review that with them and tell them to get back on track.” The ISS teacher did not go in to what opportunities the students have to see a guidance counselor, just that it was available.

The referring teacher stated the ISS teacher has a minor in psychological counseling and “he talks to the students a lot.” When questioned on whether students see a guidance counselor, he responded the students can request to speak with a guidance

counselor. He explained that the guidance counselors do not get involved with student discipline very often. They mainly advise students about their credits, grades, and college applications. The guidance counselors are very busy with those aspects of student services.

The AP discussed notifying and engaging parents of students assigned to ISS by saying,

When a child is assigned to ISS the assistant principal who assigns them calls home, this letter goes home and we engage parents and tell them that as much as we'd like to, we may not get by there in three days to check on your child. So it's your responsibility to make sure they do their work. And trust me, I get some parents that are really, really, really involved and they'll email me all day every day. And there are some parents who might call me one time, especially if there's no work. There are others who will come out here, and then there are some that you're not going to hear from at all.

The ISS teacher and referring teacher had very little to offer on the aspect of parent notification and procedures for following up on individual progress of the students referred to ISS. The ISS teacher did say that parents will call the deans to make sure their children are getting their work. He went on to say parents are not calling as much this year due to the fact he has been getting work for the students to enable them keep up with their classes. The referring teacher responded, "I really don't know" (about parent notification).

The aspect of information collection that summarizes the number of students assigned to ISS for each quarter by race and referring teacher was posed to the AP. She

responded that it is reported to the district on a screen linked to the district. The AP stated she aggregates the information and gives it to the secretary who completes a chart using this information. The information is reported to the school community at the beginning of the year, but not on a quarterly basis. These figures are discussed at department head meetings, but the names of teachers with the highest number of referrals are not disclosed.

The ISS teacher stated there was a log that kept on school suspension data. They track of the students assigned to ISS and how many times they are there. The referring teacher was unaware of anything to do with the collection of information regarding ISS statistics. He also did not know if the information is reported to the school community.

The AP was questioned on whether there were any programs at the school to improve school climate. She responded they did not have any at this time but they were looking into various programs. The AP stated, "We are trying to do something that encourages our kids to be honest because we are finding that there's a lot of cheating in the classroom." One of the AP's was looking into something called "On Your Honor."

This program involves students signing a statement to the effect that they will abide by certain rules and standards. The AP stated they would probably channel it through the ISS program, especially, for those students who are there for cheating. The AP was questioned on the role students have in developing school rules and peer mediation programs. She replied that students really do not have any role. Students are represented on the School Advisory Committee and they do ask questions, but there are no students on the discipline team.

The ISS teacher responded to the question regarding school climate and student involvement in the development of school rules and peer mediation programs by saying that they try to do things as a faculty to improve the climate for the students. He stated that this is

a high tech world that students are being brought up in so the school needs to make accommodations for various things, such as cell phones and ipods. The ISS teacher explained that they did not take away things from students as this would cause resentment and anger. He stated that the climate at the school was productive. The ISS teacher did not respond to the question referring to student involvement in the development of school rules.

The referring teacher responded to the question on school climate by explaining that they usually have a committee that deals with student referrals. They may call the student in and have a conversation with him/her. As far as school rules, there are surveys students give their input on and also the student council can approach the principal to discuss changes or how things are going.

The following table is a within site analysis of School "B". It contains First and Mizell's Principles and comments from the participants along with their rating based on a scale of zero to two with zero being negative for the principle, one being neutral for the principle, and two being positive for the principle.

Table 4.2

Within Site Analysis of Rubric for School "B" on the Principles of First & Mizell (1980)

First & Mizell's Principles	Comment	Rubric Rating	
Statement of Purpose	To give students an opportunity to remain in school even though they were involved in a discipline action.	2	
	We feel like we give them opportunity.	2	
	They do need discipline but it was not serious enough to place them on an out-of-school suspension.	2	
	But we call our ISS room the opportunity room.	2	
	It's an opportunity to be in school, not to be marked absent, not to get zeros on your work, you get full credit.	2	
	We still give kids a discipline consequence but in a positive way.	2	
	So my main goal right now is to get kids back on track academically, get their work	2	
	Also I can talk to them about their problems and things like that.	2	
	I review every day their history, academic history, I pull up their site reporter, I pull their grades as of right now, what they're doing.	2	
	But to get back to the plan, my main goal is to basically see these kids prosper.	2	
	I believe, our teacher handbook and the statement is that they are going to be able to keep up their work in their classes, not to endanger their success in the class.	2	
	Written Procedures	As an administrative team, we sit down and drew up the guidelines that we wanted in addition to what safe schools required.	2
		So we wanted to make sure that students were allowed to do their work, were allowed to get credit and not marked absent while getting a discipline consequence.	2
		As the lead assistant principal for the ISS room I am responsible for going through there to make sure that he has worksheets or packets.	2
If we have a particular incident where a student does something, and we don't have a matrix for it, my responsibility to call over to the safe schools department to find out if they have something.		2	
So if we come up with a unique situation, it's my responsibility.		2	
Well, we're always asked to give that input with the year end survey.		2	
We definitely have the opportunity to give input to the school improvement committee.		2	
I think the ideas are utilized.		2	
Designation of an Administrator	Each of our administrators have students based on alphabet.	2	
	So each assistant principal here places the student in their alphabet in ISS based on our matrix.	2	
	At our school you automatically go to ISS for skipping, leaving campus without permission, for cheating on homework or on a test.	2	
	Yeah, Each of the AP, any student can on their alphabetical listing is assigned to an AP.	2	
	So when they get into trouble their teachers should fill out a referral, they go up to student services, and their AP sees them and determines what type of discipline action to be taken.	1	
	To answer your question (Is there an administrator designated to lead the program), the AP.	2	
	Each vice principal, and a certain section of the alphabet that they are responsible	2	
	If a student has a referral and they determine if ISS is needed, it goes through that vice principal.	2	
	I believe it's all individualized. I don't know that for sure so that's kind of an iffy answer there.	1	
Academic Component	Every text book, first of all I'm the textbook coordinator, every textbook here at school is in the ISS room. We also have FCAT materials for the English department.	2	
	The PE department, the health teachers constantly send their work there because it doesn't change.	2	
	But other than that each teacher is notified by student services that the student is there.	2	
	Each teacher is required to do that (provide work for ISS students).	2	
	If Mr. H does not get the work after a second request, he lets me know and then I have to go to the teacher.	2	
	It could be a lot of circumstances but we don't want students sitting three days.	2	

Table 4.2 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Rating Principles	Comments	Rubric Rating
Academic Component (cont.)	without any work.	
	All the teachers get this on their email and so if they see one of their students on here they have an obligation to send up their work.	2
	A lot of them don't do that (provided academic work).	
	They do get an email every day on out-of-school suspension and in-school suspension.	0
	I think maybe only one-third (of teachers provide academic work).	2
	We are required. It is required. We all know that.	0
	We are notified ahead of time and we place the assignments in the ISS teacher's box or we hand deliver it to the student in the ISS room.	2
		2
Daily Resources	We trust Mr. H. to do that (ensure the ISS students have work), but we also inform the parents that it's their responsibility.	2
	The student is responsible for doing the work; parents are to make sure that they do the work.	1
	We have parents who call and say my child didn't do any work today.	0
	We do have parents who call and say Johnny was in there all day and he says to his mom, he didn't get any work.	2
	Now that could happen, say Johnny does something this morning and it is so bad that we don't want to take him home, or we can't get in touch with the parents, we will place them in ISS right now.	1
	So there is no turnaround time for him to have any work today.	0
	But we do tell them to get their books.	2
	But it's still not homework or class work. That's where the problem lies.	0
	We get in touch with the teachers and we email teachers to let them know that Johnny or Mary is in ISS.	2
	This is my responsibility to let them know where they are.	2
	But most of the time I tell my secretary, they're very good at that.	2
	We even have teachers who go there and go over things with them.	2
	Because our idea is to help them be successful at all costs.	2
	I've got teachers stop in, drop work off, I get work in my mailbox, I get tons of emails back saying, because I have all the books, I have all the resources here.	2
	The work is returned to us in our mailboxes as it is completed and we always have the option of sending more work.	2
	Because each teacher would be giving the work and getting it back.	2
	Getting the work back is important.	2
	I will hand deliver it and speak to the students sometimes and give instructions real quick and tell them to do something.	2
	If they are missing a lecture in class and I give it to them in cryptic form.	2
	So they would have to be on their own as far as reading what I had said to the class.	2
The whole object is that they're still able to keep the ball rolling and be successful and earning their credit for that class.	2	
Counseling Component	The only counseling component is that we talk to them.	1
	Mr. H. is responsible for at least one period a day to talk to them about what they could have done differently.	2
	Oh no, we don't have that kind of manpower to have guidance counselors meet with ISS students.	2
	At a school this size no way. In an ideal situation, in a perfect world that would be wonderful, but we don't have it.	0
	Well you know, I think one of the biggest thing a counselor is to sit down with the kids and go over their academic things as far as history.	0
	The number two component is to go over and see what's causing their downfall, whether it be attendance or whether it be their behavior,	1
	The teacher himself in our particular program has a minor in psychological counseling and he does talks to the students a lot.	1
	They can request their own guidance counselor.	2
	Guidance counselors, they do not get involved with a lot of discipline.	0

Table 4.2 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Rating Principles	Comments	Rubric Rating	
Notification & Engagement of Parents (cont.)	As previously stated, when a child is assigned the assistant principal who assigns them calls home.	2	
	This letter goes home and we engage the parents and tell them that as much as we'd like to, we may not get by there in three days to check on Johnny.	2	
	And trust me I get some parents that are really, really, really, really involved and they'll email me all day every day.	2	
	And there are some parents who might call me one time, especially if there's no work.	1	
	And there are others who will come out here.	2	
	And then there are some that you're not going to hear from at all.	0	
	Parents a lot of times call the deans and make sure because last year, you come to ISS you get behind in your work, you don't get work, this and that.	0	
	This year, they haven't said that as much.	2	
	I've been getting their work and I've been supporting them and I don't think the deans have had many phone calls.	2	
	Last year parents were real worried about their kids getting the work.	0	
	So it's like I don't really communicate a lot with the parents.	0	
	Parents basically will talk to Mr. S, Mr. M, Ms. W, Ms. C, they're all the assistant principals, and I get slips from them all the time about people.	2	
	Information Collection	That's done all on our 824 screen and at the end of the year when all the data is collected.	2
		Our secretary completes that chart, but also the district gives it to, I just aggregate it down.	2
It is at the beginning of the year it is our goal to report the information to the school community but we don't get it on a quarterly basis.		1	
At the department head meeting we do discuss the number of suspensions, the number of referrals, the highest level, but we don't give names of the teachers with the highest numbers of referrals.		2	
We do say how many referrals or we do say how many students were suspended and that kind of thing.		2	
We do keep a log on kids as far as times in ISS.		2	
They keep a log on here as far as in-school suspension data collection form where you collect the students, the number of times they were in there.		2	
It's good for me too to go back and see how many days certain kids is for the month of May.		2	
I believe the teacher does keep a record of that. But I'm not certain on that.		1	
I don't know if it is reported to the school community.		0	
Note: User's assessment	2 - positive for principle 1 - neutral for principle 0 - negative for principle		

School “C” Background

According to the November 2005 Gold Report, School “C” has a student population of 1,974. In the school year 2004-2005, this school earned a grade of C from the FDOE. The school was made up of 51% male students and 49% female students. The student population is 56% white, 34% black, and 6% Hispanic. Twenty-four percent of the students receive free or reduced lunch.

In the school year 2004-2005, 179 students or 10% of the student population received ISS and 240 students or 13% of the student population received OSS. In the previous year (2003-2004), 263 students or 14% of the student population received ISS while 224 students or 12% of the student population received OSS. There was a decrease of 84 in-school suspensions, but an increase of 16 out-of-school suspensions. This was only an increase of 1% but nonetheless, an increase.

School “C” ISS Room Observations

The researcher arrived at the school at 7:40 a.m. on May 8. In the conversation with the AP prior to going to the classroom, the AP explained that the ISS room, “was not ideal but it worked.” He said they have a different teacher each period of the day except the first two periods where they have the same one. The AP commented he had hoped that the first one would handle the paperwork and administrative duties for the ISS program but it was not happening that way. He said it was not an ideal ISS setup because they have six teachers who serve as ISS teachers. The assistant principal explained, “some are strict and some are easy going” so there is no consistency.

After meeting with the assistant principal to explain the procedures the researcher wanted to follow, the researcher was taken to the ISS room at 8:10 a.m. Upon the

researcher's arrival in the classroom, he was introduced to the ISS teacher by the assistant principal who then left the room. The researcher explained the procedures to the ISS teacher who allowed the researcher to observe and audio-tape the interview.

The room was a typical classroom with windows on one side, looking at a wall. The students were seated throughout the room in rows with no particular system of seating. The room had inspirational messages on the walls such as, "Life is full of choices. Choose carefully," and "Make an effort, not an excuse."

The teacher was seated at his desk. There were 15 students in the room consisting of five black females, five black males, three Hispanic females, and two white males. There was one student that appeared to be working on an academic assignment, nine students had their heads on their desks, and the rest were sitting up but doing nothing. All of the students were sitting quietly. There was no talking or movement throughout the first 10 minutes the researcher was observing.

At 8:35 a.m. two black males entered the room. They checked in with the teacher and found seats. The teacher circulated around the room. A girl asked for a newspaper which the teacher gave her. Another student asked for a newspaper which was given him.

A school staff person entered the room at 8:45 a.m. He spoke to the teacher then took one of the students out of the room. At 8:48 a.m. the student returned and was seated.

There were a total of eighteen students in the room at 8:50 a.m. They all were seated quietly. Two of the students were reading a newspaper, but the rest of the students were just sitting quietly at their seats.

At 9:15 a.m. the teacher announced that when the bell rings anyone in ISS for the day will remain seated. The researcher assumed that some students are in ISS for one period and others are in for the whole day. The bell rang and 13 students left quietly with five remaining. Six more students entered the room. The researcher remained in the room until 10 a.m. with no unusual or notable occurrences.

Observations of the ISS room revealed that teachers probably were not required to provide daily resources to the students. Only one student was doing work, so, if the students were provided work they either did not bring it or were just not doing it. Most of the students did no work while the researcher was observing. The only observable principles were the lack of an academic component and no resources provided.

School “C” Interview Analysis

The AP at School “C” discussed the purpose of their ISS program by stating it is not to interfere with attendance. As he explained it further, going into details such as making sure students are staying on campus and not out on the street. The AP stated they want the students to be able to make up their grades. If the work is not sent down to ISS, which happens, the student is allowed to make it up and receive full credit.

The ISS teacher stated the purpose of ISS is, “kind of an interim place where the disruptive student is sent so they don’t disrupt the other kids from learning.” ISS allows the teacher to have the student taken out of the room so the other students can study and learn. “If the incident isn’t serious enough to actually suspend the student, then they have in-school suspension.”

The referring teacher explained the purpose of ISS as a “cooling off period.” ISS is a place where someone goes who is “in a discipline situation and it’s not severe enough

to be put outside school, suspended (sic).” The referring teacher discussed the ISS as a place to house someone who is not appropriate to go back to class. “It’s just basically a temporary cooling off period for a one or two day situation.”

The AP felt he had a lot of input into the ISS program at his school. Despite this, it was not the way he would like the program to be administered.

We have six people involved; it’s very difficult to run with six people. We don’t have a therapeutic component set up the way it should be set up. It’s very difficult to do that although it does seem to be working. We have ISI (In School Intervention) and ISS program running in the same situation, which the ISI is in school intervention where a kid is sent down because of being sent out of the classroom for discipline for just one period. It’s really not supposed to mix those things, so maintaining as much of a structured situation as possible is my input.

The ISS teacher explained his input in terms of opportunities to talk with the principal at any time. “He keeps an open door policy and he listens to whatever comments you have.” There is also a man in charge of discipline who chairs a committee that meets once a month where they discuss policies, procedures, and make recommendations to the principal. The entire faculty is welcome to attend. The referring teacher added he felt his input was very limited.

The AP being interviewed responded he was the administrator who oversees the program when questioned. He went on to explain that all of the AP’s have the same authority as far as putting students in ISS. They make judgment calls on this aspect.

The ISS teacher said the administrator designated to oversee the program is one of two AP’s. He was not sure but thought it was the one the researcher had interviewed. He

explained they have been switching duties. When questioned further regarding authority and resources to act on a placement of a student, he replied they have an alphabetical listing of students which determines which AP the student will go to. The referring teacher concurred with this assessment of responsibility, reiterating the student is sent to the AP who has the student's name in his or her alphabetical listing.

The AP explained the process of students securing resources and materials as a listing going out to teachers in an email. If the teacher has a student in ISS, they are to send down "appropriate" work, "so they can be graded, so they don't miss their work and also they won't count them absent." He commented it was not the perfect situation. "It's very difficult for them, they just sometimes do and sometimes don't. Just depends on the teacher. Some teachers are very good at it and others really say, I'll do it when they come back." The AP was questioned further on ensuring students keep up with the class when they are in ISS. He responded he tells students that work is sent to them when they are in ISS.

If there is a parent involved that says I want to make sure my kid gets the work, then I put a second note to the teacher myself, directly to the teacher. Then I tell the student when you get back from these three days or whatever, if you have any trouble whatsoever making up your work or getting credit for your work, come and see me and I'll make sure the teacher understands what the procedure is. I don't have to do it very often, most teachers do it.

The ISS teacher responded to the question referencing students receiving daily resources and materials by stating teachers receive email reporting a student of theirs is in ISS, and they need to send materials and assignments. Despite this, he explained, many

do not send the requested materials. The ISS teacher went on to say teachers receive emails daily concerning their students that will be in ISS and missing their class, but he estimated that only one-third of teachers provide materials to these students. He explained that if teachers are concerned that their students are missing their work, “then they need to get up here and get some work to them.

The referring teacher explained regular teachers are required to send work down for the students referred to ISS. “The problem with that is sometimes they’ll post the name in ISS, that’s it. But we’re to take resources and materials down on a daily basis for a student.” This conflicts with the responses offered by the AP and ISS teacher.

In discussing counseling components of the ISS program, the AP discussed the dilemma they have with six people handling ISS duties. Due to this fact, no one has “taken charge.” The teachers talk to the students but he stressed, “it’s not in any formal manner. Record keeping is at a minimum.” Guidance counselors are only involved if it is required by the discipline matrix which is a guide sheet that provides mandatory and optional consequences for various offenses.

The ISS teacher interviewed stated there is no counseling other than the inspirational signs posted around the room. He was unaware of any requirements to see a guidance counselor as part of an entrance or exit policy from ISS. The referring teacher elaborated on the lack of availability of guidance counselors for ISS. In ISS, “it’s a quiet place, just like a volcano waiting to erupt. You have good kids in school who are bored, looking for something to create the chaos they created in the classroom.” He went on to explain the students in ISS want to entertain and want other students to be “victims” of their entertainment. The referring teacher expressed the opinion that students in ISS need

individual counselors because “the group scenario for those types of kids won’t work.” He stated, like the ISS teacher, there were no requirements for students referred to ISS to see a guidance counselor upon entrance or exit.

According to the AP, the school calls every parent when a student receives a discipline referral. He went on to explain they want the parent(s) to know what happened, why they did what they did, how the student’s work is saved, what the student’s responsibility is, making sure the student is aware that they will be getting ISS, and they can make up all of their work. As far as the success rate in contacting the parent(s), he believed it is only as good as the information that is available to them. Some of the contact numbers may be out of date.

The ISS teacher stated parents are notified by the AP upon their referral to ISS. The referring teacher concurred with the ISS teacher on this point, stating he believed it was mandatory for parents to be contacted. He did say that he occasionally followed up with a student’s parents regarding referrals to ISS.

The AP responded information collection regarding ISS was done by the school’s data processor. When questioned on whether the ISS information was reported to the school community, he replied it was not, although he felt it would be a good idea. The ISS teacher replied to this query by stating, “We don’t get involved with that at all. I don’t know if the AP’s do that or not.” The referring teacher explained this information is all documented by class, race, grade level, and male or female. He went on to explain that it is available on the school web page.

The AP was unaware of any alternatives for improving school climate. He also went on to explain students have no role in determining school rules. The ISS teacher

felt the ISS program contributed to the improvement of the school climate. He felt there was a tendency to send fewer and fewer students to ISS as students learn that ISS is not a fun place to be. He commented students complete surveys related to rules and peer mediation programs. The referring teacher stated he felt students have a major role in developing school rules and involvement in peer mediation programs. When asked to elaborate on their involvement he could not offer any examples.

The following table is a within site analysis of School "C". It contains First and Mizell's Principles and comments along with their rating based on a scale of zero to two with zero being negative for the principle, one being neutral for the principle, and two being positive for the principle.

Table 4.3

Within Site Analysis of Rubric for School "C" on the Principles of First & Mizell (1980)

First & Mizell's Rating Principles	Comment	Rubric Rating	
Statement of Purpose	I don't know what the statement is as far as the county.	0	
	We use it to not interfere with their attendance.	2	
	They are in ISS instead of out-of-school suspension	2	
	We save their attendance.	2	
	It's making sure that the kids do not miss school and that they are supervised.	2	
	It's kind of an interim place for the disruptive student.	2	
	So that they don't disrupt the other kids from learning.	2	
	If the incident isn't serious enough to actually suspend the student, then they have in-school suspension.	2	
	Well, basically it's a cooling off period.	2	
	It's a place to put someone who's in a discipline situation.	2	
	It's a place to house someone who's not appropriate to go back to class.	2	
	It's just basically a temporary cooling off period one or two day situation.	2	
	Written Procedures	I have a lot of input since it's under me.	2
		Although it's not the way I would want to set it up.	0
We don't have a therapeutic component set up the way it should be set up.		0	
It does seem to be working.		2	
We all have an opportunity to talk to the principal		2	
He listens to whatever comments you have.		2	
Mr. C, (an AP) he's in charge of discipline in the school.		2	
He has a committee and anybody is welcome to attend these meetings.		2	
He has them about once a month where we discuss procedures and so forth.		2	
All the faculty is welcome to attend.		2	
My input is very limited.		0	
It's more administrative.	0		
Designation of Administrator	I oversee it, but all the AP's have the same authority.	2	
	Between him and Mr. G (another AP), but yes, he, I think, would be the overall one at this point.	0	
	They've been switching those duties back and forth.	0	
	I think he's the one they switched the responsibilities to.	0	
	Each of the AP's.	2	
	Any student can be on their (each AP) alphabetical listing is.	2	
	All students are assigned to an AP.	2	
	They go up to student services, and their AP sees them and determines what type of discipline action to be taken.	1	
	So it's just the one administrator.	2	
	We do alphabetical order (to determine which AP a referred student would report to).	2	
	A thru K and that administrator decide if ISS is appropriate for a student.	2	
Academic Component	If there is a parent involved that says I want to make sure my kid gets the work, then I put a second note to the teachers myself.	2	
	If you have any trouble whatsoever making up your work or getting credit for your work, come and see me.	2	
	I'll make sure the teacher understands what the procedure is.	2	
	All the teachers get this (a roster of students assigned to ISS) on their email.	2	
	If they see one of their students on here they have an obligation to send up their work.	2	
	A lot of them (teachers) don't do that (provide work to ISS students).	0	
	They do get an email every day on out-of-school suspension and in-school suspension.	2	

Table 4.3 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Rating Principles	Comment	Rubric Rating	
Academic Component (cont.)	I think maybe only one-third of teachers do.	0	
	Basically we're required to send work down on a daily basis.	2	
	The problem with that is sometimes they'll post the name in ISS, that's it. So that's a problem (teachers not notified).	0	
	But we're to take resources and materials down on a daily basis for a student.	2	
	If they have a student that's in-school suspension, they're to send work down.	2	
	Appropriate work, so they can be graded.	2	
	So they don't miss their work and also they won't count them absent.	2	
	That's not a perfect situation.	1	
	It's very difficult for them, they (teachers) sometimes do and sometimes don't.	0	
	Each individual teacher is the only one that's going to know if that student's keeping up with their work.	1	
	If they know their student is in ISS and they're concerned that their student is not keeping up with their work, then they need to get up here and get some work to them.	2	
	One of the additional things, not only in ISS, if a student is tardy what we do is when the final bell rings the teachers lock the door.	0	
	Then the AP's go around and picks up the students that didn't make it to class on time and they send them over here.	0	
	Daily Resources	We're to take resources and materials down on a daily basis for a student.	2
		I would say some (teachers) have trouble (providing assignments for referred students) at our school.	0
Either the students don't do it and/or the teachers don't send it down.		0	
It's their (students) responsibility first of all.		1	
I send my work down.		2	
Second of all if you send work down with them, you never get it back.		0	
The kid had to work as opposed to wasting their time.		2	
Counseling Component	We have counseling as far as from the county.	2	
	Because there are six people involved no one's really taking charge of that.	0	
	That's not something (counseling ISS students) guidance counselors do.	0	
	They talk to the kids about it, it's not in any formal manner.	1	
	AP's talk to them also, but the teachers that actually run the ISS program also talk to them.	2	
	It's very informal though (counseling).	0	
	The guidance counselors are involved if in fact the component matches any level 25 on our matrix (denotes what is to be done for discipline offenses)	2	
	Well other than the fact that we have all these signs around the classroom, praises, the person that's in here does not do any teaching other than keeping students disciplined.	0	
	I think it's (ISS student counseling) very little.	0	
	They don't have to see a guidance counselor.	0	
Notification/Engagement of Parents	We call every parent when we do a discipline referral to make sure that the parent knows what's going on.	2	
	We make sure that that student is aware that they are getting a break.	1	
	It's not out of school, they're in school and they can make up all their work 100%.	2	
	Notifying the parents is the AP's responsibility.	2	
	I think that's part of the referral process that they contact the parents.	2	
	Parents are called by ISS.	2	
Information Collection	We can quarry information out of our data processor.	2	
	We don't report this to the school community.	0	
	It's not a bad idea (reporting to the school community) now that you mention it.	1	
	You know this is my first year being in charge of it.	1	
	I don't get involved with that at all.	1	
	I don't know if the AP's do that or not.	0	
	It's all documented, by class, race, grade level, you know male vs. female, it's all documented.	2	

Table 4.3 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Rating Principles	Comment	Rubric Rating
	Ah, if I was going to do a wish list I would keep the discipline closer to the classroom.	2
	There's no provision for students to be involved in developing school rules or any of that.	0
	I know they send out surveys periodically with the students.	2
	They mention the results on how the students rated certain things.	2
	I think there's a student body that is involved with that.	2
	I personally am not involved with that at all.	1
	I think they have a lot input in developing school rules.	1
	I don't think they have a major role because it would be much more lackadaisical.	2
	They're not going to want a lot of rules.	0
Note: User's assessment	2-positive for principle 1-neutral for principle 0-negative for principle	

Across-Site Analysis

The across-site analysis of the three schools revealed inconsistencies in the way the programs were administered. There were inconsistencies in the perceptions of the personnel regarding the policies and procedures. At School "A" the AP, ISS teacher, and referring teacher all said relatively the same thing concerning the statement of purpose. The AP explained it as an alternative to suspension, saying it was their goal to keep students in school rather than putting them out of the educational setting, which he added was what the students really wanted. Students are allowed to make up work and they are not counted as absent. The students are still getting a consequence, though.

The ISS teacher spoke about the purpose in relatively the same terms although not with the same verbiage. He reiterated the words of the AP by explaining the purpose was to keep the students in school. The referring teacher discussed the purpose as taking the students out of a destructive environment and putting them in a restricted environment where they are getting an opportunity to do their work. These statements correlated closely with the responses from the personnel from schools "B" and "C".

The AP from School "B" explained their purpose as giving students an opportunity to remain in school even though they were involved in a discipline action. He stated they want to give the students an opportunity by providing them with the means to understand what they did was wrong and there is a disciplinary consequence for their actions. The ISS teacher explained his goal was to get students back on track academically. He reviews their academic history to look at their grades and goes over it with them. The ISS teacher goes over possibilities for the ISS students' lack of success

or whatever problems they are experiencing. The referring teacher from School "B" also discussed the purpose was for students referred to ISS to keep up with their classes and not endanger their success in their classes.

The AP at School "C" commented he did not know what the school district's statement of purpose was, but at his school ISS was used to not interfere with the referred students' attendance. He also added the students are allowed to make up all their work. He summed it up by saying it is making sure students do not miss school and they are supervised. The ISS teacher took a slightly different stance by stating the purpose was to protect the rights of the other students by not interfering with their rights to an orderly classroom. His response was geared toward maintaining an orderly classroom by removing the disruptive influence(s) from the classroom. The referring teacher explained the purpose as a "cooling off period." He explained it as being a place where a student would go when it is not appropriate to go back to class, but not severe enough to be suspended from school.

In comparing the interview responses to the statement of purpose, there were some variations in the responses. For example, the AP's in all of the schools emphasized students were not only getting a discipline consequence but also they were allowed to make up the work they were missing. The ISS teacher at School "B" concurred with this purpose, as he explained his purpose was "to get kids back on track academically." He seemed to have a passion for this purpose and genuinely cared about the students referred to ISS. The ISS teacher from School "A" only briefly mentioned students getting assignments and the ISS teacher from School "C" did not mention anything in regard to the students receiving work in response to the statement of purpose. The referring

teacher from School "A" discussed the purpose as students assigned to ISS receiving a discipline consequence, but also "they can still be on campus getting their work." School "B"'s referring teacher responded students assigned to ISS were able to keep up with their classes and not endanger their success, but did not mention a disciplinary consequence. The referring teacher from School "C" replied, "basically it's a cooling off period, it's a place to put someone who's in a discipline situation and it's not severe enough to be put out of school." The teacher did not reference anything regarding academics in his response.

The second rubric of First and Mizell (1980) deals with written procedures developed with teachers, students, and parents clearly stating how students are referred and who has the authority and resources to pursue action if the referral is not adhered to. The AP from School "A" explained there was a good deal of input from the people named in the rubric. However, he did not substantiate this in his response. He stated they incorporated "some material from other schools that already had this program and tried to take a combination of what we wanted it to be." He made no mention of any teachers, students, or parents having any input into the processes or procedures of the program. The ISS teacher responded to the question by saying he has discretion, but there are certain guidelines he must follow. He did not elaborate on whether or not he had any input into these guidelines, even after he was questioned by the researcher on his role in the formulation of the guidelines. The referring teacher responded to the query on his role in the formulation of the guidelines, "I don't think that teachers give any input. I think it's more of an administrative thing." He did add, however, he likes the way the program is run.

The AP from School "B" discussed the development of the procedures being done at an administrative team meeting and drawing up guidelines in addition to what the Safe Schools Department required. He went on to explain how they dealt with various infractions, but did not allude to any one else having input into the program other than the administration. The ISS teacher stated he did not have any input into the guidelines this year, but this was his first year in the program. He explained he would go to the administrators with suggestions of what can be done to improve the program. The referring teacher explained there is a year-end survey that asks teachers for input on the ISS program as well as other issues. The teacher was questioned whether the input was utilized he replied, "I think so."

The AP from School "C" explained his input into the ISS program by saying he had a great deal of input. He stated he is in charge of the program but even though he had a great deal of input into the program it was not run as he would like it to be. When questioned, he did not allude to anyone else having any input into the processes and procedures of the program. The ISS teacher gave evidence of the program having input from other sources. He explained they are given the opportunity to talk with the principal and give input. Also, he mentioned there is an administrator who is in charge of discipline. This administrator has a committee that conducts meetings monthly, which anyone is welcome to attend. The teacher explained the meetings consisted of discussions of the procedures and faculty members could make recommendations. The referring teacher responded, "My input is very limited. It's more administrative." This response was interpreted as this particular teacher having no input, but the previous

response of the ISS teacher led the researcher to believe there are opportunities for teachers to have input.

In comparing the responses from the interviewees as to the development of written procedures, there seemed to be a lack of communication within all of the schools. None of the AP's interviewed gave any evidence of input from any other sources other than administrators and the district department responsible for the program. School "A" gave no evidence of any input from teachers or parents and the referring teacher stated, "I don't think that teachers give any input. I think it is more of an administrative thing." The referring teacher from School "B" explained there was a survey given to teachers at the end of the year and input was requested on the ISS program as well as other issues. When questioned on the use of this feedback he responded that he felt the information was utilized. The ISS teacher from School "C" gave the most evidence of input in his response. He explained the AP in charge of discipline has a committee which meets and reviews and discusses the ISS program. According to the ISS teacher this committee considers all input from the faculty. It was interesting to note there was no mention of parental input into the ISS program.

First and Mizell's third principal (1980) states that there will be an administrator responsible for determining if the placement of the student in ISS is appropriate and the resources to pursue action if it is not. In the schools studied there was one administrator responsible for the program, but in all of the schools there were several AP's responsible for assigning students to the program. The size of the schools determined that one person would not be able to handle all of the students referred for disciplinary reasons and

therefore not be the sole person to refer students to ISS. Ultimately, the student and or the parents could appeal the placement to the principal of each school.

At School "A", the AP responded that all of the AP's have the authority to send students to ISS. He went on to explain there is one administrator responsible for the ISS program and if a parent has a question about a placement the AP who assigned the student and the AP who is in charge of the program will sit down. In this case, the situation is usually resolved before it goes to the principal. The ISS teacher corroborated this but added the student would go to an AP based on their grade level. He explained that if one of the administrators is out or busy elsewhere, the student would be sent to another AP. The referring teacher disagreed with the ISS teacher on who referred students. He stated the student would be sent to the administrator who had that person's name on their list based on the alphabet.

The AP and referring teacher interviewed from School "B" also explained there was one AP that oversees the program, but any of the other AP's can refer a student to ISS. They both said a student sees an AP based on where their name falls in the alphabet. The ISS teacher did not mention that any of the AP's could refer students but did say the AP mentioned "is the main one," but he deals with other administrators as well. At School "C", the administrator stated he was the one who oversees the program "but all of the AP's have the same authority as far as putting kids in there and making their judgment calls." The ISS teacher responded there were two people in charge, but he later stated there was one who had taken over, as of now. When questioned further on who had the authority to act on an inappropriate assignment, he responded that each of the AP's based on the alphabetical listing of the student. The referring teacher explained

students go to an AP based on their listing on an AP's alphabet. He stated the AP who handled the situation handles any grievances, which agreed with the ISS teacher, but contradicted the AP. There seemed to be some confusion as to who handles grievances among the respondents. This could have been due to the ISS teacher and referring teacher not having exposure to these circumstances. When parents and administrators met the aforementioned personnel, they may not have any knowledge of the meeting.

In comparing the responses from the three schools to this principle there seemed to be a common thread in the way students were referred and grievances were handled. It was found that in the three schools students were either referred to an AP based on their alphabetical listing or their grade level. The three AP's interviewed all agreed that at their particular school there is one administrator responsible for the program, but all of the AP's have the authority to assign students to ISS. They also noted that the AP in charge handles grievances from students and parents, which sometimes involve the AP who assigned the student to ISS.

The ISS teachers and referring teachers from each of the schools basically agreed with their administrators on the responsibilities, although there seemed to be some confusion as to who had the responsibility for individual students. For instance, in School "C", the referring teacher and ISS teacher explained the AP who handled the referral would handle any grievance. This was in contrast to the response from the AP who said that the AP in charge of the program handled the grievances. The researcher surmised the variation in responses may have been due to a lack of communication as well as the ISS teacher and referring teacher not having knowledge of these situations.

The fourth principle of First and Mizell (1980) deals with an academic component ensuring students keep up with their classes while in ISS. This principle is very closely associated with the fifth principle, which is teachers continue to provide daily resources and materials to referred students. Since there is a close relationship between these two principles they will be discussed together.

The AP from School "A" replied teachers are required to provide resources and materials on a daily basis to the referred students. The referring teacher explained if a student is in ISS "they are not absent so you cannot withhold work from them." He stated the ISS teacher will request makeup work for the student and give it to the student. The ISS teacher ensures the work is done, but it is the student's responsibility to turn it in to the regular teacher. The AP discussed problems with students going to ISS the same day, so their teachers are unable to provide work for the students. When this occurs he explained, the student will be given a packet to fill out consisting of questions concerning the situation which led to the student being placed in ISS. There are questions dealing with what the situation was, and what they could have done differently not have received a consequence. He explained there are textbooks in the ISS room and students have the responsibility to turn in the work missed when they return to class. The AP stated the teachers contact the parents if the student does not turn in the work. The ISS teacher discussed requirements of the teachers to provide work for the students in ISS. He was vague on how the teachers provide it and he did say that he sends the students to the class to pick up the work. The ISS teacher said that he notifies the teachers through email that a student of theirs is in there.

At School "B", the AP explained that every textbook is in the ISS room. The ISS teacher explained the use of forms that go out daily for teachers to fill out with the assignments the students are required to complete. If this form is not returned, he emails the teachers. When questioned concerning the response rate of teachers he replied that teachers are very responsive. He also added, "This is the first year it's been productive." He continued that in past years teachers have complained about not getting work back. The AP replied the administration puts trust in the ISS teacher to ensure students keep up with their classes when in ISS. She also added that parents are informed it is their responsibility, too. The referring teacher was very affirmative in his response. He stated "It is required. We are notified ahead of time and we place the assignments in the ISS teacher's box or we hand-deliver it to the student."

The AP from School "C" responded there is a process to ensure students receive work and keep up with their classes. He explained a list goes out to teachers via email. If there is a student in ISS, "they're to send work down, appropriate work, so they can be graded and also they won't count them as absent." He went on to say, "That's not a perfect situation. It's very difficult for them (teachers), they just sometimes do and sometimes don't." The AP stated that if a parent is involved, "then I put a second note to the teachers myself." He went on to discuss if a student comes to him complaining of not getting work, he will go directly to the teacher and "... make sure the teacher understands what the procedure is." The ISS teacher discussed the procedure as email being sent, and if teachers have a student on the list it is their obligation to send work. He added, "a lot of them don't do that." He explained they get email everyday on students in ISS. When questioned on what the compliance of teachers is he replied, "... one-third do it." He

replied to the query concerning students keeping up with their classes that it is up to each individual teacher. The referring teacher replied the teachers at School "C" are required to send work on a daily basis. When questioned on the rate of teacher compliance with this policy, he replied, "I would say some have trouble here at (School "C"). Either the students don't do it and/or the teachers don't send it down." He responded to the query on ensuring students keep up with their classes it is the responsibility of the student, although he does send work down. When asked if he gets work back he responded, "Very rarely."

In comparing the three schools on these principles it seemed that schools A and B were doing a good job of ensuring that students were receiving work and keeping up with their classes. School "C" appeared to set up stringent policies, but there was little follow up. Teachers were "required" to send work to students in ISS, but according to the ISS teacher and the referring teacher, the compliance rate is not very good. The ISS teacher stated, "a lot of them don't do that" and estimated that one-third comply while the referring teacher replied that "... some have trouble here at School "C"." The AP from School "A" discussed that parents are called by teachers if students do not turn in work. School "B" also placed responsibility on parents for students turning in work by making them aware of their assignments. The referring teacher from School "B" was also very affirmative in stating that providing work for students was required and it was not optional.

The sixth principle of First and Mizell (1980) is a provision for a counseling component to help referred students. The AP from School "A" commented students have access to guidance counselors if they would like to speak to one. This was up to the

students to request a meeting with a counselor; however, he replied there was no policy for entry or exit of the ISS program to see a guidance counselor. The ISS teacher spoke of a guidance counselor coming onto the ISS classroom three to four times a week. According to the ISS teacher, the guidance counselor provided discussions related to goals, aspirations, and achievement. The referring teacher was not sure if students had access to counseling while in ISS or not. He did add, however, that prior to sending a student to ISS, he provides counseling to the student.

The AP from School "B" stated the only counseling provided to students referred to ISS is from the AP who referred the student to ISS or the ISS teacher. She explained in a school of this size they do not have the manpower. She commented, "In an ideal situation, in a perfect world that would be wonderful, but we don't have it." The referring teacher commented that the ISS teacher has a minor in counseling and "... he does talk to the students a lot." He went on to explain a student can request a meeting with a guidance counselor, but the counselors do not usually get involved with the ISS program. He explained the primary role of the guidance counselors was to advise students on their credits, grades, and college applications. The ISS teacher agreed the primary role filled by the guidance counselors was to advise students and go over their academic history.

School "C" had a similar counseling situation to the other two schools. The AP explained that guidance counselors are only involved with ISS if it is required by the county discipline matrix. He explained the ISS teachers talk with the students but since "... there are six people involved no one's really taking charge of that." The ISS teacher stated other than the inspirational posters on the wall in ISS there is no counseling done

in the room. He was not sure if students referred to ISS saw a counselor prior to entering ISS. The ISS teacher explained due to the lock-out policy, where if students are not on time to class they go to ISS for the period, there is not enough time to work with students. The referring teacher felt students get very little in terms of counseling while in ISS. He told of covering the ISS room and describing it as "... quiet place, just like a volcano waiting to erupt. You have good kids in school who are bored, looking for something to create chaos they created in the classroom." He went on to explain "... you have to have individual counselors come in, one on one to get effective counseling. The group scenario for those type of kids won't work."

The counseling component was very similar at all of the three schools that were studied. None of the three schools had policies that included trained guidance counselors meeting with the referred students. At School "A" the ISS teacher spoke of a guidance counselor coming to the class "three or four times a week" however neither the AP or referring teacher mentioned this aspect in their responses. This would be a very positive aspect if it were done. The referring teacher from School "C" made a valid point that the any counseling would need to be on an individual basis to be effective. From the researcher's observations in a previous setting, group counseling can be effective or ineffective depending on the effectiveness of the counselor and the makeup of the group. From the responses and observations, the researcher detected the ISS teachers provided informal counseling in all of the schools except School "B" This is not to say that the ISS teacher did not provide any counseling, but there was not any evidence of it from the observation or interviews.

First and Mizell's (1980) seventh principle states that there should be provisions for notifying and engaging parents along with procedures for monitoring and follow up of individual student progress. The AP, ISS teacher, and referring teacher from School "A" all agreed that whenever a student is referred to ISS, a call is made to the parents by the AP. The AP explained that it is not always possible to contact the parents, in which case he makes a copy of the referral and sends it home with a note that the parent must call him prior to the ISS time being up. He stated the parents of the referred student "always call back." The ISS teacher explained he does "not have too much contact with the parents." However, he stated on occasion he will call a parent to discuss a situation regarding a student. The ISS teacher did say that as far as "regular follow up on the student, there is none." At School "A" it appeared from the responses that parents are notified of their children being placed in ISS, however, none of the three interviewed, stated there was any follow up on the student once he or she was placed in ISS.

The AP and ISS teacher from School "B" agreed that the AP who assigned the student to ISS makes a phone call home to notify the parent(s). The referring teacher replied he wasn't sure if a call was made. The AP discussed the procedure as a call being made and also a letter going home. She explained she tells parents "it's your responsibility to make sure that they do their work." The AP commented that the range of interest from parents consists of calling her everyday to "some that you're not going to hear from at all." This school seemed to be very good at notifying parents of their children's placement in ISS as was School "A"; however, there was little if any follow up once the students were placed in ISS.

At School "C" the AP, ISS teacher, and referring teacher all agreed that the AP, who assigned the student to ISS, contacted the parent. The AP explained he calls the parents to "make sure that the parent knows what's going on, why we did what we did, what the kid's responsibility is, and making sure that the student knows that they are getting a break." He commented the success rate of contacting parents is as good as information he has on the computer. The AP estimated that up to 30% of the student telephone numbers are incorrect. The referring teacher stated that it was mandatory for parents to be called when a student is placed in ISS. He explained that he follows up on his end by asking the student if they have their work when they return from ISS. If the student does not have the work the teacher tells the student "you need to get it done, I need to have it because I do put grades in the grade book."

All of the schools studied seemed to have good policies on contacting parents when a student is placed in ISS. The general policy at all of the schools seemed to be the referring AP contacted the parent and made them aware of the situation. However, the only person interviewed who mentioned any positive follow up, once a student was placed in ISS, was the referring teacher from School "C". None of the administrators or ISS teachers mentioned any kind of follow up as far as getting missed work from the ISS students once they returned to the regular class. This may have been due to their specific roles in the ISS program. The administrator's primary concern was the placement of students in ISS and notification of parents. It would seem it would be the responsibility of the referring teachers to ensure work was completed.

Provisions for collecting information that summarizes the number of students assigned to ISS for each quarter by race, and regular reporting of this information to the

school community, is the eighth principle espoused by First and Mizell (1980). The AP at School "A" was very vague and unsure on this aspect. He was not sure if the ISS teacher turned it in on a quarterly basis or not. He did state the Safe Schools Department keeps track of numbers of in-school suspensions and out-of-school suspensions. The AP discussed their use of this information to see where their strengths and weaknesses are and to guide them on making school improvements. Neither the ISS teacher nor referring teacher offered anything on this topic in their responses to questioning.

School "B"'s AP commented data is collected and turned into the secretary who inputs it on a computer reporting screen. She discussed it as a goal to report it to the school community; however, it is not done on a quarterly basis. The AP explained that at department heads meetings they discuss the number of referrals, but they do not name the teachers who have the highest number of referrals. The ISS teacher added the ISS information is sent to the school district. He added they also do a student exit survey in which "students tell me why they're in here and how many days they are in. It's interesting to see their perceptions on some of the things they do." The referring teacher commented, "I believe the teacher does keep a record. But I'm not certain of that."

The AP at School "C" stated they can quarry information out of the data processor that gives them this information. He explained this information is not reported to the school community although he stated, "It's not a bad idea to do that, now that you mention it." He added this was his first year in charge of the ISS program. The ISS teacher stated he did not know what the AP does, but he is not involved in it. The referring teacher explained this type of information is reported on the school web page.

None of the personnel interviewed from any of the schools seemed to have an awareness of this principle. The referring teacher from School "C" did say the information is reported on the web page. He was correct in this statement. The statistics on in-school suspension and out-of-school suspension is reported on the Gold Report, which is available on the district website. This information is reported in November until that date and then again at the end of the year, for the full year. Anyone has access to this information for any of the schools in the county.

The ninth and final principle of First and Mizell (1980) recommends there be alternatives for improving school climate. These alternatives can include involving students in developing school rules and peer mediation programs. The AP from School "A" explained they are always brainstorming ways "to figure out what we can do to make it safer, more amicable for everybody, and we try to get student council involved as much as possible." He went on to explain they try "to pull students out of their shell." They encourage sports and extracurricular activities. The AP discussed the role of student council as being very active in developing school policies therefore; students have a high degree of interest in who is running for student council offices. He explained they voice their opinions, and if the students do not like something they will come and tell administration.

School "B" had very little response to this principle. The AP responded they have no formal programs designed to improve school climate although they are looking into a program that encourages kids to be honest "because we are finding that there's a lot of cheating in the classroom." The program they are looking into is called "On Your Honor." The plan was to implement it through the ISS room "especially for those kids

who get in there for cheating, lying, and stealing.” When questioned on the role of students in developing school rules and peer mediation programs, she responded they used to have a peer mediation class but not anymore. The AP also stated “technically they don’t really have a role.” She added that they “we do have senior leadership in government by our student council.” The AP explained “they do come and ask questions.”

The AP from School “C” spoke of no alternatives for improving school climate. He seemed to feel there were no programs in existence at his school that would fit the criteria. He spoke of having a “wish list” of things he would like to have at the school. But even this list did not have anything to do with improving the climate of the school. He spoke of giving teachers more authority, but he contradicted himself by saying the students have respect for the position (i.e., assistant principal, principal) rather than the person doing the discipline. He addressed the topic of school rules by stating students had no role at all in the development of the school rules. This is not to say individual teachers do not allow students in their classes to give input in the development of the rules of their classes. The ISS teacher offered no information on alternatives for improving school climate, but he did mention the school sends out surveys for students to rate different aspects of the school. When questioned further, he did not elaborate on the content of the surveys. The ISS teacher added he felt the principal and AP were doing “a fantastic job on making sure nobody keeps another student from learning.” He explained the system at their school is designed “to get the disruptive student out of the classroom as quick as possible so it doesn’t cause much harm to the rest of the students.” The

referring teacher did not offer anything of substance regarding the improvement of school climate nor student involvement in rule development or peer mediation programs.

The responses to the questions regarding this rubric shed little light on what the schools were doing. The personnel that responded to the questioning had very little awareness of the programs, if any, at their schools that existed to satisfy this principle. The researcher does not necessarily believe that such programs exist at the schools studied. The feeling is there may be programs the schools are implementing which are facilitating the improvement of school climate and enhancing student involvement, but the interviewees did not make this association. The people interviewed seemed to be genuinely interested in improving the climate of the school and they may have been doing subtle interventions to facilitate this process.

The following table is an across site analysis of the three schools studied. It contains First and Mizell's Principles and comments by the participants along with their rating based on a scale of zero to two with zero being negative for the principle, one being neutral for the principle, and two being positive for the principle.

Table 4.4

Across Site Analysis of Schools for the Principles of First & Mizell (1980)

First & Mizell's Principles	School "A"	School "B"	School "C"
Clear Statement of Purpose	<p>2 The purpose is of course an alternative to suspension.</p> <p>2 Our goal is to keep students in school as much as possible.</p> <p>2 At that time they are allowed to make up their work.</p> <p>2 They don't get counted absent.</p> <p>2 It is set up to try to keep kids out of trouble.</p> <p>2 The purpose of ISS is to put the student out of a destructive environment.</p>	<p>2 To give students an opportunity to remain in school.</p> <p>2 They do need discipline but it was not serious enough to place them on an out-of-school suspension.</p> <p>2 We call our ISS room the opportunity room.</p> <p>2 It's an opportunity to be in school, you get full credit.</p> <p>2 We still give kids a discipline consequence but in a positive way.</p> <p>2 So my (ISS teacher) main goal right now is to get kids back on track academically.</p> <p>2 I can talk to them about their problems.</p> <p>2 My main goal is to basically see these kids prosper.</p> <p>2 Just to let them know we are watching them.</p> <p>2 The statement is that they are going to be able to keep up their work in their classes, not to endanger their success in the class.</p>	<p>0 I don't know what the statement is as far as the county.</p> <p>2 We use it to not interfere with their attendance.</p> <p>2 They are in ISS instead of out-of-school suspension</p> <p>2 We save their attendance.</p> <p>2 It's making sure that the kids do not miss school and that they are supervised.</p> <p>2 It's kind of an interim place for the disruptive student.</p> <p>2 So that they don't disrupt the other kids from learning.</p> <p>2 If the incident isn't serious enough to actually suspend the student, then they have in-school suspension.</p> <p>2 Well, basically it's a cooling off period.</p> <p>2 It's a place to put someone who's in a discipline situation.</p> <p>2 It's a place to house someone who's not appropriate to go back to class.</p> <p>2 It's just basically a temporary cooling off period one or two day situation.</p>
Written Procedures	<p>2 In the beginning I'd say we (the teachers) had quite a bit of input.</p> <p>2 We incorporated some material from other schools that already had this program.</p> <p>2 We wanted it to be what other schools had already inputted.</p> <p>0 As far as what goes on here, it is my (the AP) discretion.</p> <p>0 I don't think that teachers do give any input.</p> <p>0 I think it is more of an administrative thing.</p>	<p>2 As an administrative team, we sit down and drew up the guidelines.</p> <p>2 We wanted to make sure that students were allowed to do their work, while getting a discipline consequence.</p> <p>2 So if we come up with a unique situation, it's my (the AP) responsibility (to determine the consequence).</p> <p>2 Well, we're always asked to give that input with the year end survey.</p> <p>2 I think the ideas are utilized.</p>	<p>2 I have a lot of input since it's under me.</p> <p>0 Although it's not the way I would want to set it up.</p> <p>0 We don't have a therapeutic component set up the way it should be set up.</p> <p>2 It does seem to be working.</p> <p>2 We all have an opportunity to talk to the principal</p> <p>2 He listens to whatever comments you have.</p> <p>2 Mr. C (an AP), he's in charge of discipline in the school.</p> <p>2 He has a committee and anybody is welcome to attend these meetings.</p> <p>2 He has them about once a month where we discuss procedures and so forth.</p> <p>2 All the faculty is welcome to attend.</p> <p>0 My (referring teacher) input is very limited.</p> <p>0 It's more administrative.</p>

Table 4.4 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Principles	School "A"	School "B"	School "C"
Administrator Designation	<p>2 All of the other assistant principals have the authority to send a student to ISS.</p> <p>2 Well, that's (designation of an administrator) based on grade level.</p> <p>1 They're with different administrators in different grade levels.</p> <p>1 It (designation of an Administrator) depends on the last name.</p>	<p>2 Each of our administrators has students based on alphabet.</p> <p>2 So each assistant principal places the student in their alphabet.</p> <p>2 Each of the APs, any student can on their alphabetical listing is assigned to an AP.</p> <p>2 To answer your question, the AP.</p> <p>2 Each vice principal and a certain section of the alphabet that they are responsible for.</p> <p>2 If a student has a referral and they determine if ISS is needed, it goes through that vice principal.</p> <p>1 I believe it's all individualized here.</p> <p>I don't know that for sure so that's kind of an iffy answer.</p>	<p>2 I (an AP) oversee it, but all the AP's have the same authority.</p> <p>1 Between him and Mr. G. (an AP), but yes, he, I think, would be the overall one at this point.</p> <p>0 They've been switching those duties back and forth.</p> <p>0 I think he's the one they switched the responsibilities to.</p> <p>1 Each of the APs.</p> <p>2 Any student can be on their (each AP) alphabetical listing is.</p> <p>2 All students are assigned to an AP.</p> <p>2 So it's just the one administrator.</p> <p>1 We do alphabetical order here.</p>
Daily Resources	<p>1 It is up to the students to keep up with their work.</p> <p>1 It's up to the students to turn in the work when they go back to class.</p> <p>2 The teacher will put on the computer that the student has missing assignments.</p> <p>2 This puts the responsibility back on the student as well.</p> <p>0 There is a problem in that the type of student who is referred is usually not the always responsible for their assignments.</p> <p>2 I (the ISS teacher) notify teachers through email.</p> <p>2 They (the students) have until the next day to do it.</p>	<p>1 The student is responsible for doing the work; parents are to make sure that they do the work.</p> <p>0 We have parents who call and say my child didn't do any work today.</p> <p>0 We do have parents who call and say Johnny was in there all day and he didn't get any work.</p> <p>1 So there is no turnaround time for him (the student) to have any work today.</p> <p>0 But it's still not homework or class work.</p> <p>0 That's where the problem (inappropriate work) lies.</p> <p>2 We get in touch with the teachers and we (administration) email teachers to let them know that Johnny or Mary is in ISS.</p> <p>2 But most of the time I (the AP) tell my secretaries, they're very good at that.</p> <p>2 We (administration) even have teachers who go there and go over things with them.</p> <p>2 Because our idea is to help them be successful at all costs.</p> <p>2 I've got teachers stop in or drop work off</p> <p>2 Getting the work back is important.</p> <p>2 I (referring teacher) will hand deliver it and speak to the students.</p>	<p>2 We're (teachers) to take resources and materials down on a daily basis for a student.</p> <p>0 I would say some (teachers) have trouble (providing resources to ISS students) here (at School "C").</p> <p>0 Either the students don't do it and/or the teachers don't send it down.</p> <p>0 It's they're (students) responsibility (to get the work) first of all.</p> <p>2 I send my work down.</p> <p>0 Second of all if you send work down with them, you never get it back.</p> <p>2 The kid had to work as opposed to wasting their time.</p>

Table 4.4 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Principles	School "A"	School "B"	School "C"
Counseling Component	<p>1 Our guidance counselor is right next door.</p> <p>2 They're (guidance counselors) available at any given time.</p> <p>2 Some students want to speak with a counselor.</p> <p>0 There are no entry or exit requirements for a student to see a guidance counselor.</p> <p>2 We have another guy who comes in here and he's our guidance counselor.</p> <p>2 He (the guidance counselor) gives little speeches as far as goals, aspirations, achieving and wages.</p>	<p>1 The only counseling component is that we talk to them.</p> <p>2 Mr. H. (ISS teacher) talks to them. and we have those behavior modification packets that he has.</p> <p>2 But he (Mr. H.) is responsible for at least one period a day to talk to them about what they could have done differently.</p> <p>0 Oh no, we don't have that kind of manpower to have guidance counselors meet with ISS students.</p> <p>0 At a school this size B no way. In an ideal situation, that would be wonderful, but we don't have it.</p> <p>1 Well you know, I think one of the biggest things a counselor is to sit down with the kids and go over their academic things as far as history.</p> <p>2 The teacher himself in our particular program has a minor in psychological counseling and he does talks to the students a lot.</p> <p>2 They can request their own guidance counselor.</p> <p>0 Guidance counselors, they do not get involved with a lot of discipline.</p> <p>1 They will be able to advise about their credits, grades, college applications, you know, they're just super busy</p>	<p>2 We have counseling as far as from the county.</p> <p>0 Because there are six people involved no one's really taking charge of that (counseling).</p> <p>0 That's not something (counseling) that they (ISS teachers) do.</p> <p>2 AP's talk to them also, but the teachers that actually run the ISS program also talk to them. It's very informal though.</p> <p>1 The guidance counselors are involved if in fact the component matches any level 25 on our matrix (denotes what is to be done for discipline offenses)</p> <p>0 Well other than the fact that we have all these signs around the classroom, praises, the person that's in here does not do any teaching other than keeping students disciplined.</p> <p>0 I (referring teacher) think it's (counseling services) very little</p> <p>0 They (ISS students) don't have to see a guidance counselor.</p>
Notifying/Engaging Parents	<p>2 We make a phone call to the parent.</p> <p>2 Most parents are very appreciative (of the call).</p> <p>2 They'd (the parents) rather have them (the students) here than home because they don't know what they're doing.</p> <p>2 We (administration) try to call parents, not that we always get them.</p> <p>1 If I don't hear back from the parent by the time that student has ISS time is up, then I'll say OK I'm going to suspend you.</p> <p>2 I'd say that's (the person that notifies parents) the administrator.</p> <p>1 Sometimes the administrator calls home.</p> <p>0 As far as me (the ISS</p>	<p>2 When a child is assigned to ISS the assistant principal who assigns them calls home.</p> <p>2 This letter goes home and we engage the parents.</p> <p>2 And trust me (the AP) I get some parents that are really involved and they'll email me all day every day.</p> <p>1 And there are some parents who might call me one time, especially if there's no work.</p> <p>2 And there are others who will come out here.</p> <p>0 And then there are some that you're not going to hear from at all.</p> <p>2 Parents a lot of times call the deans.</p> <p>2 This year, they (parents) haven't said that (that they were not contacted) as much.</p>	<p>2 We call every parent when we do a discipline referral.</p> <p>2 ... to make sure that the parent knows what's going on.</p> <p>2 We make sure that the student is aware that they are getting a break.</p> <p>2 Notifying the parents is the AP's responsibility.</p> <p>1 I (ISS teacher) think that's part of that referral process that they contact the parents.</p> <p>2 Parents are called by ISS.</p>

Table 4.4 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Principles	School "A"	School "B"	School "C"
Notifying/Engaging Parents (cont.)	<p>teacher), I don't have too much contact with the parent.</p> <p>0 But as far as a regular follow up on the student there is none.</p> <p>2 If they are sent to ISS on a discipline referral then the parents are automatically called.</p> <p>2 As soon as the referral comes in, the parent is called</p>	<p>2 I've (the AP) been getting their work and I've been supporting them.</p> <p>2 Last year parents were real worried about their kids getting the work.</p> <p>0 So it's like I (ISS teacher) don't really communicate a lot with the parents.</p> <p>1 Parents basically will talk to Mr. S, Mr. M, Ms. W, Ms. C, they're all the assistant principals.</p>	
Information Collection	<p>1 I'm (AP) not sure about Mr. R's (ISS Teacher) record keeping.</p> <p>1 I (AP) know he has all the forms and it all gets through to data processing.</p> <p>1 I'm (AP) not sure how he (the ISS teacher) turns that in.</p> <p>2 He (the ISS teacher) has sign in sheets and he turns it in to data processing.</p> <p>0 I'm (ISS teacher) not sure if they do that at all.</p> <p>2 Safe schools takes all our computer system and prints out documentation</p> <p>0 We don't really take it to the community.</p> <p>2 It's used in the school here. We see where strengths and weaknesses are.</p> <p>2 Every student that was in got an exit survey.</p> <p>2 I (ISS teacher) send it to them in a packet.</p> <p>0 What they do with it I don't know.</p> <p>2 They (administration) just have me (ISS teacher) collect the data on the form.</p> <p>0 I (referring teacher) don't know that.</p> <p>0 Not to my (referring teacher) knowledge.</p>	<p>2 That's done all on our A24 screen (discipline data).</p> <p>2 Our secretary completes that chart; I (AP) just aggregate it down.</p> <p>1 It is at the beginning of the year it is our goal to report the information to the school community but we don't get it on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>2 At the department head meeting we do discuss the number of suspensions, the highest level, but we don't give names of the teachers with the highest numbers of referrals.</p> <p>2 We do say how many referrals or how many students were suspended.</p> <p>2 Department heads know and it's their responsibility to inform the rest of their department.</p> <p>2 We do keep a log on kids as far as times in ISS.</p> <p>2 They keep a log on the number of times they (students) were in there.</p> <p>1 I (referring teacher) believe the teacher (ISS teacher) does keep a record of that. But I'm not certain on that.</p> <p>0 I (referring teacher) don't know if it is reported to community.</p>	<p>2 We can quarry information out of our data processor.</p> <p>0 We don't report this to the school community.</p> <p>0 It's not a bad idea to do, now that you make mention of it.</p> <p>1 You know this is my first year being in charge of it.</p> <p>0 I don't get involved with that at all.</p> <p>0 I don't know if the AP's do that or not.</p> <p>2 It's all documented, by class, race, grade level, you know male vs. female, it's all documented.</p>
Improvement of School Climate	<p>2 We're (AP) always brainstorming, trying to figure out what we can do to make it safer and more amicable for everybody.</p> <p>2 We (AP) try to get student counsel involved as much as possible.</p> <p>2 We (AP) meet with other students.</p> <p>2 We (AP) try to involve students.</p>	<p>2 The only program that we have thought about, and that was the Sun Sentinel one that most elementary and middle schools use, and it is too young for us.</p> <p>1 We are looking into something but I don't know how it's going to be used. I don't know the name of it.</p> <p>We have a teacher who is checking into it.</p>	<p>0 There's no provision for students to be involved in developing school rules or any of that.</p> <p>2 I know they send out surveys periodically with the students.</p> <p>2 They mention the results on how the students rated certain things.</p> <p>1 I (ISS teacher) think there's a student body that is involved with that.</p>

Table 4.4 (Continued)

First & Mizell's Principles	School "A"	School "B"	School "C"
Improvement of School Climate (cont.)	<p>2 We (AP) try to pull students out of their shell.</p> <p>2 We (AP) encourage sports, extracurricular activities.</p> <p>2 We (AP) do what we see the need for.</p> <p>2 The students put their input to whose running for student council office.</p> <p>2 The kids voice their opinions.</p> <p>2 If they don't like something, they will come and tell you.</p> <p>0 Students have no role in developing school rules and it should be that way.</p> <p>2 We're (AP) working on Single School Culture.</p> <p>2 We're (AP) making sure that all teachers are on the same path.</p> <p>0 Sometimes it's not the students' fault.</p> <p>2 So right now we're working on Single School Culture.</p> <p>2 We're making sure that all teachers are following the same rules and regulations.</p> <p>2 No matter what classroom you go to, you already know that if you're late, you're late.</p> <p>2 Whatever discipline infraction is going to be set on then that's what it's going to be.</p> <p>2 I (referring teacher) know that student counsel and National Honor Society have a lot of say in deciding what rules kind of go.</p> <p>2 Student counsel actually goes our school improvement meetings.</p> <p>2 Students actually have a say</p>	<p>2 We are trying to do something that encourages our kids to be honest because we are finding that there's a lot of cheating in the classroom.</p> <p>2 One of our AP's told us something, we went looking at it last week, it was called AOn Your Honor@ and we're going to look into this.</p> <p>2 We will probably feed this (citizenship program) through the ISS room for those kids who constantly, especially those kids who get in there for cheating, lying, stealing.</p> <p>2 So we (faculty) as a group would sit down and discuss, like at a faculty meeting to see how we can make things better for the kids.</p> <p>2 Yeah, the climate overall is productive. It's supposed to be a productive climate.</p> <p>2 Well we usually do have a committee that takes referrals and students' confidential referrals.</p> <p>2 I have a student that has a problem, I can refer that student to this committee and they will call the student up to the guidance department and have a private conversation with them.</p> <p>2 We do have input through the surveys. Student counsel, they are influential also.</p> <p>2 The student counsel can approach the principal and discuss changes.</p>	<p>1 I personally am not involved with that at all.</p> <p>2 I (ISS teacher) think they have a lot input in developing school rules.</p> <p>0 I (referring teacher) don't think they have a major role because it would be much more lackadaisical.</p> <p>1 They're not going to want a lot of rules.</p>

Note: User's assessment
 2-positive for principle
 1-neutral for principle
 0-negative for principle

The data in this chapter was presented through an analysis of the interviews in which the researcher compared and contrasted the responses received from in-case school data and across-case school data. The responses received from administrators were compared to the responses received from referring teachers and ISS (In-School Suspension) teachers within the same school. Also compared were responses from administrators at the three different schools, referring teachers at the different schools, and ISS teachers among the various schools. The researcher also compared responses across case from school to school.

In comparing the data and responses the researcher perceived inconsistencies among the personnel interviewed. Also, there were inconsistencies in comparisons of the data gathered from the researcher's observations and the interviews. These will be addressed in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Findings

Currently a wide range of disciplinary measures are part of the educational culture of the South Florida school district selected for this study. Included are such consequences as parental contacts, behavioral contacts, loss of privileges, and out-of-school suspension (OSS). This study addressed an alternative to OSS: in-school suspension (ISS). This alternative was a means of allowing the offending student to remain in school while theoretically maintaining their academic status yet receiving a consequence for their action(s).

Discipline in schools has come to resemble that described by Foucault (1977). The changing social context of the past century, and especially of the past two decades, has served to redefine discipline as the power needed to maintain order in an institution. In education, this new view of discipline has come to define the struggle for power between teacher and student, one supported by a series of punitive actions that too often exacerbate rather than address the misconduct.

This chapter examines the findings of the nine principles espoused by First and Mizell (1980) and their inclusion or exclusion from the ISS programs studied. The researcher discusses the principles and whether or not they were included in each of the programs studied. Also discussed is whether the principle(s) would be appropriate for each of the programs based on the researcher's observations and the participants' response to the interview questions.

The first principle to be discussed will be a clear statement of purpose, which will help to define a successful program. The question of whether or not there is a clear statement of purpose was asked of all of the participants in the study. In reviewing the school district's in-school suspension program guide for 2005-2006 it states the goals of ISS include (School District of Palm Beach, 2005):

- Incorporate a developmental focus that assumes misbehavior is a symptom of an underlying problem that must be identified and resolved.
- Explain the rationale for rules and regulations and provided an understanding for the development of these rules.
- Address the cause of inappropriate responses to school rules through social skill building and de-escalation activities, academic assistance, and follow-up procedures. (p. 6)

The expected outcomes at each school are:

- A reduction in the number and percentage of Out-Of-School Suspensions,
- A reduction in the number of discipline referrals,
- Maintained or increased academic achievement for students successfully completing the In-School Suspension Program, and
- More positive student attitudes toward school. (p. 6)

Although there is not a specific statement of purpose in the program guide, these goals and outcomes are interpreted as being a statement of purpose by the researcher and all district staff. The responses to this principle by the interviewees did not reflect this specific wording, but the basic themes of the responses were that the purpose was to keep students in school and to allow them to stay current in their classes. The students are

receiving a consequence, so they know their indiscretion will not be tolerated, but they are being given the chance to remain in school and receive their work. Also, as mentioned by the referring teacher from School "C", "...basically it's a cooling off period, it's a place to put someone who's in a discipline situation and it's not severe enough to be put out of school."

The researcher, from the observations, interviews, personal experience, and review of literature, feels this is a very important principle. It could be compared to teachers having objectives for the classes they teach. If there are no objectives, how do they know if they are successful? The same rationale applies to a clear statement of purpose for ISS. If the personnel do not have a clear statement of purpose and plan for achieving it, then it will be difficult to know if they are successful with the ISS program.

The second principle espoused by First and Mizell (1980) states there should be, "Written procedures developed with teachers, students, and parents clearly stating how students are referred and assigned to ISS." This principle seemed to be lacking in all of the schools studied. The responses centered on the fact that the procedures were developed by the school(s) administration with occasional input from the ISS teacher. It was surmised by the researcher that ISS programs are frequented by students who are not active in school policy development, as would be a student who is interested in being active in student government. Also, through past experiences of the researcher, parents of students who find themselves in disciplinary situations are not typically involved in program development at schools.

A prevailing attitude, among some of the participants in the study, is that students, especially those referred to ISS, should not have any input into the policies and

procedures of the ISS program. An example of this attitude was reflected by the AP at School "C". When responding to the query on alternatives for improving school climate and students' role in the development of school rules he responded that students have no role in the development of the rules. He added to this response, "... and that is the way it should be."

A designation of an administrator responsible for determining if the assignment to ISS is appropriate, and who has the authority and the resources to pursue action if the referral is not, is the third principle of First and Mizell (1980). In all of the schools studied there was an AP responsible for overseeing the ISS program, but all of the AP's at the schools shared the responsibility for referring students to the program. This sharing of the duties was seen as necessary and an effective component of the ISS programs. As the principle is written, there would be one administrator responsible for handling all of the student referrals, which might necessitate a student being sent to ISS. In this study, this is not practical due to the size of the schools involved. Also, if the designated administrator is out for an extended time or even a day, someone would have to assume the duties, and there is not enough staff for this to take place.

The sharing of the duties for ISS referrals was divided either one of two ways; the AP's at the school either had a portion of the alphabet (i.e., A-E, F-J...) or had responsibility for a grade level (i.e., 9, 10, 11, or 12). When a student was sent to the office with a disciplinary referral, he or she would report to the AP responsible for that student. The AP uses the district discipline matrix to determine the consequence.

As stated earlier, one AP oversees the program and if there is a student or parent protest of the ISS referral, it is handled by the AP who determined the consequence. If

there is still a conflict, the AP in charge of ISS will intervene. The next step would be the principal of the school becoming involved. The AP from School "C" explained the situation is usually resolved before it gets to the principal.

The fourth principle of First and Mizell (1980) deals with a provision for an academic component to provide daily resources so the referred students keep up with class work. This principle is closely associated with the fifth principle which states there should be requirements that teachers continue to provide daily resources and materials to referred students. For the sake of consistency these two principles will be discussed together as they were in the previous chapter.

These principles are necessary requirements of any ISS program. The purpose for ISS is to allow students to remain current with their classes while they are in ISS so they would need to have the daily resources provided. As stated in the introduction of the In-School Suspension Program Guide 2005-2006, one of the outcomes is "maintained or increased academic achievement for students successfully completing the In-School Suspension program" (School District of Palm Beach County, 2005 p. 6). In order to achieve this, it is imperative resources be provided to the referred students.

There were inconsistencies from school to school in achieving this goal. The observations and the interviews sometimes revealed conflicts in what was observed and what was said in the interviews. For example, when the researcher observed School "A"'s ISS room there were five students at the time of the researcher's entry. Of these five, one of the students was reading a paperback book, another was sitting at his desk with nothing on it and doing nothing, while the other three had books or papers on their desks but were not actively engaged with any of these materials. In the interviews, the AP

stated students are allowed to make up work. This was not observed by the researcher. The ISS teacher and the referring teacher did not mention anything in regard to academics or students staying current with their class work. Since this is one of the goals stated in the ISS manual, it should have been clear to the respondents with the possible exception of the referring teacher.

When questioned in regard to teachers providing resources and materials to students, the AP responded teachers are required to provide these to referred students. The ISS teacher explained he sends out email to teachers of the referred students requesting work. The referring teacher stressed that students in ISS are entitled to their work. He explained students must be given their work and allowed to turn it in for credit. From the observation, this was not the case. It may have been the students were sent in at the last moment so their teachers were not able to provide work.

At School "B", the researcher encountered four students. Three students appeared to be working on assignments quietly while the other was working on a computer. The ISS teacher explained that when teachers get an email that a student is in ISS, it is their obligation to send work. He went on to explain if he does not get their work from the teachers, he starts emailing them right away. The ISS teacher stated the teachers are "real responsive" in regard to providing the work for the students. The referring teacher stated it is a requirement and the teachers follow the requirement. All teachers are notified one of their students is in ISS and a request is made for assignments.

The ISS teacher at School "B" explained the previous year, the teachers complained they did not get the work back that they sent to ISS. Since he has taken over as the ISS teacher this year, he has held students more accountable for their assignments.

This has led to improved communication between the teachers and the ISS program. He stated, "I've got teachers stopping in to drop work off for students."

The researcher observed in School "C" that there were fifteen students in the ISS room with one actually working on what appeared to be an academic assignment. Nine students were sitting with their heads down on their desks with the other four sitting but doing nothing. This was a very quiet atmosphere but there was only one student working out of fifteen.

In interviewing the participants, there did not seem to be very much accountability to ensure students referred to ISS were provided their assignments. The AP explained the process by which students are to be provided with assignments. Teachers are to send down "appropriate work" for the students. He commented teachers, "sometimes do (provide work) and sometimes don't. Just depends on the teacher. Some teachers are very good at it and others really say, I'll do it when they come back." The AP went on to say:

If there is a parent involved that says I want to make sure my kid gets the work, then I put a second note to the teacher myself, directly to the teacher. Then I tell the student when you get back from these three days or whatever, if you have any trouble whatsoever making up your work or getting credit for your work, come and see me and I'll make sure the teacher understands what the procedure is. I don't have to do it very often, most teachers do it.

The ISS teacher estimated that one-third of teachers at School "C" follow through in providing assignments for referred students. He explained teachers receive email to the effect a student is in ISS and they need to send materials and assignments. He stated

many of the teachers do not do this. The referring teacher explained that regular teachers are required to send work for the students referred to ISS. "The problem with that is sometimes they'll post the name in ISS, that's it. But we're to take resources and materials down on a daily basis for a student." This conflicts with the responses offered by the AP and ISS teacher. There appeared to be a lack of communication among the parties involved in assuring students receive their work.

These two provisions would seem to be of utmost importance and should be a high priority. If students are in ISS and they are missing assignments and are receiving failing grades for them, it could discourage the student. The researcher believes through the observations and review of literature that students in ISS programs are at a high risk for being unsuccessful in the school setting. If a student is in ISS there is a very good chance the student is not highly motivated to do well in school. If students are being unsuccessful due to not receiving their work it can contribute to academic failure.

First and Mizell's sixth principle states that a provision for a counseling component needs to be provided to help referred students. This principle seemed to be lacking in the three schools studied. According to the personnel interviewed, there were no requirements of students to meet with a guidance counselor either upon entry or exit from the ISS program. At School "A", the AP stated students have access to a guidance counselor if they would like to meet with one. The ISS teacher spoke of a guidance counselor coming to the ISS room "three to four" times per week. According to the ISS teacher the guidance counselor provided discussions relating to goals, aspirations, and achievement.

The AP from School “B” explained counseling is provided by the AP who referred the student prior to the student entering the ISS room. She went on to discuss that due to the size of her school it was not feasible to have a guidance counselor meet with every student referred to ISS upon entry and exit from the program. The prevailing thought at this school, echoed by the ISS teacher and also the referring teacher, was the primary role of the guidance counselors was to advise students on their credits, grades, and college applications. While the researcher concurs these are important roles for the guidance counselor, students in need of counseling to help them overcome their behavior problems are equally important. If these students are not able to overcome the problems that are keeping them out of the regular classrooms, then they will not be in need of college and career counseling.

School “C” also lacked the expertise of trained guidance counselors in their program. As the AP explained, students only see a guidance counselor if it is required by the discipline matrix. This school has six teachers sharing the duty as ISS teacher and as the AP discussed the situation he stated, “There are six people involved and no one’s really taking charge of that (counseling). The ISS teacher explained that other than the “inspirational posters” on the walls of the room there is no counseling. When questioned in reference to entry or exit counseling sessions he stated he was not sure. The referring teacher explained, “...you have to have individual counselors come in, one on one to get effective counseling. The group scenario for those types of kids won’t work.” From the observations and experiences of the researcher, he concurs with this assessment from the referring teacher. It was observed in various situations that students did not want to reveal their feelings in front of other students possibly out of fear of “losing face.”

First and Mizell's seventh principle deals with a provision for notifying and engaging parents and also procedures for following up on individual student progress. Parent notification was very consistent in the three schools, but lacking at all three on follow up of student progress. All of the schools had policies stating if a student is referred to ISS a call would be made to parents, usually by the referring AP, making them aware of the situation. This is not to say the schools were always successful, but a call was made in every situation. The AP at School "A" tries to ensure contact is made. If he is unable to contact the parent over the phone, he will send a copy of the referral home with an attached note stating the parent must call him prior to the student returning to the regular class. He emphasized that the parents of the referred students, "...always call back."

The second part of the principle, referring to follow up on ISS students, was virtually nonexistent from the information given in the interviews. The ISS teacher from School "A" said, "As far as regular follow up on the students, there is none." The referring teacher from School "C" did allude to the fact that he would occasionally follow up by contacting parents regarding the referred students. This aspect of the principle, in the researcher's viewpoint, would seem to be of utmost importance. He feels monitoring of the students after they exit the program would alleviate problems both for the student and the school.

The eighth principle of First and Mizell is that a provision needs to be made for collecting information that summarizes (a) the number of students assigned to ISS for each quarter by race, (b) the identity of the referring teacher and (c) regular reporting of this information to the school community. School information regarding student

discipline referrals are reported to the district as it occurs at the school. This information is available on the district website through the Gold Report. The information is reported by district, school level (elementary, middle, or high), and individual schools. It is also broken down by race and sex. This information is available to the general public.

ISS statistics are identified by the number of students; there is no mention of the individual referring teachers. First and Mizell (1980) state in the principle that the information should include the identity of the referring teacher, but the researcher felt this would be unreasonable and unnecessary. In identifying the referring teacher, the school district could be subjected to legal ramifications from the teachers and their bargaining unit. No school reported this information and rightly so. The researcher felt that this practice would serve no purpose but to cause problems for the schools and teachers.

In interviewing the participants on this principle, many of the respondents were aware this information was reported to the school district, but not aware it was not only available to parents but any one who wanted to have access to this information. All of the AP's were aware that the information is reported to the district, but none of them made mention of the data being accessible to the public on the district website. The ISS teacher at School "B" mentioned the information was reported to the school district, and the referring teacher at School "C" discussed ISS information is reported on the school web page.

The ninth and final principle of First and Mizell (1980) recommends there be alternatives for improving school climate. These include involving students in developing school rules and peer mediation programs. The AP explained they try, "...to figure out what we can do to make it safer, more amicable for everybody and we try

getting student council involved as much as possible.” He went on to say they encourage student participation in sports and extracurricular activities. The AP felt the student council is very active in developing school policies.

The AP at School “B” stated, “Technically they (students) do not have a role (in developing school rules).” She did add, however, “We do have senior leadership in government by our student council.” When asked to elaborate she replied, “They come and ask questions.” The AP from School “C” felt there were no programs at his school for improving school climate. He spoke of having a “wish list” but, when asked to elaborate, it did not have anything to do with the improvement of school climate. The ISS teacher did mention in his response that the school sends out surveys to students to rate different aspects of the school. When asked to elaborate on the content of the surveys, he did not offer any response.

This principle concerning improvement of school climate and student input regarding rules and mediation programs would seem to have great potential in aiding schools. If students had input, they would possibly be more inclined to take stake in the rules and procedures of the school. Also, any input schools got from students and utilized seemed to come from student councils or student government. It is the opinion of the researcher that the students in these positions are not students who would be referred to ISS. Therefore, schools should devise ways of soliciting feedback from students who have been referred to ISS.

Adoption Recommendations

In reviewing the principles of First and Mizell (1980), while they all have merit, the researcher would recommend schools adopt them, but with some variations to fit their

particular setting. Each principle will be discussed and possible modifications schools could or should make.

Principle number one should be adopted by schools as it is written. A clear statement of purpose, which will help to define a successful ISS program is imperative.

Principle two, stating that written procedures be developed with teachers, students, and parents clearly stating how students are referred and assigned to in-school suspension should be developed, and is one of the principles that were found lacking in the research. There were procedures; however, they were developed without student or parental input. This is not to say the procedures are not effective, but rather that there might be more cooperation from the involved parties if they had input. It is the opinion of the researcher that schools would have difficulty with this aspect. The reason for this is students typically assigned to ISS are not frequently involved in policy development, and students who are not assigned to ISS on a regular basis will not have a frame of reference to make meaningful contributions to ISS policies and procedures. This aspect would also apply to parental involvement. Parents of students who have not received ISS would not have a vested interest in the program. It is the opinion of the researcher, based on the interviews and observations, parents of students frequently assigned to ISS are not involved in school policies.

Principle three states that a designation of an administrator for determining the appropriateness of the placement in ISS is needed. As has been discussed previously in detail, the schools have adapted this principle very effectively. Due to the size of the schools, it is not practical for one AP to handle all of the discipline and refer students to ISS. The schools have adopted a system where each AP has a portion of the students,

either by alphabet or by grade level, and he or she assigns a consequence to the offending student based on the discipline rubric. If there are protests from students or parents, it is dealt with by the AP who handled the situation. If it is not resolved then it goes to the AP in charge of ISS, and finally to the principal of the school. The researcher felt this was a very effective modification of this principle by the schools studied.

The fourth principle of First and Mizell (1980) deals with an academic component. The researcher, based on the review of literature (Haley, 2000), personal experience, interviews, and observations, feels this principle needs the full commitment of all personnel involved in the ISS programs. It is crucial for students to either remain current or improve their academic standing while in ISS. The schools need to focus on this principle if they are to be successful with students assigned to ISS. ISS should not be merely a “holding cell” for students with behavioral issues. This could lead to student frustration and apathy towards the school experience.

The fifth principle dealing with the provision of daily resources to referred students is very closely associated with the fourth principle. If teachers do not provide resources and materials to referred students it is very difficult for the students to stay current. The schools need to adopt a firm policy regarding this principle. It should be clear to teachers, as well as students, there will be work provided and it is expected it will be completed in a timely manner.

A counseling component provided to students is the sixth principle of First and Mizell (1980). This principle was lacking in the schools studied. The researcher feels this principle, properly incorporated into the ISS programs, could have a positive impact. Schools used their guidance counselors for academic and career counseling. The students

need the counselors to speak with them about why they are in ISS. These students need to get in control of this aspect of their lives so they will be better able to succeed academically. If they are not in class, they are not getting the academic aspect so the behavior issue needs to be rectified.

It is recommended by the researcher there be a requirement that a student referred to ISS be seen by a guidance counselor upon entry into the program, and, also, upon their return to the regular school setting. The counselor should discuss the reasons for their referral to ISS and what could have done differently to avoid this consequence. By conducting this session, it could be ascertained if there are other circumstances leading to inappropriate behavior.

The schools utilized their ISS teacher to conduct counseling sessions with students while in the program. While this could be an effective component, and it should be continued, but students were not getting the personal attention necessary. A student is not likely to go into very personal and possibly embarrassing aspects of their lives in front of their peers. There is a better chance of the student divulging this information in a one-on-one session with a person he or she trusts.

The seventh principle, providing for notification and engagement of parents and monitoring and follow up of individual student progress, is imperative for success in the ISS program. As reported earlier, school policies for contacting parents were good, but lacked follow up. It is the researcher's opinion that the schools' need to track students upon their exit from the program. This could be achieved by requiring teachers to submit reports on ISS students regarding their behavior and academic standing.

The eighth principle, regarding collection of information, is done adequately by the schools, though the personnel associated with ISS need to more aware of this process and where this information can be accessed. As described earlier, the researcher does not recommend statistics regarding referring teachers be made public.

The ninth and final principle, regarding alternatives for improving school climate and involving students in development of school rules and peer mediation, is recommended by the researcher as a way of getting student “buy in” to policies and procedures of the school. If students have a stake in the policies and procedures there is a better chance of getting compliance. This could be achieved through student council, but as discussed earlier, student council members need to be representative of the entire student body. The student council should be made up of a representative cross-section of all the students which would include students who have experienced ISS or are familiar with the program.

One aspect of the ISS program not addressed by First and Mizell (1980) is a description of the qualities and traits of the ISS teacher. The In-School Suspension Program Guide 2005-2006, for the district studied, lists the following traits an ISS teacher should possess (School District of Palm Beach County, 2005):

- Strong disciplinary and classroom management skills,
- Interest in, as well as a desire to work with academically and behaviorally challenged students,
- Proficiency in providing a positive atmosphere that is conducive to learning,
- Ability to relate to students in an empathetic, respectful, and consistent manner,

- Skills to deflect inappropriate behaviors and positively encourage appropriate behaviors and/or responses,
- Instructional skills in general academic areas,
- Competence in communicating findings to parents, teachers, administrators, and counselors,
- Willingness to seek out a variety of appropriate resources,
- Effective organizational skills for:
 - 1) Gathering work from the students' regular teachers
 - 2) Completing necessary forms for each student
 - 3) Moving students in an orderly manner to different locations
 - 4) Collecting, organizing, and submitting necessary reports and paperwork for evaluation,
- Ability to facilitate group sessions. (p. 10)

A person who possesses these qualities would be highly desirable for the position of ISS teacher. It was not possible to evaluate the ISS teachers regarding these traits in the time the researcher was observing the ISS classes. The researcher believes that, based on the observations and interviews, that the ISS teachers were committed to helping the students overcome the difficulty that led to the student being assigned to the program. This statement held true for all of the school-based personnel who participated in the study. The personnel observed and interviewed achieved this commitment through various methods. Strategies ranged from nurturing to "tough love" and, it was assumed the method depended on the style of the person as well as what the person deemed to be the most effective strategy.

The school district, in their ISS program guide also listed administrative responsibilities, which are as follows (School District of Palm Beach, 2005):

- Staff the In-School Suspension position with a full time, certified teacher who can provided an academic, yet controlled atmosphere in a caring and nurturing environment,
- Support the In-School Suspension teacher with daily visits to the classroom to offer assistance,
- Arrange a schedule and location for the In-School Suspension program and instructor to best fit the needs of all students in the school,
- Monitor the In-School Suspension program and instructor to ensure appropriate academic goals and behavioral goals are implemented,
- Ensure that students who complete class work in the In-School Suspension program receive appropriate academic credit from their regular classroom teachers,
- Assign students to the In-School Suspension program who meet the program's criteria,
- Ensure that the In-School Suspension class contains no more than 15 students at one time,
- Ensure that appropriate coverage is provided for the In-School Suspension teacher for planning periods and lunch,
- Complete the necessary documentation for each student assigned to the In-School Suspension program,

- Provide follow-up conferences for each student who successfully completes the In-School Suspension (brief discussions to promote student's(sic) behavioral success,
- Gather and submit the appropriate documentation to the Department of Safe Schools for evaluative purposes,
- Assist the Department of Safe Schools staff in scheduling visits. (p. 11)

Also, added at the bottom of the list, is a statement, "The Department of Safe Schools needs all completed In-School Suspension Data Collection Forms and Student Exit Forms." These forms should be completed by the 30th of each month. In the interviews of the ISS personnel this was not stated in any responses.

The first administrative responsibility, staff the In-School Suspension position with a full-time, certified teacher ..., was done in schools A and B but not in School "C". The AP at School "C" would have liked to have one person assume the position but, due to circumstances beyond his control, it was staffed by several teachers who rotated during different periods of the day.

The tenth responsibility on the list, provide for follow-up conferences for each student who successfully completes the In-School-Suspension program, refers to the second part of First and Mizell's seventh principle (1980). The schools followed the first part of this principle, which states there should be provisions for notifying and engaging parents along with procedures for monitoring and follow-up of individual student progress, but according to the interview responses, did not do any follow-up on students once they left the ISS program.

Other responsibilities on the list were similar to some of First and Mizell's (1980). These included monitoring the In-School Suspension program and an instructor to ensure appropriate academic goals and behavioral plans are implemented dealing with an academic component, and, providing students with daily resources. Also, closely related, were the ninth and eleventh administrative responsibilities on the district's list and First and Mizell's eight principle (1980), referring to data collection of the ISS program. The district's ninth responsibility mandates completing the necessary documentation on ISS student's and the eleventh responsibility is the submission of this information to the Safe School's Department.

Recommendations for Further Study

In conducting this study, the researcher formulated numerous ideas for further study. This study was done only in three high schools, whose ISS programs were funded by the Safe Schools Department. The district also has ISS programs, again funded by the Safe Schools Department, in middle schools. There are currently no ISS programs, funded by the district, in elementary schools.

Further research could include middle and elementary schools so the principles of First and Mizell (1980) could be compared and contrasted in terms of their impact on a different age group. As an elementary school assistant principal, it is the feeling of the researcher, based on the observations and interviews, that the principles espoused by First and Mizell (1980) would be effective in an elementary school setting.

In the execution of this research, an awareness of several factors regarding ISS became apparent to the researcher. The major factor that concerned the researcher was the lack of a formal counseling component in the ISS programs. This suggestion is for a

pilot study to be conducted using counseling by a trained counselor. The research would involve using a control group, which would receive no counseling services, and an experimental group, which would receive counseling prior to entering and exiting the ISS program. The researcher believes a quantitative study done with a much larger number of schools is warranted. In doing a quantitative study on a larger sampling of schools, the research would be more generalizable.

Conclusions

This study examined which principles of First and Mizell (1980) were being implemented in the three high schools being studied. Also, studied were what other influences might be contributing to the success or failure of the ISS programs. The study consisted of observations of the three schools' ISS classrooms and interviews of the administrator responsible for the program, the ISS teacher, and a referring teacher.

It did not appear the schools were conforming their programs to First and Mizell's (1980) principles but rather on what was determined by the District's Safe Schools Department and the individual schools as to what practices would serve their students most effectively. Not coincidentally, many of the principles of First and Mizell (1980) were being implemented in the ISS programs studied. The researcher believes some of the principles espoused by First and Mizell (1980) are mandatory if an ISS program is to be successful. These principles are reviewed throughout Chapters Four and Five.

Some of First and Mizell's principles (1980) were modified to conform to the varying needs and circumstances of the schools studied. First and Mizell's (1980) third principle, which states designation of an administrator responsible for determining if the ISS assignment is appropriate and who has the authority to pursue action if the referral is

not, is an example of this. All of the schools studied utilized all of their AP's in referring students to ISS. The reason for this was schools were so large it would not have been practical for one AP to handle all students who were referred for discipline.

In conclusion, the ISS programs studied yielded the following results based on First and Mizell's Principles:

- All ISS programs must have a clear statement of purpose and goals defined by the district and disseminated to all personnel.
- There should be a clear set of written procedures.
- Depending on the size of the school, there should be one administrator in charge of the program and possibly several assisting.
- There must be an academic component included in the ISS program.
- Teachers of referred ISS students must continue to provide daily resources and materials to these students. ISS teachers must be aware of the academic obligations of the students and assist them. Perhaps, the use of a tutor would be beneficial.
- Counseling services should take place upon entering and exiting the ISS program. Also, if it is found to be necessary, counseling sessions should be provided during the ISS confinement.
- Provisions must be made to notify and engage parents in the ISS process. Administrators and referring teachers must develop a follow up/monitoring plan to track individual student progress.

- Information should be collected that summarizes only the number of students assigned to ISS. This should be done so that there can be a valid program evaluation.
- It is recommended that there be a process involving all students in the improvement of school climate, development of school rules, and cultivation of peer mediation programs.

It is the belief of the researcher that, although ISS programs are an effective alternative to OSS, if a thorough counseling program were incorporated into the ISS programs they would be even more effective. This coupled with more significant assurances that academic programs were included in the planning and implementation would greatly enhance the ISS programs studied.

“Studying successful in-school suspension models demonstrates that simple punishment is not enough. Furthermore, if there is no academic or prosocial component, ISS has little or no advantage over OSS. An effective ISS program should be clear, consistent, selective, constructive, and involve parents” (Hrabek & Settles, 2006, p. 3).

REFERENCES

- Ames, N.L., & Miller E. (1994). *Changing middle schools: How to make schools work for young adolescents*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Algozzine, R., & Ysseldyke, J. (1992). *Strategies and tactics for effective instruction*. Longmont, Colorado: Sopris West.
- Annushko, A., & Hunter, L. (2002). Implementing three –tiered intervention in schools. *Emotional & Behavioral Disorders in Youth*, 2(2), 27-31.
- Advantage Press. (2001, March). The in-school suspension program. *Advantage Press Newsletter*. Retrieved December 12, 2004 from <http://www.advantagepress.com/newsletters/iss.asp>
- Armstrong, K. (2002) *OCIP: On campus intervention program. Safe schools/healthy students initiative*. Retrieved December 12, 2002, from <http://www.suspensionsolutions.org/ackn.html>
- Constenbader, V., & Markson S. (1994). School suspension: A survey of current policies and practices. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78, 103-107.
- Constenbader, V., & Markson, S. (1998). School suspension: A study with secondary school students. *Journal of School Psychology*, 36, 59-82.
- Chambliss, J.J. (1993). Common ground in Aristotle's and Dewey's theories of conduct. *Educational Theory*, 43(3), 249
- Dodge, K.A. (1993). Social-cognitive mechanisms in the development of conduct disorder and depression. *American Review of Psychology*, 44, 559-584.
- First, J., & Mizell, H. (1980). *Everybody's business: A book about school discipline*. Columbia, SC: Southeastern Public Education Program.
- Florida Department of Education, Prevention Center. (2000). *Alternatives to suspension*. Tallahassee, Florida: Author.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Grice, M. L. (1986). *Positive alternatives to school suspension (PASS)*, 1985-86. Portland, Or: Research & Evaluation Department, Portland Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED 276794).
- Guindon, J. (1992). *Developing an in-school suspension program in an elementary school as an alternative to homebound suspension*. Nova University; 62 pages. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 349679).

- Gunter, P., Denny, K., Jack, S., Shores, R., & Nelson, M. (1993). Aversive stimuli in academic interactions between students with serious emotional disturbance and their teachers. *Behavioral Disorders, 18*(4), 265-274
- Hamilton Fish Institute. (2004). *Public agenda*. Retrieved December 12, 2004, from <http://www.hamfish.org/programs/id/30>
- Hersh, R.H., & Walker, H.M. (1983). Great expectations: Making schools effective for all students. *Policy Studies Review, 2*(1), 147-148.
- Gushee, M. (1984). *Student discipline policies*. Washington D.C., Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259455).
- Haley, A.N., & Watson D.C. (2000). In-school literacy extension: Beyond in-school suspension. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 43*, 654-661.
- Horner, R., Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., & Todd, A. (2001). Teaching school-wide behavioral expectations. *Emotional & Behavioral Disorders in Youth, 1*(4), 77-79, 93-96.
- Hrabak, M., & Settles, D. (2006). *Effective in-school suspension programs*. Retrieved October 23, 2006 from <http://www.kysafeschools.org/pdfs&docs/clearpdf/issuesbriefs/iss.pdf>
- Hyman, I., & Snook, P. (2000). Dangerous schools and what you can do about them. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(7), 489-498, 500-501.
- Kalajian, D. (2000, June 4). Student charged in the fatal shooting of teacher Barry Grunow on the last day of school. *The Palm Beach Post*. pp. B1
- Kellam, S. (2002, October). *Prevention science, aggression and destructive outcomes: Long term results of a series of prevention trials in school settings*. Presentation to the National Press Club, Washington D.C.
- Knopf, C.M. (1991). Middle school/junior high in-school suspension programs: Do we have what we need? *North Central Association Quarterly, 65*, 457-461.
- Lancette, C. (1997). *Resistant to change*. Retrieved March 8, 2003 from http://www.cln.com/archives/Atlanta/newsstand/122097/m_cover2htm
- Lancette, C. (2000). *Child abuse and neglect*. Retrieved June 7, 2003 from http://www.eln.com/archives/Atlanta/newstand/122097/m_cover2htm
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Maxwell, J. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mendez, R., & Sanders, S.G. (1981). An examination of in-school suspension: Panacea or Pandora's box? *NASSP Bulletin*, 65, 65-69
- Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morgan-D'Atrio, C., Northrup, J., Lafleur, L. & Spera, S. (1996). Toward prescriptive alternatives to suspensions: A preliminary evaluation. *Behavioral Disorders*, 21(20), 190-200.
- Morris, R.C., & Howard, A.C. (2003). Designing an effective in-school suspension program. *The Clearing House*, 76, 156-159.
- Pemberton, R.R. (1985). A study of the effectiveness of an in-school suspension program and perceptions of its effectiveness: A case study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47 (02A), 0373.
- Radin, N. (1988). Alternatives to suspension and corporal punishment. *Urban Education*, 22, 476-495.
- Reid, J., Patterson, G., & Snyder, J. (2002). *Antisocial behavior in children and adolescents: a developmental analysis and model for intervention*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Reist, J., & Condon, L. (2003). *The useless prison*. Retrieved March 18, 2004 from <http://www.ncusd203.org/central/html/what/torsberg/2002/1st/hour4/suspension>
- Sanders, D. (2001). A caring alternative to suspension. *Education Digest*, 66(7), 51-54.
- School District of Palm Beach County. *Gold report*. (2003). Retrieved December 1, 2003, from <http://www.palmbeach.k12.fl.us/9045/goldrpt/previous.htm>
- School District of Palm Beach County. (2003). *Student and family handbook*. West Palm Beach, FL: Author. Available online: <http://www.palmbeach.k12.fl.us/handbook.pdf>
- School District of Palm Beach County. (2004, November). *Gold report: Summary report - PFS-SF-30*. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from http://www.palmbeach.k12.fl.us/9045/goldrpt/fy05_1/goldreport2.asp

- School District of Palm Beach County. (2005, October) *Gold report: Summary report-PFS-SF-32* (2005). Retrieved December 1, 2005, from http://www.palmbeach.k12.fl.us/9045/goldrpt/fy06_1/goldreport2.asp
- Severson, H., & Walker, H. (2003). Proactive approaches for identifying children at risk for sociobehavioral problems. In K. Lane, F.M. Gresham, & T. O'Shaughnessy (Eds.), *Interventions for children with or at risk for emotional and behavioral disorders* (pp. 33-53). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shank, G. (2002). *Qualitative research: A personal skills approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sheets, J. (1996). Designing an effective in-school suspension program to change student behavior. *NAASSP Bulletin*, 80, 86-90.
- Skiba, R., & Peterson, R. (2003). Teaching the social curriculum: School discipline as instruction. *Preventing School Failure*, 47, 66-72
- Southard, M. (n.d.) *In-school suspension*. Retrieved December 12, 2002 from Leon County Schools web site: <http://www.tandl.leon.k12.fl.us/programme/Suspensions.html>
- Southard, M. (2002) *In-school suspension*. Retrieved March 18, 2004 from <http://nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/5/cu9.html>
- Steinberg, L. (1996). *Why school reform has failed and what parents need to do*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Stiefer, J. (2003). *Voices unheard: an interpretative study of in-school suspension* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 2003). Retrieved from ProQuest Information and Learning.
- Sullivan, J. (1989). Elements of a successful in-school suspension program. *NAASP Bulletin*, 73, 32-38.
- Suspension Solutions, Inc. (2002). *OCIP-Alternatives to suspension*. Retrieved December 12, 2002 from <http://suspensionsolutions.org/ackn.html>
- Turner, T.E. (1998). Perceptions of in-school suspension by never suspended students, suspended students, and teachers and their relationship to the effectiveness of in-school suspension programs (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (03A), 0652,
- Vogel, S. (May, 2004) Do discipline policies in today's public schools foster the common good? *Public Agenda*: 1-6.

- Walker, H. M., Ramsey, E., & Gresham, F. M. (2004). *Antisocial behavior in school*. Canada: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Walker, H., & Shinn, M. (2002). Structuring school-based interventions to achieve integrated primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention goals for safe and effective schools. In M. Shinn, H. Walker, & G. Stoner (Eds.) *Interventions for academic and behavior problems II: Preventive and remedial approaches* (pp. 1-26). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Walker, H.M., & Walker, J.E. (1991). *Coping with noncompliance in the classroom: A positive approach for teachers*. Austin, TX Pro-Ed.
- Wheelock, A. (1986). *The way out: Student exclusion practices in Boston middle schools*. Massachusetts Advocacy Center.. Retrieved March 12, 2003 from <http://middleweb.com/INCASEiss.html>
- Winter, G. (2000). A comparative discussion of the notion of 'validity' in qualitative and quantitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 4(3-4). Retrieved June 8, 2005 from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR4-3/winter.html>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DeRidder, L. M. (1991, February). *How suspension and expulsion contribute to dropping out. Education Digest*, 44-47.
- Korinek, L. (1993). Positive behavior management: Fostering responsible student behavior. B.S. Billingsley. & Others. *Program leadership for serving students with disabilities* (Chapter 9). Department of Education, Washington, DC. And the Virginia State Dept. of Education, Richmond. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372537). Retrieved December 12, 2002, from URL <http://www.ndcd.prg/ndcpd/ndwan/coursaes/sped505/chapters/chap9.htm>
- Leven, D.C. (2002, June 7). *Cruel and unusual punishment.* Retrieved <http://www.lightparty.com/Misc/CruelUnusual.html>
- Winborne, C. (1980). In-school suspension programs: The King William County model. *Educational Leadership*, 37(6), 466-469.
- Wolf, C. (1999). Has zero tolerance in schools gone too far? *Enquirer*, 5(22). Retrieved March 16, 2004 from <http://enquirer.com/editions/1999/05/22>

Appendix A
Interview Questions

Questions to be asked of administrators, ISS teachers, and teachers of the students referred to the ISS program.

1. What is the statement of purpose for the ISS program at your school? Please elaborate on what it means to you.
2. What is your input on the guidelines and or procedures for the ISS program at your school?
3. Who is the administrator responsible for determining if the assignment of a student to ISS is appropriate and who has the authority and the resources to pursue action if it is not?
4. What requirements are there of the students' regular teachers to provide daily resources and materials to the referred students?
5. With these components in place, how do you ensure students keep up with the classes they are missing when they are in ISS?
6. What counseling components are part of the ISS program?
7. What provisions are there for notifying and engaging the parents of students assigned to ISS and following up on their individual progress?
8. What provisions are there for collecting information that summarizes the number of students assigned for each quarter by race and referring teacher? Is this information reported to the school community and if so how?
9. What alternatives are there for improving school climate? What role do students have in developing school rules and peer mediation programs

Appendix B

Authorization for Voluntary Consent



Lynn University

**THIS DOCUMENT SHALL ONLY BE USED TO PROVIDE AUTHORIZATION
FOR VOLUNTARY CONSENT**

PROJECT TITLE: In-School Suspension in Secondary Schools: A Qualitative Study of In-School Suspension Principles and Their Impact on Discipline in the High School
Project IRB Number: 2006-012 Lynn University 3601 N. Military Trail Boca Raton, Florida 33431

I, Joseph M. Boone, am a doctoral student at Lynn University. I am studying Global Leadership, with a specialization in Education Leadership. Part of my education is to conduct a research study.

DIRECTIONS FOR THE PARTICIPANT:

You are being asked to participate in my research study. Please read this carefully. This form provides you with information about the study. The Principal Investigator, Joseph M. Boone, will answer all of your questions. Ask questions about anything you don't understand before deciding whether or not to participate. You are free to ask questions at any time before, during, or after your participation in this study. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH STUDY: The study is about In-School Suspension. There will be approximately nine people participating in this study. Participants represent that they are at least 18 years of age, and that they do not have medical problems or language or educational barriers that precludes understanding of explanations contained in this authorization for voluntary consent. The participants will be teachers and administrators from high schools.

PROCEDURES:

The procedures to be followed will be interviews of teachers and administrators of the program and also the teachers of the referred students. The use of procedures by teachers of the program will be observed.

Interview

You will be asked to elaborate on questions that are relevant to this study and to provide your insights about in-school suspension. The interview should take about twenty minutes to complete. A follow up interview may be necessary at a mutually agreed upon time and place, of approximately ten minutes in duration (or a telephone call).

The interview will be recorded on audiotape to allow a more accurate transcription. This interview will be done in person in response to questions provided by the researcher. You have the right to review all or any portion of the tape, and if anything is found to be objectionable you may request that it be destroyed.

POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORT: This study involves minimal risk. You may find that some of the questions are sensitive in nature. In addition, participation in this study requires a minimal amount of your time and effort.

The threat of anyone experiencing any mental or physical harm in the course of this study is low on a scale of low, medium, and high. The participants will sign informed consent documents outlining their risks and right to withdraw from this study at any time. Should the participant(s) choose to withdraw; their data will be eliminated from the study and destroyed by shredding the information. If the participant does participate, the data will be coded to protect his/her identity and confidentially, and kept in a locked security box for a period of five years. After five years, the data will be destroyed by shredding.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS: There may be no direct benefit to you in participating in this research, but knowledge may be gained which may help in-school suspension programs.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS: There is no financial compensation for your participation in this research. There are no costs to you as a result of your participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Every effort will be made to maintain confidentiality. Your identity in this study will be treated as confidential. Only the researcher, Joseph M. Boone, will know who you are. During the Interview you will be given a fictitious name. Data will be coded with that fictitious name.

All the data gathered during this study, which were previously described, will be kept strictly confidential by the researcher. Data will be stored in locked files for a period of five years and then, destroyed. All information will be held in strict confidence and may not be disclosed unless required by law or regulation.

Interview data will be coded so that there is no personally identifying information. They will be kept in a secure place (e.g., a locked file cabinet in the investigator's office). They will be heard only for research purposes by the investigator, Joseph M. Boone and his faculty advisor, Dr. Carole Warshaw. They will be transcribed and coded. At the end of end of the study, all audiotapes will be destroyed in a responsible manner.

The results of this study will be published in a dissertation, scientific journals or presented at professional meetings. In addition, your individual privacy will be maintained in all publications or presentations resulting from this study.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW: You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this study. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled if you choose not to participate.

CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS/ACCESS TO CONSENT FORM: Any further questions you have about this study or your participation in it, either now or any time in the future, will be answered by Joseph M. Boone, Principal Investigator, who may be reached at: [REDACTED] and Dr. Carole Warshaw, faculty advisor who may be reached at: [REDACTED]. For any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you may call Dr. Farideh Farazamand, Chair of the Lynn University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at [REDACTED]. If any problems arise as a result of your participation in this study, please call the Principal Investigator, Joseph M. Boone and the faculty advisor Dr. Carole Warshaw immediately. A copy of this consent form will be given to you.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VOLUNTARY CONSENT:

I have read and understand this consent form. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions, and all my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have been assured that any future questions that may arise will be answered. I understand that all aspects of this project will be carried out in the strictest of confidence, and in a manner in which my rights as a human subject are protected. I have been informed of the risks and benefits. I have been informed in advance as to what my task(s) will be and what procedures will be followed.

I voluntarily choose to participate. I know that I can withdraw this consent to participate at any time without penalty or prejudice. I understand that by signing this form I have not waived any of my legal rights. I further understand that nothing in this consent form is intended to replace any applicable Federal, state, or local laws. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form.

Participant's printed name

Participant's signature

Date

I, _____, give permission to have this interview recorded by means of an audio recording device. I understand the interview will be taped for data collection purposes specific to this research project only. The recording will be transcribed and coded. The recording and transcription will be maintained in a locked security box for a period of five years. At that time the recording and transcription will be destroyed. I understand that these tapes, as well as all written materials, are completely confidential.

Participant's signature

Date

INVESTIGATOR'S AFFIDAVIT: I have carefully explained to the subject the nature of the above project. The person participating has represented to me that he/she is at least 18 years of age, and that he/she does not have a medical problem or language or educational barrier that precludes his/her understanding of my explanation. I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge the person who is signing this consent form understands clearly the nature, demands, benefits, and risks involved in his/her participation and his/her signature is legally valid.

Signature of Investigator

Date of IRB Approval April 18, 2006

Appendix C

School District Consent Letter



THE SCHOOL DISTRICT
OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

ARTHUR JOHNSON, Ph.D.
SUPERINTENDENT

Alison Adler, Ed.D., Chief
Safety & Learning Environment

DEPARTMENT OF SAFE SCHOOLS
1790 N.W. Spanish River Boulevard
Boca Raton, FL 33431

(5 [REDACTED])

I, Dr. Alison Adler, Chief of Safety and Learning Environment, do hereby give Joe Boone, Assistant Principal at Addison Mizner Elementary School and doctoral candidate at Lynn University, permission to do research on In-School Suspension programs in schools on behalf of the Palm Beach County School District. I understand he will be observing the programs and interviewing personnel involved in the programs.

[REDACTED]

Date 1-26-06

Alison Adler, Ed.D.
Chief, Safety and Learning Environment
The School District of Palm Beach County

Appendix D
IRB Approval Letter



Lynn University

Principal Investigator: Joseph M. Boone

Project Title: In- School Suspension in Secondary Schools: A Qualitative Study of the Principles of Anne Wheelock and Their Impact on Discipline.

IRB Project Number 2006-012 :

APPLICATION AND PROTOCOL FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS OF A NEW PROJECT: Request for Exempt Status Expedited Review Convened Full-Board

IRB ACTION by the CONVENCED FULL BOARD

Date of IRB Review of application and Research Protocol 04/18/06

IRB ACTION: Approved Approved w/provision(s) Not Approved Other

COMMENTS

Consent Required: No Yes Not Applicable Written Signed

Consent forms must bear the research protocol expiration date of 04/18/07

Application to Continue/Renew including an update consent, is due:

- (1) For a Convened Full-Board Review, two months prior to the due date for renewal
- (2) For an Expedited IRB Review, one month prior to the due date for renewal
- (3) For review of research with exempt status, one month prior to the due date for renewal

Name of IRB Chair (Print) Farideh Farazmand

Signature of IRB Chair



Date: 04/18/06

Cc: Dr. Warshaw

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
Lynn University
3601 N. Military Trail Boca Raton, Florida 33431

Appendix E

Safe Schools Department Email to Principals

Joe Boone

From: Ann Faraone
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 4:38 PM
To: David Culp; Constance Tuman-Rugg; Jose Garcia (RPBHS-Principal)
Cc: Bill Basil; Michael Rudnet; Steve Hower; Joe Boone
Subject: ISS

Mr. Joe Boone (AP at Addison Mizner Elementary), a doctoral candidate at Lynn University, has been approved by Dr. Alison Adler, to conduct part of his research at schools implementing In-School Suspension programs funded by Safe Schools, with the consent of the school Principal.

Mr. Boone will be calling you and your ISS teacher to ascertain your approval of his working with your school. If at all possible, we would so appreciate your cooperation with this study. As you know, we are doing everything in our power to advocate for the reinstatement of ISS funding to the schools.

Please feel free to give me a call with any questions/concerns.

Ann Faraone, Director
Student Intervention Services

1790 N.W Spanish River Blvd.
Boca Raton, FL 33431



661B14 T 5511

03/12/07 39800

SELE

Group