

1978

A Study of In-School Suspension Programs in Area 7 of Iowa

Stephen Darryl Glass

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1978 Stephen Darryl Glass

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

A STUDY OF IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION PROGRAMS
IN AREA 7 OF IOWA

A Thesis Abstract
Submitted
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
CEDAR FALLS, IOWA

by

Stephen Darryl Glass

March 1978

ABSTRACT

Suspension has increasingly become one of the foremost problems confronting educational administrators in American public schools. The controversy over the advantages and disadvantages of out-of-school suspension has been on stage in the current educational scene. This conflict has evoked public skepticism and some intervention on the part of courts.

Educators have begun to develop in-school suspension programs as an alternative to out-of-school suspension. The major objective of in-school suspension is to have suspended students remain in the educational setting. This change in practice enables the school and community resources to be more readily used in remediating and facilitating the improvement of student behavior problems.

Variation exists in the organization of in-school suspension programs across the country. This result is achieved because programs are designed to meet the particular needs of each school and by the availability of resources. The present study purported to (1) assess in-school suspension programs and (2) identify those criteria or organizational variables which tend to be contributing to the success or lack of success of in-school suspension programs.

The junior high/middle schools and senior high schools located in Area 7 of Iowa served as the population for this investigation. The actual implementation of an in-school suspension program by school officials in Area 7 was the basis upon which schools in this study were selected.

Three questionnaires and an interview form were developed in this study. The first questionnaire was sent to a panel of experts. The experts' responses provided validation and a rank ordered hierarchy of the ten organizational criteria utilized in the assessment of in-school suspension programs. The other two questionnaires were designed to obtain suspension data from schools in Area 7 with and without in-school suspension programs. The interview form was developed to assess the criteria or organizational variables included in the in-school suspension programs of schools in Area 7 of Iowa.

In the final analysis, in-school suspension programs were found to be operating in 27 secondary schools located in Area 7 of Iowa. Twenty-six principals and/or others designated by the principal were interviewed in regard to the in-school suspension program being operated in their own particular school.

Typically the in-school suspension programs in Area 7 of Iowa did not include a majority of the criteria or organizational variables used to assess the programs. The criteria practiced in the in-school suspension programs did not correlate well with the rank ordered hierarchy provided by the panel of experts.

There was no significant difference in the number of suspensions occurring "Before" as compared to "After" the implementation of an in-school suspension program.

The enrollment-suspension ratios improved in six schools after an in-school suspension program had been implemented, however, the enrollment-suspension ratios worsened in five schools after an in-school suspension program had been implemented.

It was found that the trend in the enrollment-suspension ratios of the 40 schools in this study, with and without in-school suspension, had improved over the past three semesters. However, it is not clear why this improvement occurred.

As a group, the in-school suspension programs of schools in Area 7 of Iowa did not possess a majority of the criteria used to assess the programs.

The criteria or organizational variables perceived by experts as being "necessary for inclusion" in an in-school suspension program were not generally reflected as being a major part of the in-school suspension programs of schools in Area 7.

It was concluded that the majority of in-school suspension programs in Area 7 of Iowa appear to be still in the developmental stages. As a result, the majority of administrators have grasped the idea of in-school suspension, but have not yet begun to operate in-school suspension programs that are generally accepted as educationally sound.

A STUDY OF IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION PROGRAMS
IN AREA 7 OF IOWA

A Thesis
Submitted
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

by
Stephen Darryl Glass
March 1978

This Study by: Stephen Darryl Glass

Entitled: A STUDY OF IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION PROGRAMS IN AREA 7 OF IOWA

has been approved as meeting the thesis requirement for the Degree of
Specialist in Education

R. P. Brimm

1/13/78
Date Chairman, Thesis Committee

Donald L. Hanson

1-13-78
Date Member, Thesis Committee

Leander Brown

1-13-78
Date Member, Thesis Committee

Upon recommendation of the Thesis Committee, accepted by

H. Roy Hoops

Dean of the Graduate College

2/28/78
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is appropriate at this time to express sincere thanks to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. R. Paul Brimm, Mr. Leander Brown and Dr. Donald L. Hanson, for exercising their foresight and judgement in the initial planning phases of this study.

A special note of thanks goes to Mr. Brown and his wife, Cathy, whose special acts of kindness and generosity made the completion of this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
1. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Importance of the Study	5
Assumptions	7
Limitations	8
Definition of Terms	9
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
Research Findings in the Area of School Suspension	12
Characteristics of suspended students	12
Effects of suspension on student behavior	15
Why students are suspended	17
Legal ramifications of suspension	19
Summary	23
In-School Suspension Programs and Special Disciplinary Programs	24
In-school suspension programs	24
Special disciplinary programs	32
Summary	35
3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	37

	Page
Procedures	37
Analysis of Data	40
4. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA	45
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	79
Introduction	79
Problem	80
Subjects and Setting	80
Instrumentation	82
Analysis	83
Results	85
Conclusions	88
Answers to questions posed in the study	90
Limitations	91
Recommendations for In-School Suspension Programs	92
Basic provisions	92
Planning a program	93
Evaluation	94
Recommendations for Future Study	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY	97
APPENDICES	
A. SAMPLE OF LETTERS, QUESTIONNAIRES AND THE INTERVIEW FORM USED IN THE STUDY	103
B. PANEL OF EXPERTS AND CRITERIA IN THE SCHOOLS	121

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Analysis of Interviewee Responses To Questionnaire Items	53
2. Analysis of Interviewee Responses To Questionnaire Items Categorized by Operational Definitions Into Ten Organizational Variables	60
3. Panel of Experts' Responses to the Ten Organizational Variables	63
4. Criteria and Data Used to Compute the Correlation of Organizational Variables Practiced in Schools with the Opinions of Experts	65
5. A Comparison of the Number of Suspensions Occurring "Before" and "After" the Implementation of an In-School Suspension Program	67
6. Three Pair-Wise Comparisons of the Enroll- ment-Suspension Ratios (ESRATIOS) of Schools which Responded to Suspension Data Questionnaires	71
7. A Comparison of Enrollment-Suspension Ratios (ESRATIOS) of Large Schools Versus Small Schools	73
8. A Comparison of the Enrollment-Suspension Ratios of Large Senior High and Large Junior High Schools with In-School Suspension Versus Small Senior High and Small Junior High Schools with In- School Suspension	74
9. A Comparison of the Enrollment-Suspension Ratios of Large Senior High Schools With In-School Suspension Versus Small Senior High Schools With In-School Suspension	75
10. A Comparison of the Enrollment-Suspension Ratios of Large Junior High Schools With In-School Suspension Versus Small Junior High Schools with In-School Suspension	76

Table

Page

11.	A Comparison of Enrollment-Suspension Ratios of Senior High Schools with In-School Suspension Versus Junior High Schools with In-School Suspension	77
12.	A Comparison of Enrollment-Suspension Ratios of All Schools with In-School Suspension Programs Versus All Schools Without In-School Suspension Programs	78

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Introduction

Suspension has increasingly become one of the foremost problems confronting educational administrators in American public schools. The magnitude and seriousness of the problem is exemplified in the millions of youngsters now being suspended from schools annually (16:5).

Central to the use of suspension is the belief that it provides a means for maintaining an educational atmosphere that is necessary for learning (38:11). Suspension has also been known to be used for providing a student with time and opportunity to concentrate on his behavior, for making parents aware of their child's inappropriate school behavior and for securing the parents' cooperation in dealing with their child's misbehavior (39:20). These functions establish a practical foundation upon which suspension has been based as a control for student behavior (3:34).

Despite the above mentioned purposes, opponents of suspension assert that the weaknesses inherent in the traditional suspension system surpass its positive outcomes. The most frequently criticized aspects of suspension as described by Kittle and Meares (33) suggest that (1) students experience increased academic difficulty because of time spent out of school, (2) students amplify community problems while out of school, (3) complex readmittance procedures sometimes unnecessarily extend the duration of suspension, and (4) students become

inaccessible to special service personnel who could be best used toward the resolution of the student's problems (33:60-61).

In addition to these criticisms, the Supreme Court has also addressed itself to the matter of suspension. The Supreme Court's decisions of *Goss versus Lopez* (26) and *Wood versus Strickland* (56), concurrently mandate that care must be taken to ensure that minimum due process procedures are provided for in disciplinary cases involving suspension (39:8). In view of this judicial intervention educators have expressed concern regarding the attenuation of their discretionary power relative to the disciplinary process (2:17). Taken together these events challenge the credibility of schools as effective and fair places for the education and treatment of youth.

Public skepticism, along with an intensive analysis of the effects of suspension policies, has compelled educators to conceptualize alternatives to out-of-school suspension. A seemingly more productive approach to suspension has resulted from these efforts. The rapidly spreading new concept of in-school suspension is one example. The major objective found within this approach is that of having the student remain within the educational setting. This change in practice enables the school and community resources to be more readily used in remediating and facilitating the improvement of student behavior problems.

In-school suspension programs attempt to accommodate the needs of students, parents and the community as well as satisfy dictates imposed by the courts. Consequently in-school suspension programs have been perceived as educationally and legally sound (33:63). However, educators must assess in-school suspension programs to determine their effectiveness as viable options to the traditional suspension system.

There is also a need to examine those organizational variables which tend to suggest a relationship between their inclusion and the ultimate success of the in-school suspension programs.

Statement of the Problem

Suspension has been one of the traditional disciplinary measures used by school administrators to control learning environment. The complexity of modern society, characterized by changes in values and mores, has undermined traditional methods of educating and disciplining youth. "In the present school setting, except in the case of the most calamitous emergencies adoption of unimaginative and traditional control devices seems to produce perverse and contraproductive results" (3:34). Legal rulings such as Tinker versus Des Moines (51) which support student rights and Goss versus Lopez (26) which mandates minimum due process procedures for school children are indicative of the types of changes with which school officials must cope. Likewise there is evidence that parental attitudes are changing with respect to disciplinary procedures as they are used in schools. Some parents are now requesting that their children serve punishments in school rather than being sent home for recalcitrant behavior. These changes, requests and demands have prompted educators to seek alternative disciplinary methods. In-school suspension has been seized upon as a possible solution.

Variation exists in the organization of in-school suspension programs across the country. This result is achieved because program designs are usually determined by the particular needs of each school and by the availability of school resources (38). This diversity

intensifies the need for assessment. Desiring a more thorough examination of in-school suspension programs, this study purported to (1) assess in-school suspension programs of schools located in the Area Education Agency 7 region of Iowa and (2) identify those factors which tend to be contributing to the success or lack of success of in-school suspension programs.

The two major hypotheses and six sub-hypotheses tested in this study include the following:

Hypotheses

- (1) There is no difference in the number of suspensions occurring before the implementation of an in-school suspension program as compared to the number of suspensions occurring after the implementation of an in-school suspension program.
- (2) There is no relationship between the specific organizational variables included in an in-school suspension program and the subsequent number of observed suspensions.

SubHypotheses

- Sub H_1 There is no difference in the suspension rates of Large schools versus Small schools.
- Sub H_2 There is no difference in the suspension rates of Large Senior and Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension programs versus Small Senior and Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension programs.
- Sub H_3 There is no difference in the suspension rates of Large Senior high schools with in-school suspension programs versus Small Senior high schools with in-school suspension programs.
- Sub H_4 There is no difference in the suspension rates of Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension programs versus Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension programs.
- Sub H_5 There is no difference in the suspension rates of Senior high schools with in-school suspension versus Junior high schools with in-school suspension.

Sub H₆ There is no difference in the suspension rates of schools with in-school suspension versus schools without in-school suspension.

Stated below are the questions posed in the study:

- (1) Are in-school suspension programs effective in reducing the number of suspensions?
- (2) What organizational factors are present in in-school suspension programs of schools located in Area 7?
- (3) What organizational factors tend to be contributing to the success of in-school suspension programs?
- (4) What factors are perceived by experts to have importance in the organization of in-school suspension programs?
- (5) Is there a difference in the suspension rates of large schools as compared to small schools?
- (6) Is there a difference in the suspension rates of schools that have in-school suspension programs as compared to schools that do not have in-school suspension programs?
- (7) Is there a difference in the suspension rates of junior high schools as compared to high schools?

Importance of the Study

Unquestionably discipline has been one of the major concerns of parents and persons interested in the education and welfare of youth (21:188). Disciplinary methods which prove to be fair and effective serve as a safeguard against accusations of racism, discrimination and denial of constitutional rights. Lawsuits have more and more become the means by which parents and students are seeking redress for inconsistent and unfair disciplinary actions which result in suspension and expulsion (40:48, 50-51).

Intervention of the courts to resolve conflicts in the educational arena has diminished the autonomy of policy-making once enjoyed

by school officials. This is evidenced in the remarks made by Chief Justice Powell in his dissenting opinion in Goss versus Lopez.

No one can foresee the ultimate frontiers of the new "thicket" the Court now enters. Today's ruling appears to sweep within the protected interest in education a multitude of discretionary decisions in the educational process (24;6).

Such decisions create periods of uncertainty because educators must immediately adhere to new guidelines, but have few programs readily available with which to do so.

Court decisions did cause changes in suspension procedures for some principals. Their major impact, however, was to cause uncertainty among all principals about the extent of their authority to discipline students (48;1).

The atmosphere is thus ripe for educational change and innovation. School officials are exploring new methods, developing new programs, and modifying existing programs to accomplish increased effectiveness. New concepts in education are being transmitted via word of mouth, media coverage, lectures by distinguished educators, workshops, films and publications. Nonetheless, care must be taken to carefully study these new concepts and programs. Human energy and school resources should not be committed to such concepts or programs simply on the basis that they are new or that they have some appealing cosmetic quality.

The present study should have particular significance for practicing school administrators who plan to initiate in-school suspension programs as well as for school administrators currently operating in-school suspension programs. An attempt is made to evaluate whether in-school suspension is successful in reducing the total number of suspensions experienced by schools. The organization of in-school

suspension programs of schools located in Area Education Agency 7 is studied and compared to a list of variables suggested by experts as being associated with the success of in-school suspension programs. A list is also provided which illustrates how these certain variables ranked in importance according to a selected panel of experts.

This investigation of in-school suspension should provide school personnel with a more precise picture of the concept of in-school suspension programs. In essence the study may assist school administrators currently operating in-school suspension programs in objectively assessing their own programs and may also serve as a source of information and quasi-guide to administrators planning to develop in-school suspension programs.

Assumptions

The assumptions of the present study are based on an in-depth review of the literature pertaining to in-school suspension programs and other programs aimed at modifying the behavior of school children. Consequently, those factors which have continuously appeared in the literature as being associated with the success of in-school suspension, and such similar behavior shaping programs, are held as validly representing the factors most likely needed to achieve success with in-school suspension programs in general.

The following assumptions established a foundation for the study:

- (1) It is assumed that the inclusion of specific organizational factors enhance the quality of in-school suspension programs. These organizational factors include (1) written goals and objectives, (2) a single certified teacher assigned to the in-school suspension program, (3) instructional assignments for which suspended students receive credit,

- (4) involvement of guidance personnel, (5) parental involvement, (6) follow-up and evaluation, (7) behavior contracts, (8) written rules, (9) self-concept development, and (10) interest building activities.
- (2) It is assumed that surveying the opinions of a selected panel of prominent educators is an educationally sound method of determining the ordinal importance of organizational variables of in-school suspension programs.
- (3) It is assumed that the instrument utilized in the study provides an appropriate representation of the in-school suspension program existing in each school.
- (4) It is assumed that the information obtained through personal interviews, and the information submitted on suspension data questionnaire forms is reasonably accurate for each school involved in the study.
- (5) It is assumed that schools located in Area Education Agency 7 are typical of schools throughout Iowa.

Limitations

The problems and limitations of the present study resulted primarily from uncontrolled occurrences in the educational environment.

(1) A change in the number of suspensions experienced by individual schools could not always be contributed to the implementation of an in-school suspension program. For example, a school may have had a policy specifying that students who were truant automatically received a suspension. Suppose now that such a school implemented an in-school suspension program during the same semester and also changed its suspension policy so that students were no longer suspended for truancy. It becomes rather apparent that a change in the number of suspensions at the end of the year could not be solely attributed to the in-school suspension program. (2) Changes in administrators also had possible effects on suspension data. An example of this effect

can be observed when an administrator adheres more rigidly or more leniently to the enforcement of school district policies regarding suspension than did his predecessor. (3) Raw suspension figures may be misrepresentative of the actual number of students being suspended from a particular school. A school may have had fifteen reported cases of suspension, but one student may have been responsible for several of these suspensions through repeated violations. These repeated violations by a single student can distort the actual incidence of suspension in terms of the number of students suspended. (4) Only schools located in Iowa, Area Education Agency 7 served as the population of the study.

Definition of Terms

Suspension. Suspension is the temporary forced withdrawal of a student from school for various disciplinary reasons.

In-school suspension. In-school suspension is the temporary forced withdrawal of a student from a single class or classes, but such that students are permitted to remain within the attendance center or a comparable educational setting.

In-school suspension supervisors. In-school suspension supervisor is a person designated the responsibility of guiding and directing the learning experiences of students in an in-school suspension center.

In-school suspension center. In-school suspension center is a room or facility which accommodates suspended students.

Goals and objectives. Goals and objectives are a written set of statements which illustrate the philosophical foundation or theoretical model upon which an in-school suspension program is established.

Behavior contract. Behavior contract is a written plan worked out between a student and an in-school suspension supervisor, principal or counselor designed to improve student behavior as well as facilitate student adjustment to the educational environment.

Rules. Rules are a written set of statements which prescribe the type of behavior expected of students during assignment to an in-school suspension center.

Follow up and evaluation. Follow up and evaluation is a formally planned process of assessing the effectiveness of an in-school suspension program utilizing external criteria.

Secondary school. Secondary school is the school unit which includes the higher numeric level of grades as defined by a school system; typically it consists of such patterns as 7-8, 7-9, 10-12, 9-12, 7-12.

Assignments. Assignments are instructional activities for which credit is received.

Certified teacher. Certified teacher is a person granted official state certification and employed in an official capacity for the purpose of guiding the learning experiences of students in an educational institution.

Guidance personnel. Guidance personnel refers to a person with the primary responsibility of advising and helping students make choices about educational, vocational, or personal problems.

Outside agencies. Outside agency is any of the service agencies in the community, including health clinics, psychological and psychiatric services, social service agencies, family and children's agencies, civic and professional clubs, placement agencies, churches and other similar groups.

Self-concept and self-awareness activities. Self-concept and self-awareness activities are learning experiences designed to help a child find out more about himself as a person, his abilities, academic capabilities and occupational interests.

Parental involvement. Parental involvement is any action taken by the parent in response to action taken by a principal, in-school suspension supervisor or counselor, which is other than a response to a formal notification of a suspension. Suggestions and/or participation by the parent in the resolution of the child's behavior problem is required to meet this standard.

Organizational variables or factors. Organizational variables or factors are the various elements which make up an in-school suspension program. These elements may typically involve goals and objectives, a theoretical model, certified personnel, parental involvement, involvement of special service personnel, instructional assignments, self-concept development, interest building activities, rules, and follow-up and evaluation.

Interest building activities. Activities that focus on career development, goal-setting and participation in extra-curricular or community events.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Research studies that treat different aspects of school suspension have been conducted. Often these studies focus on such themes as how, which and why students are suspended, the frequency of student suspensions, characteristics of suspended students, the effect of suspension on student behavior, the legal ramifications of suspension and alternatives to suspension. The intent of this review is twofold, and, as a consequence, the related literature is divided into two major sections. The first section familiarizes the reader with some of the research findings in the area of suspension and identifies problems that result from the use of suspension. When these findings are synthesized, the interests of educators in seeking alternatives to the conventional suspension system become manifest. The second section of the review of related literature is an outgrowth of the first and is an examination of in-school suspension programs and similar educational programs and theoretical models aimed at changing student behavior. The amalgamation of these various programs results in a rationale for the selection of specific organizational variables utilized in the assessment of in-school suspension programs.

Research Findings in the Area of School Suspension

Characteristics of suspended students. In a dissertation entitled "A Comparison of Suspended and Non-Suspended Fourth Grade

Students in Urban Low Socio-Economic Level Schools on Two Measures of Self-Concept As-A-Learner," Sara Foulks (20) summarized the results of three studies conducted in the New Orleans Public School System.

Encompassing a three year time span (1967-69) these studies identified some unique traits of suspended students.

The findings of these studies (16,38, 39) [18, 43, 44, 49] indicated that the indefinitely suspended student in the elementary and junior high levels of the New Orleans Public Schools is characteristically a black adolescent boy, academically less bright than his peers, from low socio-economic background in which the breadwinner tends to be poorly educated and manually employed, and is more likely to be suspended because of disrespect to superiors, fighting, and habitual violation of school rules (20,27).

Foulks also reported the results of a research study conducted by the Seattle Public School System during a three year period, 1961-64. The information derived from this study paralleled that found in the New Orleans study.

. . . .boys accounted for the majority of suspended students, 71% in Seattle and 81% in New Orleans, a high prevalence of family disorganization (death, divorce, desertion or separation) was present in the families of suspended students in both systems, behavioral and learning problems; and the suspended student frequently fell in the below-average range of intellectual functioning. . . . (20,29).

A study conducted by Binkley and others (5) in the Metropolitan Nashville Public School System surveyed the attitudes of principals and/or others designated by the principal concerning identifiable characteristics of suspended students. Some of the results cited amount to a restatement of trends found in previous studies.

A majority of suspended students were ranked in the bottom three stanines with respect to Reading Achievement and Mathematics Achievement. . . .Approximately 40% of the students were ranked in the bottom three stanines with respect to Academic Aptitude. . . .The majority 56% of the suspended students were in grades 7-9, 36% of suspended

students were in grades 10-12, 4% were in grades K-6, and 4% were in ungraded Special Education classes. . . .The majority of the suspended students had little or no meaningful extracurricular involvement in the school program (5:16-17).

A non-profit organization of lawyers, federal policy monitors, researchers and community liaison people designated as the Childrens Defense Fund (CDF) researched extensively the topic of school suspension. Their findings appeared in a highly publicized document, Children Out of School in America (11). CDF reported that a vast number of children were not attending school for various reasons, including suspension and expulsion. CDF also scrutinized suspension data submitted to the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) by five states-- Arkansas, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, and South Carolina. Their findings suggested a distinct pattern of minority student suspensions.

. . . . Almost 7 percent of the minority pupils in the five states . . . analyzed were suspended at least once during the 1972-73 school year. Over 50 percent of the students suspended in these five states were minority, though less than 40 percent of the districts' total enrollment was minority. Fifty percent of the 402 districts analyzed reported suspending 5 percent or more of their black students, but only 23 percent of the districts reported suspending 5 percent or more of their white students (11:30).

CDF followed up their first report a year later with another publication, School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? (12). The report focused exclusively on school suspension. A large scale analysis of suspension data submitted to OCR by 2,862 districts provided an analytical basis for the study. In addition, CDF surveyed 6,500 families in nine states and the District of Columbia (Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, and South Carolina); interviews were also conducted with more than 300 officials

and community leaders (12:118-122). Factors such as regional variation, racial and ethnic mix, urban and rural populations and different income levels served as the criteria for the selection of specific localities in each state. Some of the major findings of this concerted research effort described characteristics of suspended students. ". . . . Suspensions affect some children more than others. Although the largest number of suspended children are white, proportionately, suspensions hurt more children who are Black, poor, older and male" (12:9).

Effects of suspension on student behavior. In an article entitled "Suspension: The Approach Positive" Bocciardi (6) summarized the results of a study conducted to determine the effect of suspension on student behavior. The study which occurred in the 1962-1963 academic year involved students of James Lick High School, San Jose, California. The students had been suspended for one day or more and the parent contacted. The findings of the study convinced Bocciardi that suspension was one of the best available methods to serve as a rehabilitative stimulus for the nonconforming or immature students and equally important to serve as a force to create the most healthful learning environment.

. . . .Over half the students suspended (53%) failed to commit a second violation of any kind after suspensionSeventy-seven percent of those suspended for truancy refused to be truant a second time. . . .There appears to be a definite correlation between severity of suspension and positive rehabilitative effect (6:66).

Binkley and others (5) ". . . .found that the behavior of about half of the reported suspended students had improved greatly. . . .Another 34% reported no change. Only 6% of the sample reported that behavior had worsened" (5:17).

Strunk (50) made several generalizations and conclusions in regard to a statistical study involving Western Hills Junior High School, Cincinnati, Ohio. The study sought to examine the effects of suspension on behavior. Strunk observed the number of referrals before a student was suspended and compared this number of referrals to the number of referrals after suspension for the same offense. Strunk concluded that suspension was effective in preventing the reoccurrence of suspension for the same offense, but not necessarily effective for improving the students total behavior (50:137-138). Strunk also felt that the complexity of human behavior made it impossible to isolate its components and view them separate from the whole (50:138). This assertion tends to support his findings which indicated that students who were suspended for one offense were subsequently suspended for having trouble in a variety of other areas.

CDF (11) on the other hand has concluded that suspension has a negative impact on children. Labeling, missed school work, denying children help and encouragement of juvenile delinquency are listed as factors which may result whenever a child is suspended from school.

. . . .it is clear that any exclusion from school interrupts the child's educational process and forcibly removes the child from his normal daily environment. . . . First, it forbids the child from participating in academic work. . . .Second, suspensions merely remove troubling children. They do not set in motion diagnostic or supportive services that might uncover and remediate the causes of a child's misbehavior. . . .Third, suspension is a powerful label that not only stigmatizes a child while in school (or out of it), but follows the child beyond school to later academic or employment pursuitsFourth, suspensions are highly correlated with juvenile delinquency (11:135).

The members of the Citizens Commission to Investigate Corporal Punishment at Junior High School 22 (New York City, New York) released

their findings in a report, Corporal Punishment and School Suspension: A Case Study (13). The commission consisted of independent citizens who had been connected in various ways with the problems of children and youth in the city. Assertions made in the report illustrate the committee's position that suspension offers destructive consequences to youngsters.

The abuse of the power of school suspension does serious harm to a student in many ways beside depriving him of his right to education. Where procedure is not fair the student senses the injustice, and anger and distrust may result. The student is humiliated. He is marked as deviant which threatens his self-esteem. All too often, suspension, in fact, means pushing a student who needs special services out of school. . . . (13;29).

Why students are suspended. Morissette and Koshiyam (34)

reviewed the CDF (12) report and pointed out that suspension usually results from non-dangerous offenses.

. . . .CDF found that the vast majority of suspensions were for non-violent, non-dangerous offenses. 63.4 percent of all suspensions were for offenses that were neither dangerous to persons nor property. . . .24.5 percent of all suspensions were related to truancy and tardiness. . . . destruction of school property, criminal activity or use of drugs accounted for only 3 percent of suspensions (34;16).

Bell (4) noted that in the Dallas Independent School District during the 1971-72 school year approximately 72 percent of the aggregate total of suspensions were assessed in three categories: truancy, student assaults and class disruptions (4;66). The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) cataloged the most frequent reasons for suspension in a survey based on answers from 42 schools or districts in 24 states (39).

The most frequent reasons for suspensions in rank order were: . . .attendance problems (truancy, skipping, repeated tardiness). . . .smoking, non-violent acts disruptive of the

educational process. . . .violations of other school rules
assault, fighting or threat of injury. . . .drugs
 and alcohol, vandalism, theft or other destruction of
 property (39:15).

Clarke (14) analyzed some of the findings of the Orleans Parish Superintendent's Task Force on Suspension. Statistical information originated from a survey conducted in the Orleans Parish School System (Louisiana) (42). The study indicated that the highest percentages of indefinite suspensions resulted from general failure to adapt to school. This was manifested in continued disobedience, refusal to do work, etc., disruption of class or other school activity; disrespect, insolence, impudence, using obscene language; and chronic class cutting, truancy, or absence (14:32).

In August of 1976, the American Friends Service Committee (1) prepared a report which focused on suspension data in the Junior High/Middle and High Schools of Richland County School District #1 (South Carolina). Among the various reasons cited for short term suspensions in the high schools during the 1975-76 school year were non-violent acts which accounted for the overwhelming majority of suspensions.

. . . ."Cutting class" and "excessive tardies" accounted for 55% of the total number of suspensions. "Cutting class" resulted in 977 suspensions and "excessive tardies" resulted in 384 suspensions. . . . other major causes of suspensions reported were; "disruption"-342; "disrespect"-99; "fighting"-89; "assault"-55; "repeated violations"-49; "group activity"-10; "weapons"-6; and "truant"-4 (1:10).

An analysis of Junior High/Middle School Suspension data revealed considerable differences in the causes of suspension. Disruption accounted for 283 suspensions; cutting class-205; assault-204; repeated violations-131; fighting-99; excessive tardies-82; dis-

obedience-64; disrespect-63; starting fire in trash bin-11; leaving school without permission-9; drugs-4; and weapons-2 (1:13).

Legal ramifications of suspension. In recent years the courts have been called upon to decide educational issues emanating from the expulsion-suspension of school students. These cases invariably involve student rights as they apply to the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution (32:52). In general, the courts have defended the position that a student does not lose his fundamental rights of freedom of speech, dress, personal grooming, etc., upon entrance to school as long as these rights do not disrupt the educational process (32:52). The courts have also ruled that students must be afforded minimal due process in expulsion-suspension cases (32:64-65). More serious charges which evoke long-term suspension or expulsion require more extensive due process proceedings (32:65). In addition to these decisions, the courts have held that school board members no longer have absolute immunity (32:9). This section treats several cases involving the expulsion-suspension of students. The holdings cited typify the current trend of court decisions on the topic.

In two court decisions, *Goss v. Lopez* (26) and *Wood v. Strickland* (56) the U.S. Supreme Court spelled out due process as it applies to suspensions and expulsions of public school students. Neil (39:8-10) succinctly described each case and reported the decisions reached in both cases. *Goss v. Lopez* involved nine students who had been suspended from the Columbus, Ohio schools for alleged participation in illegal demonstrations (39:8). The students claimed that the Ohio statute under which they were suspended violated their rights provided by the

14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (39:8). The Ohio statute in question authorized suspensions to be conducted without any hearing or other procedures to determine their propriety (39:8). The Supreme Court decided in favor of the students ruling that the Ohio statute was unconstitutional and that student rights had been violated (39:8).

Gluckman (24) outlined the recommendations provided by the Supreme Court's decision in *Goss v. Lopez*.

. . . .The *Goss* decision requires before actual suspension. . . .oral or written notification of the nature of the violation and the intended punishment"discussion" with disciplinarian providing the pupil with an opportunity to tell his side of the storyif the student denies the violation, an explanation of the evidence of the violation upon which the disciplinarian is relying. . . . (24:7).

Buss (10) speculated on the educator's response to *Goss v. Lopez*. Buss asserted that some educators may pay only lip service to the decision; others may be intimidated by *Goss* requirements and begin to avoid discipline in order to avoid the jeopardy of non-compliance; still others may choose to ignore the decision out of ignorance or lawlessness or both (10:574-575). Buss favored the fourth foreseeable response in which the responsible official may objectively probe further into the situation through his own initiative or some additional proceeding (10:575).

Anson (2) suggested that the essence of *Goss* and *Wood* is a ". . . .demand upon the educator to act in a professionally competent manner, the same demand made of any professional who, because of expertise, has entrusted to him or her another person's self resources" (2:18).

Wood v. Strickland is a case which involved the expulsion of

three teenage girls from public school in Mean, Arkansas for approximately three months (39:9). Spiking the punch served as an extra-curricular event precipitating the expulsions. The students relied on the 14th Amendment in defense of their case. Two of the girls filed suit requesting reinstatement in school and punitive and compensatory damages from the members of the board of education (39:9). The court of appeals and the district court held conflicting views about the school board members' immunity. The Supreme Court decided by a 5-4 majority that school board members do not now have immunity (39:9).

. . . .A school board member is not immune from liability for damages if he knew or reasonably should have known that the action he took within his sphere of official responsibility would violate the constitutional rights of the student affected. . . . (39:9).

Gluckman (24) prescribed several steps educators might take to avoid financial liability.

. . . .Make and enforce any rule which appears to abridge civil rights only after careful consideration. If at all possible, get the advice of counsel. . . .If a rule or its enforcement appears to abridge a pupil's civil rights, be certain that it is necessary, reasonably related to the school's purposes, and administered without discrimination. . . .Set up fundamentally fair disciplinary procedures which meet the standards for suspensions and expulsions. . . .Make a reasonable attempt to keep up with court decisions governing student conduct in your jurisdiction (24:7).

Cole (15) reviewed several court cases having various implications for expulsions and long term suspension. As a result of his investigation, Cole commented that serious problems may evolve from the use of expulsion and long term suspension. A child who has been meted a long term suspension once rehabilitated no longer constitutes a threat to the school environment. However, the long term suspension deprives the

child from returning to school. If the courts consider education a fundamental right, then the continued denial of an education to students who would no longer cause the feared disruption is violative of the equal protection clause (15:330). Cole suggested that in situations where students assert that their behavior has changed and seek re-admittance, the student should be given a hearing; if the child demonstrates that he no longer poses a threat to the school then he should be readmitted (15:334).

Nolte (40) viewed the Tinker case as one of the most important *decisions by any court anywhere to affect education (40:49)*. The suspension of students for wearing arm bands in protest of the war in Vietnam was the incident that provoked the case. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that school officials acted unlawfully in preventing the students from wearing the arm bands. Based on First Amendment rights the Court concluded that a pupil's rights do not stop once he enters campus (32:52).

Hudgins (32) analyzed the court case *Graham v. Knutzen (27)* which concerned due process in suspension and expulsion. "The plaintiffs filed suit challenging the constitutionality of the suspension-expulsion procedures of the Omaha school district" (32:60). The court held that the suspension-expulsions did violate student rights provided by the Fourteenth Amendment (32:60). The court also directed that the school district adopt the following amendments to guarantee the right of due process to students and parents in suspension-expulsion cases:

. . . .The school district is to distribute to all students and parents its procedures for implementing and conducting suspension-expulsion hearings. . . .

. . . .In suspension-expulsion hearings, parents and students have the right to be represented by an attorney,

but not be a layman. . . .

. . . .Every effort shall be made to have a suspension-expulsion hearing within the time limits established by the suspension policy. . . .

. . . .Prior to the hearing, parents and students are to be notified of those persons having primary knowledge of the facts (32;61).

Summary. The review of literature in this first section focused on existing practices and various problems of school suspension. An exploration of these practices disclosed problems associated with the traditional system of suspension. At this point, some conclusions may be drawn which provide support for the study. First, it appears that suspension tends to affect a higher proportion of those students who experience indifference in the educational environment; and students who possess academic and emotional difficulties. Second, despite the limited and inconclusive research regarding the effects of suspension on student behavior, it is apparent that forced exclusion from school interrupts a child's educational process. Third, an overwhelming majority of students have been suspended from public school for non-dangerous offenses. Fourth, unilateral suspension practices have induced the courts into directing educators to amend school policies and procedures violative of student rights. These types of conclusions initiate questions challenging the accountability, integrity and competence of school officials. The significance of the challenge lies in the current search by school administrators for alternatives to suspension.

The second section of the review of related literature looks at how educators have responded to new demands and expectations.

In-School Suspension Programs and
Special Disciplinary Programs

This section of the review of literature is devoted to a study of various types of in-school suspension programs and special programs aimed at modifying student behavior. A study of these various behavior shaping strategies reveals that certain factors are frequently associated with the organization and success of the programs. A synthesis of the literature is used to provide a rational foundation for the study. It is used as well in the creation of an instrument used in the assessment of in-school suspension programs in Area 7 schools of Iowa.

The evergrowing problems resulting from the use of the traditional out-of-school suspension system have served as an impetus for the development of alternative approaches. Among these approaches, in-school suspension has been perceived as an educational innovation of sound educational merit. The organizational structure of in-school suspension programs is often such that students remain in an educational setting so that school and community resources can be utilized to treat students' problems. A descriptive review of some in-school suspension programs follows.

In-school suspension programs. A special program for suspended students from grades seven, eight, and nine at T. L. Hardin Junior High School, St. Charles, Missouri was reviewed by Borman (7). The in-school suspension program purported to provide punishment for students classified as discipline problems while concomitantly meeting their educational needs. The assistant principal supervised the total program; however, a full-time certified teacher managed the suspension room.

A set of rules was developed. Students were expected to observe these rules during time spent in the suspension center. Failure to comply with any one of the rules resulted in additional work assignments. Students' assignments were sent to the suspension center by the regular classroom teacher. Completion of all assignments in a satisfactory manner was required prior to student release. A conference with the parents of a suspended student was also mandated as a prerequisite for release from the suspension center. The length of in-school suspension varied from two, to five, to ten days. The program was organized into two parts. Students spent the first half of each day doing work assignments. This was followed by films, discussion and rap sessions with the assistant principal. In concluding, Borman asserted that the in-school suspension program at Hardin enhanced learning and discipline (7:36).

Harvey and Moosha (28) described an experimental in-school suspension program instituted in the Virginia Beach Public School System during the 1975-76 academic year. The project involved Bayside Junior High School and Bayside High School. The major purpose of the program was to develop an in-school suspension program as an alternative to the out-of-school suspension program. Evaluation of the program was designed to determine which method would be more effective in changing student behavior. A full-time certified teacher with the skills to diagnose specific behavioral problems and seek individual solutions coordinated the in-school suspension room. Teachers and parents participated in counseling sessions. The staff and students worked on values clarification and the development of problem solving skills. A specific set of rules were established to structure student behavior

in the in-school suspension room. Students were required to sign and fulfill a contingency contract before being returned to the regular classroom. A conference involving the student, the parent(s), the assistant principal and the in-school suspension coordinator constituted another prerequisite for release from the suspension room.

The results of this study permitted Harvey and Moosha to accept the hypothesis that in-school suspension was more effective than out-of-school suspension in changing student behavior. This effectiveness was reflected in a reduction in the number of students suspended in the two schools. Both schools experienced a substantial reduction in the total number of suspensions during the 1975-76 school year. "The total number of students suspended was reduced by approximately 42 percent at Bayside Junior High School and 29 percent at Bayside High School" (28:17). An even more dramatic change occurred with the number of repeat suspensions. "The number of students suspended four or more times was reduced by 94 percent at Bayside Junior High School and by 78 percent at Bayside High School" (28:17). Parental feedback served as an informal evaluation of the in-school suspension program. Every parent who came in for conference indicated their preference for the in-school suspension program to the out-of-school suspension system.

Kelly and Finley (19) discussed an alternative in-school suspension program implemented in the Smith-Cotton High School in Sedalia, Missouri. The program developed out of the belief that more personal attention, a cooling off period and an in-school suspension experience would benefit both the learning environment and the disruptive youngster. A certified teacher served as the "helping teacher" that worked with students who were assigned to the educational adjustment class (suspension

room) by the principal. Parents were contacted prior to the students' admittance to the in-school suspension room. The helping teacher immediately initiated the process of developing a positive attitude toward school and self. The helping teacher also cooperated with the regular classroom teacher so that students who were assigned to the suspension room continued to receive regular classroom assignments. The counseling staff provided guidance via the recommendation of the helping teacher. Kelly and Finley identified the helping teacher as the central element in achieving success in the program (19:9).

Patience, friendliness, firmness, understanding and considerable knowledge of delinquent behavior were characteristics that the authors felt the helping teacher should possess. The objectives of the educational adjustment program teacher included: (1) serving as a concerned listener to students with problems, (2) motivating and encouraging students to develop the ability to make appropriate decisions and accepting the consequences that follow, (3) helping develop self-realization and self-worth, (4) assisting students in the attainment of educational goals, and (5) encouraging students to utilize the school's support services (19:9). Follow-up and evaluation involved notification of parents, periodic checks with teachers and counselors, and continued personal contacts with students.

Qualitative data, collected after a two year period of operation, demonstrated the promise of in-school suspension as a program for keeping problem students in school. Two hundred and sixty-nine students had been referred to the program. One hundred seventy of these were one time referrals for a short period of time. There were ninety-nine cases of repeated referrals to the educational adjustment class.

Thirty-one out of the original 269 students were eventually classified as drop outs, two students graduated, twelve students moved to other communities and 224 were still enrolled at the writing of the article (19:9).

Meares and Kittle (33) contrasted the disadvantages of out-of-school suspension with the advantages of in-school suspension. The authors offered a list of alternatives to out-of-school suspension which had been developed and incorporated into the in-school suspension program at Urbana Junior High School, Fisher Campus, Illinois. The alternatives offered to students were designed so that (1) students continue to do regular class work assignments under the guidance of an experienced, certified teacher, (2) students may be removed from only those classes in which they are having severe difficulties, (3) students may be readmitted to classes from which they have been suspended at the discretion of the principal without a formal reinstatement with the parents present, and (4) students are made available for support services (33:63). Meares and Kittle concluded that in-school suspension was a pedagogical and legally sound method of improving student behavior (33:63).

O'Brien (41) discussed an in-school suspension program currently being practiced in four suburban schools in Minneapolis. The program was aimed at helping children develop maturity and responsibility for their behavior. Developed by a teacher in 1971 as an alternative to the at-home suspension program, the program was described as being three-fourths education and one-fourth punishment. It operated in such a way that students were confined to a room from two to five days at a time and deprived of many of the usual privileges. Students were

required to complete regular class assignments. A certified professional person with authority and support was assigned to deal with student problems. Rules of conduct were established to state the type of behavior expected in the suspension room. Activities were developed which provided for self-analysis. There was also close communication with parents. Although quantitative data was limited in terms of measuring the effectiveness of the program, it was found that during the last year, 23 out of 173 students were suspended a second time after their initial in-school suspension experience (41:36).

Mendez (38) described various methods of staffing and organizing an in-school suspension program. Given that programs differ as a result of school district philosophy and economic condition, Mendez suggested that a teacher may serve as a resource person for suspended students (38:13). The resource teacher's primary responsibility would be to help students with assignments that are prepared by the regular classroom teacher. A second objective for the suspension room teacher was to develop an individualized relationship as well as to foster a counseling relationship with students. Professional support personnel were also suggested for inclusion so that individual diagnosis, treatment, motivation and counseling could be provided to suspended students. Mendez indicated that an in-school suspension program must be designed to help enhance self-concept and stimulate motivation (38:13). Interaction with the parents of suspended students was considered an essential part of an in-school suspension program. In summary, Mendez asserted that an in-school suspension program provided a means for accountability to the community reflecting responsiveness rather than insensitivity in dealing with youth (38:13).

Neil (39) restated advice on in-school suspension programs which had been submitted by M. Hayes Mizell. Mizell proposed that in-school suspension programs, if they are to be effective must be based on the assumption that student misbehavior is a symptom of an underlying problem. These problems must be identified and worked upon (39:47). Faculty input during the initial developmental stages of an in-school suspension program was emphasized in order to gain support and understanding of the program. Affording students minimum due process, and allowing one person to screen student referrals to determine whether the program offered an appropriate solution for a student's problems, are guidelines that Mizell offered (39:47).

Provisions that should be made for students during suspension included instruction comparable to or superior to regular classwork, diagnosis of academic problems resulting from learning disabilities and inadequate previous preparation or lack of basic skills, and capacity to make needed curriculum and instructional adjustments to meet the needs of students with special problems. Mizell also suggested that the establishment of a process of follow-up and evaluation may focus on such questions as (1) Is the program reducing the number of out-of-school suspensions? (2) Is it helping to solve the problems of the referred students? (3) Is it aiding students and others to develop greater self-discipline? (39:48).

White (55) examined an in-school suspension program implemented at Knoxville Junior High School in 1974-75 (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania). The program operated out of a small room designated as the Learning Adjustment Center. Students had the option of spending their suspension in LAC or out of school. Students who elected to serve their

suspension in school signed a contract that was mailed to their parents with a suspension notice. The contract also stated the rules of the program. Typical behaviors such as verbal expression, movement and social interaction were restricted. A supervising teacher managed the in-school suspension center. Individualized instruction and remediation were instructional strategies utilized by the supervising teacher. Students failing to observe rules or contracts were required to finish their suspension at home. White observed much enthusiasm by parents in support of the in-school approach. Although recidivism had not yet been analyzed, White observed that the total suspension rate was down nearly fifty percent from the previous year (55,498).

Bostrom and Spencer (8) described an alternative educational program designed to modify the behavior of disruptive youngsters. The program, Self Achievement and Growth through Education (SAGE), was self-contained and housed in a center for handicapped persons in Edmonds, Washington. SAGE worked with students who were severely emotionally disabled. This grouping included those persons with social and emotional disorders and those whose behavior was disruptive as a result of frustrations arising from home or school.

The immediate objective of the program was to help students develop appropriate skills so that they could function in the regular academic setting. Increasing the self-worth of students and helping them make appropriate choices were also purposes of the program. Organizational components included: (1) isolation--students were removed from the regular class setting, (2) identification of maladaptive behaviors for which the child was referred, (3) power and support services to deal with a youngster's problem once it had been identified,

and (4) goal-setting, in which students and staff defined acceptable behaviors and made a plan to effect the desired behavioral change (8:60-61).

Students were not admitted to SAGE unless the teacher met with the child's parents. Bostrom and Spencer concluded by asserting that problem youngsters need administrators who are willing to find a place for them that is intent on truly meeting their needs; where teachers are prepared to offer appropriate alternatives for anger (8:61).

Special disciplinary programs. Stephens and Thomson (48) described various detention, intervention and prevention programs designed to change student behavior. The authors obtained their information from schools responding to NASSP's annual questionnaire on exemplary programs. One program described by Stephens and Thomson was the Wilde Lake High School in-school suspension program.

School officials at Wilde Lake High School, Columbus, Maryland had developed a special disciplinary program based on William Glasser's Reality Therapy. Stephens and Thomson reviewed the organizational structure of the program.

As an alternative to suspension Wilde Lake High School has developed a disciplinary system based on William Glasser's Reality Therapy. Teachers take responsibility for redirecting student misbehavior by conferring with the student immediately following a violation of school rules. Student violators are required to make an acceptable verbal or written plan for changing personal behavior. Failure to keep this commitment results in referral to a school planning room for a minimum of one day. There they must make specific written plans to change their behavior. The process is repeated as necessary. Students are sent home only when the rules of the planning room are not followed or when the health and welfare of other students are endangered.

The Reality Therapy disciplinary system places responsibility directly on students for improving un-

acceptable behavior. Wilde Lake reports that only a few students must return to the planning room once a plan is formulated and accepted by the teacher. Students appear to become more responsible for their behavior under this system, according to Principal John Jenkins (48:8).

Stephens and Thomson examined the components of a special disciplinary program at Spring Valley High School, Columbia, South Carolina. The program had been successful in reducing the number of student suspensions and expulsions by utilizing five specific strategies.

A parent conference request is used in lieu of suspension. Parents are expected to come to school with the student on the day following misbehavior to discuss the problems and to seek solutions.

Probation-suspension is given to students who ordinarily would be suspended but are not because their attitude is good.

A student supreme court rules on disciplinary actions appealed by students. If the court rules in support of the action the student is disciplined. If the student is judged innocent, the student receives no punishment. Also, the student supreme court may indicate guilt but recommend lenience by the administrator.

Group counseling is optional for students who are suspended for the first time. The student choosing this alternative to suspension is assigned to a group headed by a guidance counselor. The group meets one period per week for six weeks.

A "Time Out" program is designed to aid students who are having problems with the regular school curriculum. An individual program of study and therapy is designed for the student by an administrator, the parents, a regular teacher, school counselor, psychologist, and special teacher. Students work their way back into the regular program, but must remain in "Time Out" for a minimum of nine weeks (48:8-9).

Stephens and Thomson noted the major activities included in a special program, "Positive Alternatives to Suspension" (PASS). The program, developed in St. Petersburg, Florida focused on reducing the

number of students suspended from school and decreasing the number of students referred to administrative personnel as a result of unacceptable behavior. As outlined by Stephens and Thomson the major activities of the program included:

Establishing "time out" rooms managed by a trained teacher or paraprofessional who can listen to student problems. The listener aids students in forecasting consequences, exploring alternatives, and making decisions about future behavior.

Having a social worker and school psychologist provide individual and group consultation sessions in which teachers learn values clarification, transactional analysis, and reality therapy in an attempt to create a "caring" school that meets the needs of students.

Providing counseling in the form of a "school survival course" for students who have low self-concepts and experience frustration.

Providing counseling to parents, assisting them in the development of communication and problem-solving skills (48:12).

Stephens and Thomson also critiqued a program, Volunteer Teacher-Probation Officer (TPO), developed at Hughes High School in Cincinnati, Ohio. The program was designed to assist students who had become involved with the law and were under probation by Juvenile Court. "Each officer is required to provide close supervision of the probationee in order to improve school and class attendance, to develop constructive behavior, to build self-concept, and to help with academic efforts." (48:9)

Organizational components of TPO included:

Pretesting the probationee to determine attitudes and feelings.

Conferences with the probationee at school, at home, and in rap sessions with other probationees in the program, and with the juvenile court probation officer.

Establishing a relationship with the probationee through participation in out-of-school recreational and educational experiences.

Through grants to the school, jobs in the school are available to the probationee.

A complete file of written records is maintained, including the TFO's comments regarding all contact with the probationee.

At the option of the TFO, court appearances are made on behalf of the probationee.

At the end of the probation period each probationee is post-tested (48:9).

Summary. The literature cited in Section Two treated various in-school suspension programs and special disciplinary programs. Through studying the literature, this writer has deduced that certain elements have continuously appeared in the organizational structure of programs which experienced success. In addition, specific factors have been identified by program developers as being "essential" components. Those factors most frequently associated with the success of in-school suspension programs and perceived as being highly essential to the development of such programs and/or similar special disciplinary programs include: (1) a certified teacher to manage the in-school suspension center (7; 28; 19; 41; 38; 39; 47; 55; 48; 33), (2) goals and objectives (39;47; 7; 28; 19; 41; 38; 48:8; 23; 48:12), (3) parental involvement (7; 28; 19; 38; 55; 48:8-9; 48:12; 48:9; 8), (4) involvement of special service personnel and guidance personnel (28; 19; 33; 41; 38; 39;47; 48:8-9; 48:12; 8), (5) instructional assignments (7; 19; 33; 41; 38; 39;47), (6) behavioral contracts (55; 48:8; 8; 23; 28), (7) rules (7; 28; 19; 41; 55), (8) self-concept and self awareness development

(7; 28; 19; 41; 38; 48:8; 48:12; 48:9; 23; 8), (9) follow-up and evaluation (38:48; 28; 19; 41; 55; 58:9; 8), and (10) interest building activities (7; 19; 38; 48:9). Thus the assumption is made in this study that these frequently cited elements represent those factors needed to achieve success in an in-school suspension program.

Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Procedures

The junior high/middle schools and senior high schools located in Area 7 of Iowa served as the population for this investigation.* The expressed interest in and subsequent implementation of in-school suspension programs by school officials within these schools was the basis for inclusion of these particular schools in this study.

Initially, the writer sent a brief cover letter enclosed with a postcard questionnaire (Appendix A, pages 104, 105) to every principal in the population. The cover letter provided each principal with an abbreviated explanation of in-school suspension. The postcard was designed to aid in identifying schools that were currently utilizing in-school suspension programs; the number of years the programs had been in operation; and, to ascertain a convenient time in which principals would be willing to interview with the researcher in regard to their in-school suspension program. Returned questionnaires indicated that twenty-eight principals operated in-school suspension programs in various attendance centers.

In the Review of Related Literature section of the present study,

*In Iowa, the county educational unit has been replaced by the area system of organization. There are 15 such education regions in Iowa. These educational agencies provide support services and personnel to all schools within their respective boundaries.

this researcher identified ten criteria associated with the success of in-school suspension programs. These criteria established a rational basis for assessment of in-school suspension programs within the Iowa Area 7 population.

A panel of experts was then identified. A questionnaire was mailed to each expert. The questionnaire (Appendix A, page 107) requested each expert to respond by indicating his agreement or disagreement as to the "necessity for inclusion" of each variable in an in-school suspension program.

An analysis of the panel's responses provided a rank ordered hierarchy of the variables. In addition, the panel's responses added content validity to the ten criteria being studied.

The next phase of the procedures involved the development of two questionnaires and an interview form. The first questionnaire (Appendix A, page 118) was designed to determine the total number of students suspended before and after the implementation of an in-school suspension program. It was assumed that an analysis of this data would suggest the effectiveness of an in-school suspension program in reducing a school's total suspension cases. The second questionnaire (Appendix A, page 119) was designed to determine the total number of suspensions during the past three semesters in schools which did not operate in-school suspension programs. An analysis of this data provided the researcher with data which could be compared to schools with in-school suspension programs. An interview form (Appendix A, pages 112-117) was developed to assess the criteria, or organizational components, of in-school suspension programs. Operational definitions were assigned to each criterion prior to the field interviews.

Eleven questions appeared on the interview form. Response categories were developed for each item to facilitate efficient and reasonably accurate recording of interviewee responses. Each question was designed to measure the various components of each in-school suspension program in the population. The focus of each question is illustrated as follows:

- Question 1 - written goals, objectives or theoretical model included in the program.
- Question 2 (a) - the presence of a single certified teacher.
- Question 2 (b) - validation of teacher's designation as being a full-time certified in-school suspension supervisor.
- Question 3 - type of assignments that students are expected to complete in the in-school suspension center.
- Question 4 (a) - involvement of guidance personnel.
- Question 4 (b) - involvement of special support service personnel.
- Question 5 - degree of parental involvement.
- Question 6 (a) - interest building activities [response categories (a) and (b) or other responses given by interviewee].
- Question 6 (a) - self-concept and self-awareness development [response categories (a) and (b) or other responses given by interviewee].
- Question 6 (b) - utilization of behavioral contracts.
- Question 7 - rules guiding conduct within the in-school suspension center.
- Question 8 - a system of follow-up and evaluation utilized in assessment.

The researcher mailed a letter (Appendix A, page 108), a copy of the interview questions (Appendix A, page 109), and a tentative interview schedule (Appendix A, pages 110, 111) to principals with in-school

suspension programs prior to the interviews. This was done to enhance the effectiveness of the actual face to face interviews.

The researcher personally conducted all of the interviews. During the interview, the researcher asked the interviewee to present examples of the materials included in his in-school suspension program. At the conclusion of each interview, the researcher presented the interviewee with a suspension data form. Those principals who could readily respond to the information requested were asked to complete the suspension data form. Principals who could not respond with such data were asked to mail the suspension data questionnaire as soon as convenient.

The final phase of the study involved the mailing of suspension data forms to schools which did not operate in-school suspension programs.

Analysis of Data

The first section of the analysis was designed to give a description of in-school suspension programs which had been implemented by schools in Iowa Area 7. This descriptive examination illustrated the way principals responded in regard to the criteria, or organizational variables, included in their own particular in-school suspension programs. The number of principal responses indicating "yes" or "no" was recorded for each questionnaire item. An analysis of the responses given indicated the percentage of principals utilizing each of the various organizational variables in Iowa Area 7 in-school suspension programs.

The researcher operationally defined each criterion. As a result, principals were not given credit for certain organizational

variables which they stated were included in their in-school suspension programs. For example, a principal may have stated that students worked on academic assignments during their in-school suspension; however, no credit was given for this reply if students did not receive credit for the academic work completed. This is because, this researcher initially defined assignments as instructional activities for which credit is received.

The second section of the analysis focused on questionnaires that were mailed to the panel of experts. The purpose of the questionnaires was to determine which criteria were rated as being necessary for inclusion in an in-school suspension program. In addition, the experts' responses provided a rank ordered hierarchy of the criteria.

Each expert responded to the questionnaire items on a Likert scale. A numerical value was assigned to each response (1 point - strongly disagree, 2 points - disagree, 3 points - cannot say, 4 points - agree, 5 points - strongly agree). The number of points received by each criterion was then totaled. The rank of each criterion thus was determined by the mean score that each criterion received.

The objective of the third analysis was to determine how the experts' rank ordered hierarchy correlated with the frequency with which the criteria, or organizational variables, appeared in the organizational structure of in-school suspension programs in Iowa Area 7.

The Pearson product-moment correlation was used to measure this relationship. The .05 level was set as the level at which the correlation had significance.

The fourth section of the analysis examined the data obtained via Suspension Data Questionnaire I. This questionnaire was distributed to schools with in-school suspension programs. The questionnaire was designed to determine the number of suspensions occurring before the implementation of an in-school suspension program as compared to the number of suspensions occurring after the implementation of an in-school suspension program.

A t-test was used to determine whether any significant difference occurred in the reduction of suspension rates, one semester before in-school suspension as compared to one semester after in-school suspension. Effectiveness for reducing the rate of suspension was determined at the .10 level of significance.

The next step involved a more thorough examination of those schools with the appropriate "Before" and "After" data. These schools were isolated and studied to find out which organizational variables contributed to the success of in-school programs.

Attention was given to Suspension Data Questionnaire I (Part II, Grid #2) and Suspension Data Questionnaire II, in the fifth section of the Analysis of Data. Suspension Data Questionnaire I (Part II, Grid #2) determined the total number of suspensions reported by principals of schools with in-school suspension programs during the past three semesters. Suspension Data Questionnaire II obtained the same information as Questionnaire I from principals utilizing out-of-school suspension.

Enrollment figures for the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school years were secured from the Iowa Area 7 educational unit. The researcher collected enrollment figures for each attendance center in the population of the

study. These figures represented the number of students enrolled at each attendance center, as reported by school officials at the beginning of each school year.

Securing the enrollment figures enabled the researcher to analyze the enrollment-suspension patterns of students in schools responding to the survey during each of the past three semesters. The enrollment of each school was divided by the total number of reported cases of suspension for each school. This calculation yielded the ratio (enrollment-suspension ratio) of suspensions to students. The enrollment-suspension ratio was calculated for each semester that was studied.

The most recent three semesters included Fall 1975-76, Spring 1976, and Fall 1976-77. These three semesters were studied to determine whether trends existed in the suspension rates of schools in the Iowa Area 7 population. A t-test was utilized to determine whether significant differences occurred between any two semesters.

The next step involved separating the schools in the population into specific subdivisions. These subdivisions included: (1) the type of school--Senior high or Junior high as defined by school officials, (2) the size of school--Large or Small, and (3) schools with in-school suspension programs and schools without in-school suspension programs.

Attendance centers with 450 or more students were classified as large schools. Attendance centers with less than 450 students were classified as small schools. A large enrollment was defined as being greater than the arithmetic mean population score of all schools participating in the study.

The three subdivisions mentioned above were divided again into specific subgroups. T-tests were utilized to test the following paired-subdivisions and paired-subgroups at the .05 level of significance.

Large schools versus Small schools	proportion of suspensions proportion of suspensions	} Significant Difference
--	--	-----------------------------

Large Senior high and large Junior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Senior and Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension	proportion of suspensions proportion of suspensions	} Significant Difference
---	--	-----------------------------

Large Senior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Senior high schools with in-school suspension	proportion of suspensions proportion of suspensions	} Significant Difference
--	--	-----------------------------

Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension	proportion of suspensions proportion of suspensions	} Significant Difference
--	--	-----------------------------

Senior high schools with in-school suspension versus Junior high schools with in-school suspension	proportion of suspensions proportion of suspensions	} Significant Difference
--	--	-----------------------------

Schools with in-school suspension versus Schools without in-school suspension	proportion of suspensions proportion of suspensions	} Significant Difference
---	--	-----------------------------

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The first section presented in this chapter treats the interviewees' responses to the eleven questionnaire items. To simplify interpretation, the researcher presented this analysis of data in table format. Table 1 (pages 53-57) illustrates (1) the rank order of the most frequent responses given by the interviewees, (2) the total number of persons responding to each item, (3) the frequency with which the interviewees gave a specific response, and (4) the percentage of the responses included in the table.

A specific response had to be stated at least three times by different interviewees to be included in the Most Frequent Responses column. The number (three) was used as a cutoff point because responses stated at least one or two times by the interviewees were too numerous.

Question 1 focused on the assessment of written goals and objectives that were included in the various in-school suspension programs of the schools located in Area 7 of Iowa. Twenty-two of the 26 respondents indicated that they did not have a written set of goals and objectives for their in-school suspension programs, while 4 indicated that goals and objectives had been developed. In terms of percentages, 85 percent of the respondents indicated that they did not have a written set of goals and objectives; 15 percent indicated that such goals had been developed.

Question 2(a) assessed whether a single certified teacher managed the in-school suspension center. Thirteen of the 26 respondents indicated that the principal or the assistant principal managed the in-school suspension center. Three of the respondents indicated that the principal or the assistant principal managed the in-school suspension center along with aid of a secretary. Three of the respondents indicated that several teachers managed the in-school suspension center. In terms of percentages, 50 percent of the respondents indicated that the principal or the assistant principal managed the in-school suspension center; 11 percent of the respondents indicated that the principal or the assistant managed the in-school suspension center along with the aid of a secretary; and 11 percent of the respondents indicated that several teachers managed the in-school suspension center.

Other responses given to question 2(a) included:

1. A single certified teacher manages the in-school suspension center.
2. Principal or the assistant principal manages the in-school suspension center along with the aid of a counselor.
3. A full-time study hall monitor manages the in-school suspension center.

Question 2(b) was designed to assess those responsibilities of the in-school suspension supervisor which occurred outside the in-school suspension center. Fifteen of the 26 respondents indicated that they had dual responsibility for supervising the in-school suspension center and classroom instruction. In terms of percentages, 58 percent of the respondents indicated that they had dual responsibility for supervising the in-school suspension center and normal administrative duties, 11 percent of the respondents indicated that the in-school

suspension supervisor had dual responsibility for supervising the in-school suspension center and classroom instruction.

Other responses given to question 2(b) included:

1. The primary responsibility of the in-school suspension supervisor is management of the in-school program.
2. Dual responsibility for supervising the in-school suspension center and counseling duties.

Question 3 focused on the type of assignments that students were expected to complete within the in-school suspension center. Nineteen of the 26 respondents indicated that students were expected to complete regular classroom assignments. Four respondents indicated that students were expected to complete some type of academic work not necessarily considered regular classroom work. In terms of percentages, 73 percent of the respondents indicated that students were expected to complete regular classroom assignments, 15 percent of the respondents indicated that students were expected to do some other type of academic work.

Other responses given to question 3 included:

1. Students are expected to do non-instructional tasks.
2. Students are not expected to do anything.

Question 4(a) assessed the type of guidance personnel involved with students assigned to the in-school suspension center. Seven of the 26 respondents indicated that school counselors worked with students assigned to the in-school suspension center. Six respondents indicated that no guidance personnel worked directly with students assigned to the in-school suspension center, and 4 respondents indicated that guidance personnel were involved only to the extent of being notified. In terms of percentages, 27 percent of the respondents indicated that

school counselors worked with students assigned to the in-school suspension center, 23 percent of the respondents indicated that no guidance personnel worked directly with students assigned to the in-school suspension center, 15 percent of the respondents indicated that guidance personnel were involved only to the extent of being notified.

Other responses given to question 4(a) included:

1. In-school suspension supervisor provides counseling.
2. Guidance personnel involved only when a situation warrants their expertise.
3. Principal serves as a counselor to students assigned to the in-school suspension center.

Question 4(b) assessed the various outside agencies contacted in order to solve the problems of students assigned to the in-school suspension center. Seven of the 26 respondents indicated that area education agency specialists would be contacted in order to solve students' problems. Five of the respondents indicated that area education agency specialists along with social service personnel would be contacted in order to solve students' problems. Four of the respondents indicated that area education specialists along with municipal and county probation and social service personnel would be contacted in order to solve students' problems. In terms of percentages, 27 percent of the respondents indicated that area education agency specialists would be contacted in order to solve students' problems, 19 percent of the respondents indicated that area education agency specialists along with social service personnel would be contacted in order to solve students' problems, 15 percent of the respondents indicated that area education agency specialists along with municipal and county and social service personnel would be contacted in order to solve students' problems.

Other responses given to question 4(b) included:

1. Truant officer is contacted.
2. No outside agencies are contacted.

Question 5 assessed the extent of parental involvement once a student had been assigned to the in-school suspension center. Ten of the 26 respondents indicated that parents were notified as required by school policy. Five of the respondents indicated that parents were notified as required by school policy and required to come to school before a student was readmitted to his regular class. Four of the respondents indicated that parents were notified as required by school policy and were also asked to come to school for conference. In terms of percentages, 38 percent of the respondents indicated that parents were notified as required by school policy, 19 percent of the respondents indicated that parents were notified as required by school policy and also required to come to school before their child was returned to class, 15 percent of the respondents indicated that parents were notified as required by school policy and also asked to come to school for conference.

Other responses given to question 5 included:

1. Parents are required to come to school before students are assigned to the in-school suspension center.
2. There is little parental involvement unless a student is a chronic disrupter.
3. Parents must sign students' behavior contracts.

Question 6(a) assessed the types of activities designed for self-concept and self-awareness development. Fourteen of the 26 respondents indicated that no specific plan had been developed to build self-concept or self-awareness of students assigned to the in-school suspension

center. Four of the respondents indicated that a general program of self-concept development had already been developed in the school. Three of the respondents indicated that group counseling sessions had been developed to enhance the self-concept of students assigned to the in-school suspension center. In terms of percentages, 54 percent of the respondents indicated that no specific plan had been developed to build self-concept or self-awareness of students assigned to the in-school suspension center, 15 percent of the respondents indicated that a general program of self-concept and self-awareness building had been developed in the school, 11 percent of the respondents indicated that group counseling sessions had been developed to enhance the self-concept and self-awareness of students assigned to the in-school suspension center.

Other responses given to question 6(a) included:

1. Principal works with students individually.
2. Counseling sessions are held after students are released from the in-school suspension center.
3. No activities are encouraged to build self-concept and self-awareness of students assigned to the in-school suspension center.

Question 6(b) assessed the type of behavior contracts students were required to make in order to improve their behavior. Twelve of the 26 respondents indicated that no attempt was made to have students make contracts. Four of the respondents indicated that students were given form contracts to complete. Four of the respondents indicated that students were required to make verbal agreements intended to improve their behavior. In terms of percentages, 46 percent of the respondents indicated that no attempt was made to have students make contracts,

15 percent of the respondents indicated that students were given specific form contracts to complete, 15 percent of the respondents indicated that students were required to make verbal agreements intended to improve their behavior.

Other responses given to question 6(b) included:

1. Students are given informal individualized hand written contracts.
2. Contracts are made between students and classroom teachers.

Question 7 assessed whether rules had been written to guide student behavior in the in-school suspension center. Twenty of the 26 respondents indicated that no rules had been written to guide student behavior in the in-school suspension center. In terms of percentages, 78 percent of the respondents indicated that no rules had been written to guide student behavior within the in-school suspension center.

Other responses given to question 7 included:

1. Rules have been written and posted in the in-school suspension center.
2. Rules are on tape and students are required to listen to the rules upon entrance into the in-school suspension program.
3. Rules are written and presented to students upon their entrance into the in-school suspension center.

Question 8 assessed whether a system of follow-up and evaluation had been devised to assess the in-school suspension program. Thirteen of the 26 respondents indicated that observation of repeat suspensions and/or professional judgement was used to evaluate the in-school suspension program. Three of the respondents indicated that counselors and/or the in-school suspension supervisor did follow-up on students after their release from the in-school suspension center. Three of the

respondents indicated that no formal system of follow-up and evaluation had been devised to assess the in-school suspension center. In terms of percentages, 50 percent of the respondents indicated that observation of repeat suspensions and/or professional judgement was used to evaluate the in-school suspension center, 11 percent of the respondents indicated that counselors and/or the in-school suspension supervisor did follow-up on students after their release from the in-school suspension center, 11 percent of the respondents indicated that no formal system of follow-up and evaluation had been devised.

Other responses given to question 8 included:

1. Interviews and discussions with teachers.
2. Students are given questionnaires which are designed to assess attitudinal change.
3. Analysis of suspension data such as the reduction in the total number of suspensions, a decrease in the number of drop outs and a decrease in absenteeism.
4. A review of individual case studies.

Table 1
 Analysis of Interviewee Responses
 To Questionnaire Items

Question	Rank Order of Most Frequent Responses	Total Number of Respondents	Frequency of Response	Percentage	
1	Does your in-school suspension program have a written set of goals and objectives upon which the in-school suspension center is established?	(1) No, we do not have a written set of goals and objectives	26	22	85%
		(2) Yes, we do have a written set of goals and objectives	"	4	15%

2 (a)	Is there a single certified teacher managing the in-school suspension center?	(1) No, principal or assistant principal manages the in-school suspension center	26	13	50%
		(2) COMBINATION* Principal or assistant principal manages the in-school suspension center & Secretary aids in managing the program	"	3	11%
		(3) No, several teachers manage the in-school suspension program	"	3	11%

Table 1 (Continued)

Question		Rank Order of Most Frequent Responses	Total Number of Respondents	Frequency of Response	Percentage
2 (b)	What responsibilities does the in-school suspension supervisor have other than supervision of the in-school suspension center?	(1) Dual responsibility, in-school suspension and normal administrative responsibility	26	15	58%
		(2) Dual responsibility, in-school suspension and classroom instruction	"	3	11%

3	What type of assignments are students expected to complete while they are assigned to the in-school suspension center?	(1) Students are expected to complete regular classroom assignments	26	19	73%
		(2) Students are expected to complete some type of academic work	"	4	15%

4 (a)	What type of guidance personnel are involved with students assigned to the in-school suspension center?	(1) School counselors work with the students	26	7	27%
		(2) No guidance personnel work directly with students	"	6	23%

Table 1 (Continued)

Question	Rank Order of Most Frequent Responses	Total Number of Respondents	Frequency of Response	Percentage
	(3) Guidance personnel involved only to the point of being notified	26	4	15%

4 (b)	What outside agencies are contacted in an effort to solve the problems of a child who has been assigned to the in-school suspension center?	(1) 26	7	27%
	(2) COMBINATION* Area education agency specialist & Social service agencies	"	5	19%
	(3) COMBINATION* Area education agency specialist & Municipal and county probation personnel & Social service agencies	"	4	15%

5	To what extent are a child's parents involved once the child has been assigned to the in-school suspension center?	(1) Notification as required by school policy	10	38%

Table 1 (Continued)

Question	Rank Order of Most Frequent Responses	Total Number of Respondents	Frequency of Response	Percentage
	(2) COMBINATION* Notification as required by school policy & Parents are required to come to school before student is readmitted to class	26	5	19%
	(3) COMBINATION* Notification as required by school policy & Parents are asked in for conference	"	4	15%
6 (a)	What type of activities are encouraged to build self-concept and self-awareness of students assigned to the in-school suspension center?	26	14	54%
	(1) No specific plan to build self-concept is included	26	14	54%
	(2) General program of self-concept building in school	"	4	15%
	(3) Group therapy or counseling sessions	"	3	11%

Table 1 (Continued)

Question	Rank Order of Most Frequent Responses	Total Number of Respondents	Frequency of Response	Percentage	
6 (b)	What type of contract are students required to make in an effort to improve their behavior?	(1) No attempt is made to have students make a contract	26	12	46%
		(2) Form contracts--students are given a specific form to complete	"	4	15%
		(3) Informal verbal agreements	"	4	15%
7	What rules have been written to guide student conduct within the in-school suspension center?	(1) No rules have been written	26	20	78%
8	What system of follow-up and evaluation has been devised to assess the in-school suspension program?	(1) Observation of re-occurrences and professional judgement	26	13	50%
		(2) Counselors or in-school suspension supervisor does follow-up on students after they are released from the suspension center	"	3	11%
		(3) No formal system of follow-up and evaluation has been devised	"	3	11%

Table 2 (pages 60-61) examines the frequency of occurrence for the ten in-school suspension criteria. A dichotomous "Yes" or "No" format is used.

The interviewees were given credit for having a particular criterion included in their own in-school suspension programs, if their responses met the operational definition requirement (see pages 9-11).

Criterion one focused on written goals and objectives. Written goals and objectives existed in 15 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Eighty-five percent of the in-school suspension programs did not have a written set of goals and objectives.

Criterion two focused on the inclusion of a single certified teacher to manage the in-school suspension center. A single certified teacher was present in 8 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Ninety-two percent of the in-school suspension programs did not have a single certified teacher.

Criterion three focused on instructional assignments (for which credit was received) that students were expected to complete while assigned to the in-school suspension center. Instructional assignments for which credit was received existed in 61 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Thirty-one percent of the in-school suspension programs did not have instructional assignments for which credit was received.

Criterion four focused on the involvement of guidance personnel while students were assigned to the in-school suspension center. Guidance personnel were involved in 39 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Sixty-one percent of the in-school programs did not have guidance personnel involved while students were assigned to the in-school

suspension center.

Criterion five focused on the involvement of parents while students were assigned to the in-school suspension center. Parents were involved in 77 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Twenty-three percent of the in-school suspension programs did not have parents involved while students were assigned to the in-school suspension center.

Criterion six focused on development of self-concept and self-awareness building activities. Self-concept and self-awareness building activities had been developed in 11 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Eighty-nine percent of the in-school suspension programs did not have self-concept and self-awareness building activities for students assigned to the in-school suspension center.

Criterion seven focused on the development of interest building activities. Interest building activities had been developed in 4 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Ninety-six percent of the in-school suspension programs did not have interest building activities for students assigned to the in-school suspension center.

Criterion eight focused on the use of behavior contracts. Behavior contracts were utilized in 27 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Seventy-three percent of the in-school suspension programs did not have behavior contracts for students assigned to the in-school suspension center.

Criterion nine focused on the development of written rules. A list of written rules existed in 19 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Eighty-one percent of the in-school suspension programs did not have a list of written rules to guide student behavior within the in-school suspension center.

Table 2

Analysis of Interviewee Responses to Questionnaire
Items Categorized by Operational Definitions
Into Ten Organizational Variables

Cri- teria	Question	Number of Responses and Percent YES		Number of Responses and Percent NO		Total Number of Responses
1	Does your in-school sus- pension program have a <u>*written set of goals and objectives</u> upon which the in-school suspension center is established?	4	15%	22	85%	26
2	<u>*Is there a single certi- fied teacher managing the in-school suspension center?</u>	2	8%	24	92%	"
3	<u>*(Credit must be given)</u> What type of assignments are students expected to complete while they are assigned to the in-school suspension center?	16	61%	10	39%	"
4	<u>*(Guidance personnel are involved)</u> What type of <u>guidance personnel are involved</u> with students assigned to the in-school suspen- sion center?	10	39%	16	61%	"
5	<u>*(Parental involvement)</u> To what extent are a child's <u>parents involved</u> once the child has been assigned to the in-school suspension center?	20	77%	6	23%	"
6	<u>*(Self-concept and self- awareness development)</u> What types of <u>activities</u> are encouraged <u>to build self-concept and self- awareness</u> of students assigned to the in-school suspension center?	3	11%	23	89%	"

Table 2 (Continued)

Criteria	Question	Number of Responses and Percent YES		Number of Responses and Percent NO		Total Number of Responses
7	* <u>(Interest building activities)</u> What types of activities are encouraged to build self-concept and self-awareness of students (Response categories c, d, e, or other)	1	4%	25	96%	26
8	* <u>(Behavior contracts)</u> What type of <u>contract</u> are students required to make in an effort to <u>improve their behavior</u> ?	7	27%	19	73%	"
9	* <u>(Written rules)</u> What <u>rules</u> have been written to <u>guide student conduct</u> within the in-school suspension center?	5	19%	21	81%	"
10	* <u>(Follow-up and evaluation)</u> What system of <u>follow-up and evaluation</u> has been devised to <u>assess the in-school suspension center</u> ?	7	27%	19	73%	"

Criterion ten focused on the development of a system of follow-up and evaluation. A system of follow-up and evaluation had been devised in 27 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Seventy-three percent of the in-school suspension programs did not have a system of follow-up and evaluation.

The second section of analysis examined the questionnaires that were mailed to the panel of experts for their ranking in terms of appropriateness in being included in an in-school suspension program. A rank ordered hierarchy of the ten criteria was provided by computing the total number of points each variable received and by dividing this number by ten (the number of experts). A mean score for each variable resulted from this calculation.

Table 3 on page 63 illustrates the panel of experts' responses to the ten criteria. A Likert scale was used to measure the experts' responses (see page 41). Table 3 also illustrates (1) the total number of points each criterion received, (2) the mean score each criterion received and (3) the standard deviation.

An abbreviated version of Table 3 is featured below as follows:

CRITERIA	MEAN	RANK
Parental Involvement	4.80	1
Follow-up and Evaluation	4.60	2
Behavior Contracts	4.60	3
Written Rules	4.50	4
Self-Concept Development	4.40	5
Written Goals and Objectives	4.30	6
Involvement of Guidance Personnel	4.20	7
Instructional Assignments	4.10	8
Interest Building Activities	3.90	9
A Single Certified Teacher	3.40	10

Table 3

Panel of Experts' Responses to the
Ten Organizational Variables

Panel of Experts	Criteria									
	Written Goals & Objec- tives	Single Certified Teacher	Instruc- tional Assign- ments	Involvement of Guidance Personnel	Parental Involve- ment	Follow-up and Evaluation	Behavior Contract	Written Rules	Self Concept Develop- ment	Interest Building Activities
1	4	3	2	4	5	5	4	3	4	4
2	4	2	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	2
3	3	4	5	3	4	5	5	5	4	5
4	5	2	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
5	4	3	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	3
6	4	1	2	4	4	4	4	5	4	2
7	5	4	4	3	5	4	5	4	5	4
8	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5
9	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
10	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4
Total	43	34	41	42	48	46	46	45	44	39
Mean	4.30	3.40	4.10	4.20	4.80	4.60	4.60	4.50	4.40	3.90
S.D.	.67	1.42	1.19	.78	.42	.51	.51	.70	.51	1.19

As illustrated above, Parental Involvement received a mean score of 4.80 and was ranked number one. Follow-up and Evaluation received a score of 4.60 and was ranked number two. Behavior Contracts also received a mean score of 4.60 and was ranked number three. Written Rules received a mean score of 4.50 and was ranked number four. Self-Concept Development received a mean score of 4.40 and was ranked number five. Written Goals and Objectives received a mean score of 4.30 and was ranked number six. Involvement of Guidance Personnel received a mean score of 4.20 and was ranked number seven. Instructional Assignments received a mean score of 4.10 and was ranked eight. Interest Building Activities received a mean score of 3.90 and was number nine. A Single Certified Teacher received a mean score of 3.40 and was ranked number ten.

The University of Northern Iowa Academic Computing Service was utilized to compute all of the statistical tests that appear in the next three sections of analysis.

The objective of the third section of analysis was to determine whether a correlation existed between the opinions of the experts and the frequency with which the organizational variables were practiced in the schools. (See Appendix B for a complete listing of the organizational variables practiced by each school.)

The Pearson product-moment correlation technique was used to test the frequency of variables practiced in the schools with the opinions of the experts. The raw data used to compute the correlation coefficient and the significance level of the correlation are listed on the following page. A confidence level of .05 was set as the level

at which the correlation had significance.

The coefficient yielded by the Pearson technique was .4683. Statistically the correlation was not significant at the .05 level. This means that the organizational criteria as practiced in schools with in-school suspension programs did not correlate well with the rank ordered hierarchy provided by the panel of experts' responses.

Table 4

Criteria and Data Used to Compute the Correlation of
Organizational Variables Practiced in Schools
with the Opinions of Experts

Criteria	Frequency of Use	Total Number of Points Given by Experts
1. Written Goals and Objectives	4	43
2. A Single Certified Teacher	2	34
3. Instructional Assignments	16	41
4. Involvement of Guidance Personnel	10	42
5. Parental Involvement	20	48
6. Follow-up and Evaluation	7	46
7. Behavior Contracts	7	46
8. Written Rules	5	45
9. Self-Concept Development	3	44
10. Interest Building Activities	1	39

Correlation Coefficient = 0.4683

Correlation significant at the .09 level

The fourth section of analysis treated the data obtained via Suspension Data Questionnaire I. This questionnaire was designed to determine the number of suspensions occurring before the implementation of an in-school suspension program, as compared to the number of suspensions occurring after the implementation of an in-school suspension program.

Only 11 of the 26 schools with in-school suspension programs possessed the appropriate "Before" and "After" data needed to make the comparison. The in-school suspension programs existing in the remaining 15 schools had been in operation for several or more years and "Before" in-school suspension data was unavailable. Therefore, principals of these schools could not provide the suspension data needed to compute the difference between the number of suspensions occurring one semester before and one semester after the implementation of an in-school suspension program.

Factors such as changes in administration (respondents first or second year as principal) and unwritten records of previous suspension cases were also reasons why some principals could not give the requested "Before" and "After" in-school suspension data. As a result, the researcher asked principals to provide the number of suspensions that had occurred during the most recent past three semesters. This data permitted an analysis of the on-going (semester to semester) suspension rates of schools with in-school suspension programs.

The eleven schools which did possess the appropriate "Before" and "After" in-school suspension data were listed and enrollment-suspension ratios (ESRATIOS) were computed for them. This ratio was derived by dividing the semester enrollment by the number of suspensions

occurring in that semester. The differences between semesters were computed to show the change in the enrollment suspension ratio for the total group. A t-test was applied to test whether the difference obtained had significance. The significance level set for this comparison was .10.

Table 4 shows that the difference between the two means was not significant at the .10 level. Thus, the number of suspensions occurring before the implementation of an in-school suspension program did not differ significantly from the number of suspensions occurring after the implementation of an in-school suspension program.

Table 5

A Comparison of the Number of Suspensions Occurring
"Before" and "After" the Implementation of an
In-School Suspension Program

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Before In-school suspension	11	80.7273	132.749	-0.91	0.386
After In-school suspension	11	125.2727	181.570		

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios of suspensions significant at the .39 level.

There was, however, an observable improvement in the suspension ratio from Semester Two (Before in-school suspension) to Semester Three (After in-school suspension).

Percentage-of-increase or decrease was computed from enrollment-suspension ratios. This was done by subtracting the second semester enrollment-suspension ratio (ESRATIO) from the third and last semester

suspension ratio. This computation yielded the difference (ESRDIFF) between semesters Two and Three. Secondly, these enrollment-suspension-ratio-differences (ESRDIFF) were divided by the enrollment-suspension-ratio (ESRATIO) for semester Two. The quotient that resulted from each computation was then multiplied by one hundred in order to obtain the enrollment-suspension-ratio percentage of the eleven schools possessing the appropriate "Before" and "After" in-school suspension data. Thus:

$$\text{ESRATIO 3} - \text{ESRATIO 2} = \text{ESRDIFF}$$

$$\frac{\text{ESRDIFF}}{\text{ESRATIO 2}} \times 100 = \text{ESRPCT}$$

The list below illustrates the various increases and decreases in the Suspension/Ratio Percentage of the eleven schools possessing the appropriate "Before" and "After" in-school suspension data.

CASE NUMBER	SUSPENSION/RATIO DIFFERENCE	SUSPENSION/RATIO PERCENTAGE
1	-106.	-49%
2	139.	273%
3	-47.	-46%
4	27.	36%
5	67.	439%
6	33.	200%
7	-0.	-13%
8	-0.	-12%
9	2.	61%
10	-6.	-56%
11	14.	53%

GROUP MEAN = 85%

As illustrated above, six schools experienced percentage increases and five schools experienced percentage decreases in the Suspension/Ratio Percentage.

The second major hypothesis of this study was also treated in the fourth section of analysis. Hypothesis Two was stated as, "There is no relationship between the specific organizational variables included in an in-school suspension program and the subsequent number of observed suspensions.

A multiple regression technique was the statistical method applied to the second hypothesis. In addition to measuring the relationship between several variables, multiple regression has also been used for multiple prediction. Stated broadly, the purpose of multiple prediction is the estimation of a variable Y , the dependent variable, from a linear combination of n independent variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n (22:186).

An attempt to estimate the effect that one variable has on another variable (causation) is sometimes termed univariate estimation or prediction because there is only one "predictor variable" (22:187). A multivariate prediction of the Y variable given scores on n independent variables, is an estimation of the effect that each independent variable has on the dependent variable Y .

The Pearson product-moment correlation between Y and \hat{Y} is a measure of how well the "best" linear weighting of the independent variables X_1, \dots, X_n predicts or correlates with the single dependent variable Y (22:186).

An example of a multiple prediction or multiple regression equation is illustrated below as

$$\hat{Y} = b_0 + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \dots, b_n X_n.$$

In the present study, the Y dependent variable was the difference in the number of suspensions occurring between Semester Two (Before in-school suspension) and Semester Three (After in-school suspension). The

independent variables $X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_n$, were the ten criteria. An illustration of a simple equation that can be formed from the data of this study can be represented as

$$\hat{Y} \text{ (Difference of suspensions)} = b_0 + b_1 \text{ written goals}_1 + b_2 \text{ single certified teacher}_2 + \dots \\ \text{Semester Two--Semester Three} \quad \dots b_{10} \text{ interest building} \\ \text{activities}_{10}.$$

Generally speaking, regression appropriately applied should have 30 cases or more for each independent variable. The present study involved ten such independent variables. Consequently a sample size of 300 or more would have been desirable in order to make valid inferences and/or generalizations. Only eleven schools, however, contained the appropriate "Before" and "After" in-school suspension data. As a result, the sample size for this particular analysis was 11. This small sample size, while providing possible clues, precluded the possibility of making a statistically sound analysis of the second hypothesis.

The fifth section of analysis focused on Suspension Data Questionnaire I (Part II, Grid #2) and Suspension Data Questionnaire II. Both of these questionnaires gathered suspension data for the most recent three semesters. The three semesters included Fall 1975-76, Spring 1976, and Fall 1976-77. These three semesters were studied to determine whether trends existed in the suspension rates of schools in the Iowa Area 7 population. A t-test was utilized to test the comparisons between individual semesters. The .05 level was set as confidence level at which a comparison had significance.

Table 6 illustrates three pairwise comparisons of the enrollment-

suspension ratios of all schools between the Fall 1975-76 semester (one) and the Spring 1976 semester (two). The other two comparisons were not significant at the .05 level.

Table 6 also shows that the ratio of suspensions to students had improved gradually over the past three semesters for the group of schools studied. During the Fall semester of 1975-76, administrators of schools responding to the survey meted out one suspension per 46 students. However, during the Spring semester of 1976, administrators of these same schools issued one suspension per 76 students. There was no difference in the ratio of suspensions per students between the Spring 1976 semester and the Fall 1976-77 semester.

Table 6

Three Pair-Wise Comparisons of the Enrollment-Suspension Ratios (ESRATIOS) of Schools which Responded to Suspension Data Questionnaires

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Fall 1975-76 semester	40	45.8964	-2.17	0.036*
Spring 1976 semester	40	75.4919		
Fall 1975-76 semester	40	45.8964	-1.73	0.092
Fall 1976-77 semester	40	75.4055		
Fall 1975-76 semester	40	75.4919	0.00	0.996
Spring 1976 semester	40	75.4055		

Next, all of the schools were separated into three major subdivisions (Large/Small, Senior high/Junior high and schools With/Without

in-school suspension). These subdivisions were divided again into subgroups. T-tests were then utilized to test selected matched pairs. The following groups of matched pairs were tested in the study: (1) Large schools versus Small schools, (2) Large Senior and Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Senior and Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension, (3) Large Senior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Senior high schools with in-school suspension, (4) Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension, (5) Senior high schools with in-school suspension versus Junior high schools with in-school suspension, and (6) Schools with in-school suspension versus Schools without in-school suspension. Each of these matched pairs was tested over three semesters: Fall 1975-76, Spring 1976 and Fall 1976-77.

Table 7 illustrates three comparisons of Large schools versus Small schools. The difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios of Large schools versus Small schools was significant at the .05 level only during the Spring 1976 semester. This was the semester prior to the initiation of in-school suspension programs by the eleven schools previously mentioned.

Large Schools versus Small Schools

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall 1975-76 semester was significant at the .07 level.

*Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Spring 1976 semester was significant at the .02 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall 1976-77 semester was significant at the .65 level.

Table 7

A Comparison of Enrollment-Suspension Ratios
(ESRATIOS) of Large Schools
Versus Small Schools

Semester	Matched Pair	Number of Cases	Mean	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Fall 1975-76	Large schools	13	28.045	-1.47	0.070
	versus Small schools	27	54.491		
Spring 1976	Large schools	13	37.1566	-2.43	0.020*
	versus Small schools	27	93.9497		
Fall 1976-77	Large schools	13	88.2478	0.46	0.646
	versus Small schools	27	69.2222		

Table 8 shows three comparisons of Large Senior high and Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Senior high and Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension. The difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios of Large Senior high and Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Senior high and Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension was significant at the .05 level only during the Spring 1976 semester.

Large Senior high and Large Junior high
Schools with in-school suspension
Versus
Small Senior high and Small Junior high
Schools with in-school suspension

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall 1975-76 semester was significant at the .08 level.

*Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Spring 1976 semester was significant at the .03 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall 1976-77 semester was significant at the .60 level.

Table 8

A Comparison of the Enrollment-Suspension Ratios
of Large Senior High and Large Junior High
Schools with In-School Suspension Versus
Small Senior High and Small Junior High
Schools with In-School Suspension

Semester	Matched Pair	Number of Cases	Mean	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Fall 1975-76	Large Senior high and Large Junior high with in-school suspension	8	25.7234	-1.85	0.078
	versus Small Senior high and Small Junior high with in-school suspension	16	62.5982		
Spring 1976	Large Senior high and Large Junior high with in-school suspension	8	27.8982	-2.27	0.034
	versus Small Senior high and Small Junior high with in-school suspension	16	92.1001		
Fall 1976-77	Large Senior high and Large Junior high with in-school suspension	8	53.6869	-0.54	0.599
	versus Small Senior high and Small Junior high with in-school suspension	16	70.3923		

Table 9 shows three comparisons of Large Senior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Senior high schools with in-school suspension. Table 9 also shows that the differences in the enrollment-suspension ratios of Large Senior high schools with in-school

suspension were not significant at the .05 level during any of the three semesters.

Table 9

A Comparison of the Enrollment-Suspension Ratios
of Large Senior High Schools With In-School
Suspension Versus Small Senior High
Schools With In-School Suspension

Semester	Matched Pair	Number of Cases	Mean	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Fall 1975-76	Large Senior high schools with in- school suspension	4	18.5928	-2.07	0.056
	versus Small Senior high schools with in- school suspension	13	53.6080		
Spring 1976	Large Senior high schools with in- school suspension	4	23.1612	-1.82	0.090
	versus Small Senior high schools with in- school suspension	13	79.9308		
Fall 1976-77	Large Senior high schools with in- school suspension	4	62.9847	-0.14	0.899
	versus Small Senior high schools with in- school suspension	13	69.7136		

Large Senior high schools with in-school suspension
versus
Small Senior high schools with in-school suspension

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall
1975-76 semester significant at the .06 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Spring
1976 semester significant at the .09 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall
1976-77 semester significant at the .09 level.

Table 10 shows three comparisons of Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension versus Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension. None of these comparisons were significant at the .05 level during any of the semesters.

Table 10

A Comparison of the Enrollment-Suspension Ratios
of Large Junior High Schools with In-School
Suspension Versus Small Junior High
Schools with In-School Suspension

Semester	Matched Pair	Number of Cases	Mean	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Fall 1975-76	Large Junior high schools with in- school suspension versus	4	32.8541	-0.97	0.433
	Small Junior high schools with in- school suspension	3	101.5555		
Spring 1976	Large Junior high schools with in- school suspension versus	4	32.8541	-2.28	0.107
	Small Junior high schools with in- school suspension	3	144.3891		
Fall 1976-77	Large Junior high schools with in- school suspension versus	4	44.3891	-0.37	0.738
	Small Junior high schools with in- school suspension	3	73.3333		

Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension
versus
Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall
1975-76 semester significant at the .43 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Spring
1976 semester significant at the .11 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall 1976-77 semester significant at the .74 level.

Table 11 shows three comparisons of Senior high schools with in-school suspension versus Junior high schools with in-school suspension. None of the comparisons were significant at the .05 level.

Table 11

A Comparison of Enrollment-Suspension Ratios
of Senior High Schools with In-School
Suspension Versus Junior High
Schools with In-School
Suspension

Semester	Matched Pair	Number of Cases	Mean	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Fall 1975-76	Senior high schools with in-school suspension	17	45.3691	-0.51	0.626
	versus Junior high schools with in-school suspension	7	62.2976		
Spring 1976	Senior high schools with in-school suspension	17	66.5732	-0.37	0.719
	versus Junior high schools with in-school suspension	7	80.7201		
Fall 1976-77	Senior high schools with in-school suspension	17	68.1303	-0.32	0.758
	versus Junior high schools with in-school suspension	7	56.7938		

Senior high schools with in-school suspension
versus
Junior high schools with in-school suspension

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall 1975-76 semester significant at the .63 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Spring 1976 semester significant at the .72 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall 1976-77 semester significant at the .76 level.

Table 12 shows three comparisons of schools with in-school suspension versus schools without in-school suspension. None of these comparisons were significant at the .05 level.

Table 12

A Comparison of Enrollment-Suspension Ratios
of All Schools with In-School Suspension
Programs Versus All Schools Without
In-School Suspension Programs

Semester	Matched Pair	Number of Cases	Mean	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Fall 1975-76	Schools with in- school suspension	24	50.3066	0.79	0.434
	versus Schools without in- school suspension	16	37.0364		
Spring 1976	Schools with in- school suspension	24	70.6994	-0.31	0.762
	versus Schools without in- school suspension	16	80.7235		
Fall 1976-77	Schools with in- school suspension	24	64.8238	-0.63	0.536
	versus Schools without in- school suspension	16	87.8422		

All schools with in-school suspension
versus
All schools without in-school suspension

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall 1975-76 semester significant at the .43 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Spring 1976 semester significant at the .76 level.

Difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios for the Fall 1976-77 semester significant at the .54 level.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Suspension has increasingly become one of the foremost problems confronting educational administrators in American public schools. Central to the use of suspension is the belief that it provides a means for maintaining an educational atmosphere that is necessary for learning (38:11). In contrast, opponents of suspension assert that students become inaccessible to special service personnel who could be best used toward the resolution of the student's problems (33:60-61).

Public skepticism, along with an intensive analysis of the effects of suspension policies, has compelled educators to conceptualize alternatives to out-of-school suspension. A seemingly more productive approach to suspension has resulted from these efforts. The rapidly spreading new concept of in-school suspension is one example. The major objective found within this approach is that of having a student remain within the educational setting. This change in practice enables the school and community resources to be more readily used in remediating and facilitating the improvement of student behavior problems.

In-school suspension programs tend to accommodate the needs of students, parents, and the community as well as satisfy the dictates imposed by the courts. As a result, in-school suspension has been perceived as educationally and legally sound (33:63). Educators need

to assess in-school suspension programs to determine their effectiveness as viable options to the traditional suspension system.

Problem

The contemporary educational setting in which educators must work is complex and involved. Legal rulings such as *Tinker versus Des Moines* (51), which supports students' rights, and *Goss versus Lopez* (26), which mandates minimum due process procedures for school children, are indicative of the types of changes with which school officials must cope. Likewise there is evidence that parental attitudes are changing with respect to disciplinary procedures as they have been practiced in the past. Some parents are now requesting that their children serve punishments in school rather than being sent home for recalcitrant behavior. These changes, requests and demands have prompted educators to seek alternative disciplinary methods. In-school suspension has been seized upon as a possible solution.

Variation exists in the organization of in-school suspension programs across the country. This result is achieved because program designs are usually determined by the particular needs of each school and/or the availability of resources (38). This diversity intensifies the need for assessment. There is also an immediate need to identify those organizational variables (components) which tend to be contributing to the success, or the lack of success, of in-school suspension programs.

Subjects and Setting

The junior high/middle schools and senior high schools located

in Area 7 of Iowa, served as the population for this investigation.* The implementation of an in-school suspension program by school officials in Area 7 was the basis upon which schools in this study were selected.

Initially, a brief cover letter enclosed with a postcard questionnaire was sent to every principal in the population. The cover letter provided each principal with an abbreviated explanation of in-school suspension. The postcard was designed to identify (1) those schools in which in-school suspension was the current policy, (2) the number of years the programs had been in operation, and (3) a convenient time in which principals would be willing to be interviewed by the researcher in regard to their own in-school suspension program.

In the review of related literature ten criteria, or organizational variables, were identified as being associated with the success of in-school suspension programs. These ten criteria established a basis for assessment of in-school suspension programs within Area 7 of Iowa.

A panel of experts was then identified. A questionnaire was mailed to each expert. An analysis of the panel's responses provided a rank ordered hierarchy of the criteria.

Following the development of two suspension data questionnaires and an interview form, the researcher arranged for interviews with the principals who had indicated that they had implemented in-school suspension programs in their attendance centers.

*In Iowa, the county educational unit has been replaced by the area system of organization. There are 15 such education regions in Iowa. These area educational units provide support services and personnel to all schools within their respective boundaries.

The researcher mailed a letter, a copy of the interview questions and a tentative interview schedule to each principal prior to the interviews.

All of the interviews were conducted personally by this researcher. During the interviews, each interviewee was asked to present samples of the materials included in his in-school suspension program. At the conclusion of each interview, each interviewee was presented with a suspension data form. Those principals who could respond readily to the information requested were asked to complete the suspension data form. Principals who could not respond with such data were asked to mail the suspension data form as soon as convenient.

The final phase of the study involved the mailing of suspension data questionnaires to schools in which in-school suspension programs were not operating.

Instrumentation

Three questionnaires and an interview form were developed in this study. The first questionnaire surveyed the opinions of a panel of experts. This questionnaire requested each expert to respond by indicating his agreement or disagreement as to the necessity of including each of the ten criteria, or organizational variables, as seems suggested in the literature for an in-school suspension program. The second questionnaire (Suspension Data Questionnaire I) was designed to determine the total number of students suspended "Before" and "After" the implementation of an in-school suspension program. It was assumed that an analysis of this data would suggest the effectiveness of an in-school suspension program in reducing the total number of suspensions

in the Area 7 schools.

The third questionnaire (Suspension Data Questionnaire II) was designed to determine the total number of suspensions during the past three semesters. This questionnaire was sent to schools in which in-school suspension programs were not operating.

Next, an interview form was developed to assess the organizational components of the various in-school suspension programs in Area 7 schools. Operational definitions were assigned to each criterion prior to the field interviews. Eleven questions appeared on the interview form. Response categories were developed for each item to facilitate efficient and reasonably accurate recording of interviewee responses. Each interview question was designed to measure or validate the existence of a specific criterion included in an in-school suspension program.

Analysis

Analysis of the data was presented in five sections. The first section of analysis treated the interviewee responses to the eleven questionnaire items. In addition, the first section also examined the frequency of occurrence of the ten in-school suspension criteria. An operational definition had been initially assigned to each of the ten criteria. As a result, respondents did not receive credit for those criteria which did not match the pre-assigned definition.

The second section of analysis examined the questionnaires that were mailed to the panel of experts. The responses given by the experts provided a rank ordered hierarchy of the ten organizational criteria.

The objective of the third section of analysis was to determine

whether a correlation existed between the opinions of the panel of experts and the frequency with which the organizational criteria were practiced in the schools.

The fourth section of analysis treated the data obtained via Suspension Data Questionnaire I. A t-test was applied to test whether the difference was significant between the number of suspensions occurring "Before" and "After" the implementation of an in-school suspension program.

The percentage-of-increase and decrease was also calculated for those schools (11) with sufficient data. This calculation resulted in the percentage of increase or the percentage of decrease of suspensions for each school after an in-school suspension program had been implemented.

The last part of the fourth section of analysis treated the second major hypothesis of the study. A multiple regression technique was the statistical method planned in order to test this hypothesis. It was assumed that this analysis would aid in identifying those criteria which most likely contribute to the success of in-school suspension programs.

The fifth section of analysis focused on the two suspension data questionnaires. Both of these questionnaires were designed to gather suspension data for the past three semesters. Three semesters were studied to determine the trends in the suspension rates of schools with and without in-school suspension programs. A t-test was utilized to test whether the difference in the suspension rates of the schools was significant between the three semesters. (semester 1 vs. semester 2, semester 2 vs. semester 3, semester 3 vs. semester 1)

In the last phase of the fifth section of analysis, all of the schools for which suspension data had been received were separated into three major subdivisions (Large/Small, Senior High/Junior High, and schools With/Without in-school suspension). These major subdivisions were divided again into subgroups. T-tests were then utilized to test selected matched pairs. Each of the matched pairs was tested over three semesters. This was done to determine whether the difference in the enrollment-suspension ratios of a specific matched pair was significant during any one of the three semesters.

Results

In the final analysis, in-school suspension programs were found to be operating in 27 secondary schools located in Area 7 of Iowa.

Twenty-six principals and/or others designated by the principal were interviewed in regard to the in-school suspension program being operated in their particular school.

The following criteria existed in the in-school suspension programs of schools in Area 7 of Iowa:

Written Goals and Objectives existed in 15 percent of the in-school suspension programs; such goals and objectives had not been developed in 85 percent of the programs. A Single Certified Teacher existed in 8 percent of the in-school suspension programs; 92 percent of the programs did not have such a teacher. Instructional Assignments for which credit was received existed in 61 percent of the in-school suspension programs; such assignments did not exist in 39 percent of the programs. Involvement of Guidance Personnel existed in 39 percent of the in-school suspension programs; such personnel were not involved

in 61 percent of the programs. Parental Involvement existed in 77 percent of the in-school suspension programs; parents were not involved in 23 percent of the programs. Self-Concept and Self-Awareness Activities existed in 11 percent of the in-school suspension programs; such activities did not exist in 89 percent of the programs. Interest Building Activities existed in 4 percent of the in-school suspension programs; such activities did not exist in 96 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Behavior Contracts existed in 27 percent of the in-school suspension programs; such contracts did not exist in 73 percent of the in-school suspension programs. Written Rules existed in 19 percent of the in-school suspension programs; such rules did not exist in 81 percent of the programs. Follow-up and Evaluation existed in 27 percent of the in-school suspension programs; such an evaluative process did not exist in 73 percent of the programs.

The ten organizational criteria were rank ordered by the panel of experts as follows:

(1) Parental Involvement, (2) Follow-up and Evaluation, (3) Behavior Contracts, (4) Written Rules, (5) Self-Concept Development, (6) Written Goals and Objectives, (7) Involvement of Guidance Personnel, (8) Instructional Assignments, (9) Interest Building Activities, (10) A Single Certified Teacher.

The correlation of the ten organizational criteria practiced in schools with the opinions of the panel of experts was not significant at the .05 level. Thus, the organizational criteria practiced in the in-school suspension programs of schools in Area 7 did not correlate well with the rank ordered hierarchy provided by the experts.

Eleven schools were utilized to test the first major hypothesis. These schools contained the appropriate "Before" and "After" in-school suspension data needed to test Hypothesis number 1. There was no significant difference in the number of suspensions occurring "Before" as compared to the number of suspensions occurring "After" the implementation of an in-school suspension program. Thus the null hypothesis was accepted.

Percentage-of-increase and decrease was computed from an equation involving an enrollment-suspension ratio of the 11 schools with the appropriate "Before" and "After" in-school suspension data. Six schools had percentage increases (suspension ratio improved) after the implementation of an in-school suspension program. Five schools had percentage decreases (suspension ratio worsened) after the implementation of an in-school suspension program.

The small sample size of 11 schools with sufficient data, while suggesting possibilities as regard outcomes, precluded a valid analysis of the second major hypothesis.

It was found that the trend in the enrollment-suspension ratios of the 40 schools in this study, with and without in-school suspension, had improved over the past three semesters. There was a significant difference in the suspension ratios of these schools between semester 1 (Fall 1975-76) and semester 2 (Spring 1976). However, it is not clear why this large improvement occurred.

The major subdivisions of the schools were divided again into subgroups. Matched pairs were selected from these subgroups. These matched pairs were studied to determine whether significant difference occurred in the suspension ratios during a particular semester. Only

two of the 18 comparisons were significant at the .05 level. It was found that large schools had more suspensions per students than small schools (significant at the .05 level) during the Spring 1976 semester. It was also found that Large Senior high and Large Junior high schools with in-school suspension had more suspensions per students than Small Senior high and Small Junior high schools with in-school suspension (significant at the .05 level) during the Spring 1976 semester. The null hypothesis was accepted with respect to all of the other comparisons of selected matched pairs.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were reached on the basis of the interview and survey results:

- (1) Written goals and objectives had not been developed for in-school suspension programs in most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (2) A single certified teacher did not manage the in-school suspension programs of most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- * (3) Instructional assignments (credit received) were included in the in-school suspension programs of most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (4) Guidance personnel were not involved in the in-school suspension programs of most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- * (5) Parents were involved in the in-school suspension programs of most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (6) Self-concept and self-awareness activities did not exist in the in-school suspension programs of most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (7) Interest building activities did not exist in the in-school suspension programs of most Iowa Area 7 schools.

- (8) Behavior contracts were not used in the in-school suspension programs of most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (9) A list of written rules did not exist in the in-school suspension programs of most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (10) A system of follow-up and evaluation was not included in the in-school suspension programs of most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (11) Parental Involvement appeared to be the most highly regarded organizational component of an in-school suspension program as perceived by experts and practiced by most Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (12) A single certified teacher appeared to be the least regarded organizational component of an in-school suspension program as perceived by experts and as practiced by Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (13) The criteria, or organizational variables, perceived by experts as being "necessary for inclusion" in an in-school suspension program were not generally reflected as being a major part of the in-school suspension programs of Iowa Area 7 schools.
- (14) The majority of in-school suspension programs of schools in Area 7 of Iowa appear to be still in the developmental stages. As a result, the majority of administrators have grasped the idea of in-school suspension, but have not yet begun to operate sound in-school suspension programs. A majority are small schools who do not have a suspension problem.

Answers to questions posed in the study. (1) Are in-school suspension programs effective in reducing the number of suspensions?

Question one could not be answered from the data obtained from this study. Factors such as changes in administrative policies and changes in administrators also affect suspension rates. Consequently, one cannot look at a single program and credit it alone for the change in suspension rates.

Data from this study showed that the suspension ratios improved in six schools after an in-school suspension program had been implemented, however, the suspension ratios worsened in five schools after an in-school suspension program had been implemented.

(2) What organizational factors are present in the in-school suspension programs of schools in Area 7?

A variety of criteria or organizational variables were present in the in-school suspension programs. Some programs included as many as all ten of the organizational criteria which appeared in this study, while other programs did not include any of the criteria.

(3) What organizational factors tend to be contributing to the success of in-school suspension programs?

Question three could not be answered from the data obtained from this study. An insufficient sample size, while suggesting a possible way to arrive at an answer to question three, precluded the possibility of making valid inferences which would have been used to answer the question.

(4) What factors are perceived by experts to have importance in the organization of an in-school suspension program?

The five most important organizational criteria of an in-school suspension program as perceived by experts include: (1) Parental Involvement, (2) Follow-up and Evaluation, (3) Behavior Contracts, (4) Written Rules, and (5) Self-Concept Development Activities.

(5) Is there a difference in the suspension rates of large schools as compared to small schools?

There was a significant difference in the suspension rates of large schools versus small schools during one of the three

semesters studied. There were no significant differences in the suspension rates of large schools versus small schools during the other two semesters studied.

(6) Is there a difference in the suspension rates of schools that have in-school suspension programs as compared to schools that do not have in-school suspension programs?

There were no significant differences in the suspension rates of schools that have in-school suspension programs versus schools without in-school suspension programs during any of the three semesters studied.

(7) Is there a difference in the suspension rates of junior high schools as compared to senior high schools?

There were no significant differences in the suspension rates of junior high schools with in-school suspension programs versus senior high schools with in-school suspension programs during any of the three semesters studied.

Limitations. Factors such as changes in administrative policies and changes in administrators of specific attendance centers also affected suspension rates. Consequently, changes in the suspension rates of schools in Area 7 of Iowa with in-school suspension programs could not be solely contributed to the in-school suspension program.

Raw suspension figures sometimes misrepresented the actual number of students being suspended from a particular school. It happens that some students were suspended more than once.

Only schools in Area 7 of Iowa served as the population of this study.

Insufficient records of the actual suspension incidents in some Area 7 schools with in-school suspension programs did not permit a complete study of all of the schools' programs.

Recommendations for In-School Suspension Programs.

It is safe to say that in-school suspension programs across the country as well as in Area 7 of Iowa are diverse with respect to their organizational structure. As a result, in-school suspension programs range from those that are well designed to those that are generally not accepted as satisfactory. Recommendations are made from this study to assist school officials in bringing about quality in-school suspension programs.

The following recommendations result from (1) a review of special disciplinary programs, (2) a study of in-school suspension programs which have appeared in the literature, and (3) an investigation into the various in-school suspension programs of schools in Area 7 of Iowa.

Basic provisions.

- (1) Develop diagnostic devices which aid in identifying the causes of student misbehavior.

A basic assumption of in-school suspension is that student misbehavior is a symptom of an underlying problem. Diagnostic instruments should be designed to help students examine their own behavior. One idea is to get students to focus on questions such as, "What causes me to do the things that I do?" "Where am I going?" "What else could I have done in this situation?" Other devices should focus on the assessment of problems that may result from trouble with school work, trouble at home and trouble in peer relations.

- (2) Provide students with regular class assignments or some other academic work that is either comparable to or superior to classroom work.

A basic assumption of in-school suspension is that a student's educational progress should not be interrupted or penalized as a result of suspension. Several of the studies cited in this report have indicated that a major characteristic of suspended students is poor academic performance. Consequently, an in-school suspension program should be aimed at remediating academic deficiencies while concomitantly helping to improve student behavior. It also suggested that credit be given for academic work that is completed in the suspension center. In this way, student adjustment back into the regular classroom can be facilitated.

Planning a program.

- (3) Communicate with faculty to inform them of the objectives of the in-school suspension program as well as to secure faculty input with respect to the planning, development, organization and implementation of the program.

It is essential that the faculty be involved in the initial planning stages of an in-school suspension program. The responsiveness of the faculty toward the in-school suspension program ultimately determines the success or lack of success of the program. An uninformed faculty may misinterpret the objective of in-school suspension. This may cause some teachers to believe that students are not being disciplined appropriately. Furthermore, some teachers may begin to use the in-school suspension center as a dumping ground for mischievous students.

- (4) Communicate with parents in order to involve the parents in the resolution of their child's behavior problems.

The criterion Parental Involvement was perceived by experts as being the most important organizational component of an in-school suspension program. Also, more schools in Area 7 of Iowa practiced the

criterion Parental Involvement than any other organizational component.

- (5) Make sure that care is taken to select an in-school suspension supervisor(s) who (1) has knowledge of various behavior changing techniques and (2) is sensitive to the needs of problem youngsters.

An in-school suspension supervisor should possess several key qualifications. A good "listening" ear and consistency in personal behavior in regard to being fair, firm and supportive of all students, are examples of these required qualifications. Thus, a principal who serves as the in-school suspension supervisor must be aware of the role that he must assume.

- (6) Select organizational components which meet the particular needs of the school.

The criteria or organizational variables that are selected for an in-school suspension program should reflect the intensity of a school's suspension problem. It may not be necessary to use all of the criteria suggested in this study if there is no suspension problem. It is also important to explore other alternatives to in-school suspension. In some cases an out-of-school suspension may be more effective than an in-school suspension experience in changing student behavior.

Evaluation.

- (7) Design a form (evaluation instrument) which is aimed at the recording of the exact number of suspension cases observed each semester or academic year.

The development of such a form is suggested so that school personnel can observe the actual pattern of suspension in a particular school. In the event that alternative disciplinary programs are implemented, the effectiveness of such programs may be suggested by changes in the actual incidence of suspension.

- (8) Develop a filing system in which the number of suspension cases can be kept and maintained from year to year regardless of change in administration.

A filing system would assist a first year administrator in assessing the pattern of suspension in his/her school. As previously indicated such an assessment would suggest possible clues as to what factors are contributing to the increase or decrease of suspension.

- (9) Develop disciplinary forms which can be used by a principal or an in-school suspension supervisor to record the (1) number of repeat suspensions (2) the offenses for which students are suspended.

The information derived from data collected with these forms can aid in suggesting the effectiveness of an in-school suspension program in improving student behavior.

- (10) Develop follow-up procedures.

It is suggested that follow-up procedures be developed in order to measure the student's academic and behavioral progress. Various methods can be utilized to measure student progress and behavior change. Examples of these methods include (1) interviews and discussions with teachers, (2) interviews and discussions with individual students at some distant time after their return to the regular classroom, (3) casual home visits or phone conversations with a child's parents and (4) counseling sessions with a group of previously suspended students at some distant time after their release from the in-school suspension center.

Recommendations for Future Study

The procedures utilized in the present study were designed to seek possible methods for assessing in-school suspension programs. Different approaches need to be developed to determine the effectiveness of in-school suspension as a viable disciplinary technique. At this

point, several suggestions are in order for future study.

- (1) Longitudinal studies need to be conducted. These studies should look at the pattern of suspension over a series of semesters of years in schools with in-school suspension programs.
- (2) Studies need to be conducted which incorporate sample sizes that are larger than the sample size used in the present study so that educators can possibly determine which criteria or organizational variables contribute to the success of in-school suspension programs.
- (3) Studies need to be conducted which focus on administrator, teacher or student perception of in-school suspension programs.
- (4) Follow-up studies need to be done on the in-school suspension programs of schools in Area 7 of Iowa to determine what progress has been made with respect to organizational criteria included in the programs as well as the increases or decreases in the suspension rates of the schools.
- (5) Studies need to be conducted that use different criteria for classifying large schools and small schools in the population. It is suggested that researchers look at criteria such as percent of minority enrollment and type of community (rural, urban or suburban) when grouping schools into specific subdivisions. It is also suggested that researchers study the suspension rates of large schools and small schools separately.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Friends Service Committee. "A Report on Short-Term, Out-of-School Disciplinary Suspensions in Junior High/Middle and High Schools of Richland County School District #1, 1974-1975 and 1975-1976," August, 1976.
2. Anson, Ronald J. "The Educator's Response to Goss and Wood," Phi Delta Kappan, LVII (September, 1975), 16-19.
3. Bailey, Stephen K. Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.
4. Bell, John A. "Race and School Suspensions in Dallas," Integrated Education, XI (March-April, 1973), 66-67.
5. Binkley, Ed, et. al. Study of School Suspensions, 1971-1972. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document Ed 083,286, 1972.
6. Bocciardi, Gerald. "Suspension, The Approach Positive," Journal of Secondary Education, XXXVIII (November, 1963), 64-66.
7. Bormann, S. "An In-School Suspension Program," School and Community, LXII (May, 1976), 36.
8. Bostrom, Betty and Spencer Thunder. "Dealing with the Angry Ones," Today's Education, LXV (November-December, 1976), 60-61.
9. Brimm, Robert P. Handbook for Developing a Philosophy; Generating Objectives; Setting Goals. (Supplemental classroom material, University of Northern Iowa), 1975.
10. Buss, William G. "Implications of Goss v. Lopez and Wood v. Strickland for Professional Discretion and Liability in Schools," Journal of Law and Education, IV (October, 1975), 567-578.
11. Children's Defense Fund. Children Out of School. Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project, Inc., 1974.
12. _____. School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document Ed 113,797, 1975.
13. Citizens Commission to Investigate Corporal Punishment in Junior High School 22. Corporal Punishment and School Suspensions: A Case Study. New York: Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Inc., 1974.

14. Clarke, Lillian W. "Race and Suspensions in New Orleans," Integrated Education, XI (May-June, 1973), 30-33.
15. Cole, Michael T. "Expulsion and Long-Term Suspension: Is It Legal?," Journal of Law and Education, IV (April, 1975), 325-335.
16. Cottle, Thomas J. "A Case of Suspension," The National Elementary Principal, LV (September-October, 1975), 4-9.
17. Crunk, P. E. "A Socio-Epidemiological Inquiry into Indefinite Disciplinary Suspension from School and Alienation of the Maternal Household Head," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Tulane University, 1970).
18. Ebel, Robert L. and Victor H. Noll (eds.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 4th ed. Ontario: The MacMillan Co., 1960.
19. Finley, E. R. and Norris Kelley. "An Alternative to Suspension," School and Community, LX (April, 1974), p. 9.
20. Foulks, Sara L. A Comparison of Suspended and Non-Suspended Fourth Grade Students in Urban Low Socio-Economic Level Schools on Two Measures of Self-Concept As A Learner, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document Ed 081,870, July, 1975.
21. Gallup, George. "Eighth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan LVIII (October, 1976), 187-200.
22. Glass, Gene V. and Julian G. Stanley. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs; Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
23. Glasser, William. "A New Look at Discipline," (Special report by permission of Learning, December, 1974 issue).
24. Gluckman, Ivan. "Student Discipline: Suspension and Expulsion," A Legal Memorandum; National Association of Secondary School Principals (June, 1975), pp. 1-7.
25. Good, Carter V. and Winifred R Merkel (eds.). Dictionary of Education. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1973.
26. Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565, 95 s. ct 729 (1975).
27. Grahm v. Knutzen, 362 F. Supp. 811 (1973).

28. Harvey, Donald L. and William G. Moosha. "In-School Suspension: Does It Work?," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LXI (January, 1977), 14-17.
29. _____. "In-School Suspension Improves Discipline," Virginia Journal of Education, LXX (November, 1976), 13-15.
30. Harwood, Charles E. "Suspension: A Valid Disciplinary Tool?," Clearing House, XXXIV (September, 1969), 29-32.
31. Haskins, Kenneth. "You Have No Right to Put a Kid Out of School," The Urban Review, VIII (Winter, 1975), 273-287.
32. Hudgins, H. C., School Administrators and the Courts: A Review of Recent Decisions. Arlington: Educational Research Service, 1975.
33. Kittle, Helen Adele and Henry O'Neil Meares. "More Advantages: In-House Suspension," National Association of School Principals Bulletin, LX (February, 1976), 60-63.
34. Koshiyoma, Albert N. and Marilyn Morissett. "Student Advocacy In School Discipline: A Look at Suspensions," Thrust, VI (November, 1976), 16-18, 31.
35. Lichtman, Elliot C. "Wood v. Strickland: Significant Inducement for School Officials to Obey the Law," Journal of Law and Education, IV (October, 1975), 591-594.
36. MacFeeley, Richard M. "The Nuts and Bolts of Procedural Due Process," Phi Delta Kappan, LVIII (September, 1975), 26.
37. Manley-Casimir, Michael E. "Suspension, Expulsion, and Procedural Due Process," Administrator's Notebook, XX (February, 1972).
38. Mendez, Roy. "School Suspension-Discipline Without Failure," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, (January, 1977), 11-13.
39. Neil, Shirley Boes (ed.). Suspensions and Expulsions. Arlington: National School Public Relations Association, 1976.
40. Nolte, Chester M. "Brush Up in One Short Sitting: Ten Years of Tumult in School Law, and Their Lessons," American School Board Journal, CLXI (January, 1974), 48-51.
41. O'Brien, Diane M. "In-School Suspension: Is It the New Way to Punish Productively?," American School Board Journal, CLXIII (March, 1976), 35-37.
42. Orleans Parish School System, Child Welfare and Attendance Section, Division of Pupil Personnel Services, New Orleans Public Schools, 1971-1972.

43. Orleans Parish Public Schools. Visiting Teachers and Attendance Section. "An Exploratory Study of Major Characteristics of the Indefinitely Suspended Child: A Comparison of Statistically Significant Differences Between Children Referred and Children Not Referred to the Visiting Teacher Service of the Orleans Parish School System."
44. _____. "The Indefinite Suspension of a Child from School and Its Impact on the Child's Family: A Practice Based Study with suggestions for Administration and Policy Changes." 1970 (Mimeographed).
45. Pinkney, H. B. "Urban Education Problems: Shadows That Scare Me," Today's Education, LXV (March-April, 1976), 71.
46. Punke, Harold H. "Exclusion from Public Schools," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XXXII (September, 1958), 41-59.
47. Schumaker, John A. and George H. Weinberg. Statistics: An Intuitive Approach, 3rd ed., Monterey: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1974.
48. Stephens, Richard and Scott Thomson. "Alternatives to Suspension," The Practitioner: National Association of Secondary School Principals, III (April, 1977), 1-12.
49. Stretch, J. and Crunk, P. "School Suspension: Help or Hindrance?" In R. Sarri and F. Maple (eds.) The School in the Community. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1972.
50. Strunke, William P. "Exclusion from School as a Disciplinary Tool," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XXXV (October, 1961), 136-144.
51. *Tinker v. Des Moines Community School District*, 383 U.S. 503, 511, 89 s. ct 733 (1969).
52. Tuckman, Bruce W. Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.
53. Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. 3rd ed., New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1973.
54. Walther, N. "A Study of School Suspension." (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1965, 26:5, 2553.
55. White, Brian. "In-School Suspension: No Panacea, But the Impact is Positive," Phi Delta Kappan, LVIII (February, 1977), 497-498.
56. *Wood v. Strickland*, 420 U.S. 308, 95 s. ct 992 (1975).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE OF LETTERS, QUESTIONNAIRES
AND THE INTERVIEW FORM
USED IN THE STUDY

February 3, 1977

During the past few years school systems throughout the country have been experimenting with programs designed to serve as alternatives to out of school suspension. A common goal found within these programs is the intent of having students remain within an educational environment so that school and community resources can be utilized to facilitate the improvement of students' problem behavior.

As a graduate student in the Department of School Administration and Student Personnel Services at the University of Northern Iowa, I am currently working on a thesis project designed to evaluate the effectiveness of in-school suspension programs. Researching the topic extensively and having conversed with several educators in the area, I have discovered that several schools in Area Education Agency 7 have implemented alternative (in-school suspension) programs to out-of-school suspension.

To initiate the research process a postcard questionnaire has been enclosed. Would you please complete the items and return the card as soon as possible. Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully,

Stephen D. Glass
Candidate for Ed.S. Degree
University of Northern Iowa

Approved by:
Dr. R. P. Brimm
Research Advisor

SDG/pb

Enclosure

Dear Principal;

Please check

1. Does your attendance center currently operate an in-school suspension program? Yes _____ No _____

2. If answer is yes to question (1), how long has the program been in operation?
Less than 1 2 3 4 or
one year year years years more years
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

3. If your school is presently operating an in-school suspension program, could I call you to arrange for an interview at a future date concerning the program? Yes _____ No _____

February 14, 1977

During the past few years school systems throughout the country have been experimenting with in-school suspension programs designed to serve as alternatives to out-of-school suspension. A common goal found within these programs is the intent of having students remain within an educational environment so that school and community resources can be utilized to facilitate the improvement of students' problem behavior.

As a graduate student in the Department of School Administration and Student Personnel Services at the University of Northern Iowa, I am currently working on a thesis project designed to evaluate the effectiveness of in-school suspension programs.

Assuming that in-school suspension programs will vary in terms of quality, a list of variables has been selected to assess the content of the programs. These variables appear in the literature as being associated with the quality and success of disciplinary programs aimed at modifying behavior.

To add validity to these criteria and to the instrument being utilized in the study, a panel of educators has been identified to judge the criteria. You have been recognized as a person whose expertise in this area demands respect. As a result, you have been recommended to serve on this panel. I would sincerely appreciate it if you would respond to each item and return the questionnaire as soon as convenient.

Respectfully yours,

Stephen D. Glass
Candidate for Ed.S. Degree
University of Northern Iowa

Approved by:
R. P. Brimm
Research Advisor

SDG/lks

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to the following statements on the basis of their agreement with your personal views by circling your answer (SA = strongly agree, A = agree, U = uncertain, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree).

1. A written statement of goals and objectives should be prerequisite to the development of an in-school suspension program. SA A U D SD
2. A positive student-teacher relationship is most likely achieved when a single teacher supervises the in-school suspension center. SA A U D SD
3. Students should continue regular classroom assignments during the time they are assigned to the in-school suspension center. SA A U D SD
4. It is essential that guidance personnel be involved in resolving problems of students assigned to the in-school suspension center. SA A U D SD
5. When a child has been assigned to the in-school suspension center, parental involvement in the solution of the child's behavior problem should be encouraged. SA A U D SD
6. In-school suspension programs should have a system of follow-up and evaluation built into the program. SA A U D SD
7. A student is likely to change his behavior if he changes his attitude and subsequently makes a "commitment" to change. SA A U D SD
8. A specific list of "rules" which describe the behavior expected of students during in-school suspension should be written and distributed to students assigned to the in-school suspension center. SA A U D SD
9. Building self-awareness and self-concept of students while assigned to the in-school suspension center is important to the success of the in-school suspension program. SA A U D SD
10. A major goal of the in-school suspension supervisor(s) is to encourage an appreciation for achievement (academic, athletic, theatrical, etc.) while students are in the suspension center. SA A U D SD

February 27, 1977

Thank you for your immediate response to my preliminary questionnaire concerning in-school suspension programs. A total of 29 schools in AEA 7 were identified as having in-school suspension programs.

The second phase of the study consists of a personal interview. The purpose of the interview is to identify the various components (variables) of in-school suspension programs.

Certain variables have appeared in the literature as being associated with the quality and success of disciplinary programs aimed at modifying behavior. Although it may be desirable that these variables be included in an in-school suspension program in actuality their inclusion may not be practical.

Variation among the programs is expected because in-school suspension programs are designed to meet the specific needs of each school. The various components of your in-school suspension program will be kept highly confidential.

To enhance the effectiveness of the interview, I have enclosed a list of the interview questions. Please note that you will be requested to provide the interviewer with samples of the materials that you indicate are included in the in-school suspension program.

The third and final phase of the project will involve a brief suspension data questionnaire. You will be given this questionnaire at the conclusion of the interview.

Looking forward to visiting with you soon.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Glass
Candidate for Ed.S. Degree
University of Northern Iowa

SDG/pb
Enclosures

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Does your in-school suspension program have a "written" set of goals and objectives upon which the in-school suspension center is established?

*Please present the interviewer with materials illustrating the goals and objectives of the program or model upon which the in-school suspension program is based.

2. (a) Is there a single "certified teacher" managing the in-school suspension center?

(b) What responsibilities does the in-school suspension supervisor have other than supervision of in-school suspension center?
3. What type of assignments are students expected to complete while they are assigned to the suspension center?
4. (a) What type of Guidance personnel are involved with students assigned to the in-school suspension center?

(b) What outside agencies are contacted in an effort to solve the problems of a child who has been assigned to the in-school suspension center?
5. To what extent are a child's parents involved once the child has been assigned to the in-school suspension center?
6. (a) What types of activities are encouraged to build self-concept and self-awareness of students assigned to the in-school suspension center?

(b) What type of contract are students required to make in an effort to improve their behavior?

*Please provide the interviewer with printed materials which illustrate student contracts.

7. What rules have been written to guide student conduct within the in-school suspension center?

*Please provide the interviewer with the list of rules which guide student behavior within the in-school suspension program.

8. What system of follow-up and evaluation has been devised to assess the in-school suspension program?

*Please provide the interviewer with printed material which describes the system of follow-up and evaluation you indicated.

Tentative Interview Schedule

DATE: March 3, 1977

TIME:	9:00 a.m.	Logan Junior High School
	10:00 a.m.	East High School
	11:00 a.m.	McKinstry Junior High School
	1:00 p.m.	Edison Middle School
	2:30 p.m.	Central High School

Tentative Interview Schedule

DATE: March 4, 1977

TIME:	9:00 a.m.	Peet Junior High School
	10:00 a.m.	Malcolm Price Laboratory School
	11:00 a.m.	Holmes Junior High School
	1:00 p.m.	Columbus High School
	2:30 p.m.	Don Bosco High School

Tentative Interview Schedule

DATE: March 7, 1977

TIME:	9:00 a.m.	New Hartford Junior High School
	10:00 a.m.	Parkersburg High School
	11:15 a.m.	Allison-Bristow Junior High School
	11:45 a.m.	Allison-Bristow High School
	1:00 p.m.	Plainfield High School
	2:30 p.m.	Janesville High School

Tentative Interview Schedule

DATE: March 8, 1977

TIME:	9:00 a.m.	Jesup Junior High School
	10:15 a.m.	Jefferson High School
	1:00 p.m.	Sumner High School
	2:30 p.m.	Denver Middle School
	3:15 p.m.	Denver High School

Tentative Interview Schedule

DATE: March 9, 1977

TIME:	9:00 a.m.	Hudson High School
	11:00 a.m.	Dysart-Geneseo High School
	1:00 p.m.	North Tama Junior High School
	2:00 p.m.	North Tama High School

Tentative Interview Schedule

DATE: March 10, 1977

TIME:	9:00 a.m.	Dike Junior High School
	11:00 a.m.	Grundy Center Junior High School
	1:00 p.m.	Reinbeck Junior High School

Interview Questionnaire

Yes No

___ ___

1. Does your in-school suspension program have a "written" set of goals and objectives upon which the in-school suspension center is established?

Response _____

Categories

- (a) No, we do not have a written statement of goals and objectives.
 (b) Yes, we use the Glasser Model.
 (c) To reduce dropout rate or rate of out-of-school suspensions.
 (d) To change student behavior through positive non-punitive methods.
 (e) Goals have been written in official school policies booklet.
 (f) Goals have been stated in proposal (Federally funded project).

*Please present the interviewer with materials illustrating the goals and objectives of the program or model upon which the in-school suspension program is based.

Yes No

___ ___

- 2.(a). Is there a single "certified teacher" managing the in-school suspension center?

Response _____

Categories

- (a) Yes, a single teacher manages the in-school suspension program.
 (b) No, several teachers manage the in-school suspension program.
 (c) No, Principal or Assistant Principal manages the in-school suspension center.
 (d) No, a study hall teacher manages the in-school suspension center.
 (e) No, a full-time aid manages the in-school suspension center.
 (f) No, counselor(s) manage in-school suspension center.

- 2.(b). What responsibilities does the in-school suspension supervisor have other than supervision of the in-school suspension center? *For example, does the I.S.S.P. teacher spend part of the school day in the I.S.S. center and part of day teaching in History, Math, etc., in a regular classroom?

Response _____

- Categories
- (a) Primary responsibility is management of the in-school suspension program.
 - (b) Dual responsibility, one-half I.S.S.P. and one-half classroom instruction.
 - (c) Dual responsibility, I.S.S.P. and normal administrative duties.
 - (d) Dual responsibility, I.S.S.P. and counseling duties.
 - (e) Dual responsibility, I.S.S.P. and coaching.

Yes No

___ ___

3. What type of assignments are students expected to complete while they are assigned to the suspension center?

Response _____

- Categories
- (a) Students are expected to complete regular classroom assignments.
 - (b) Students are expected to complete learning packages.
 - (c) Students are expected to complete non instructional tasks.
 - (d) Students are expected to do some type of academic work.

*Do students receive credit for assignments completed?

Yes ___ No ___

Yes No

— —

4.(a). What type of Guidance personnel are involved with students assigned to the in-school suspension center?

Response _____

Categories

- (a) "Guidance" staff works with teachers in making contracts with students.
- (b) School counselors work with the students.
- (c) School psychologist works with the students.
- (d) Visiting counselor or teacher works with students.
- (e) No guidance personnel work directly with students.
- (f) Guidance personnel involved only to the point of notification.
- (g) Guidance personnel involved only when situation warrants their expertise.

Yes No

— —

4.(b). What outside agencies are contacted in an effort to solve the problems of a child who has been assigned to the in-school suspension center?

Response _____

Categories

- (a) Child protective agencies.
- (b) Juvenile Court.
- (c) Social service agencies.
- (d) Probation personnel.
- (e) Police liaison officer.
- (f) College personnel.
- (g) Truant officer.
- (h) Churches
- (i) Area education agency specialists.
- (j) No outside agencies are contacted.

Yes No

___ ___

5. To what extent are a child's parents involved once the child has been assigned to the in-school suspension center?

Response _____

Categories

- (a) Notification only as required by school policy.
- (b) Parents are asked in for counseling sessions.
- (c) Parents are required to come to school before student is released from the suspension center.
- (d) Parents must sign contract which acknowledges that they have read it.
- (e) On-going communication with parents through contact (letter, phone) preceding suspension.
- (f) Parents contacted to inform them of their child's progress during or after in-school suspension.

Yes No

___ ___

- 6.(a). What types of activities are encouraged to build self-concept and self-awareness of students assigned to the in-school suspension center?

Response _____

Categories

- (a) Students are given career development materials.
- (b) Students are encouraged to get involved in school activities.
- (c) Group therapy or counseling sessions.
- (d) General program of self-concept building has been developed in the school.
- (e) No specific plan to build self-concept is included.

Yes No

___ ___

6.(b). What types of contracts are students required to make in an effort to improve their behavior?

Response _____

- Categories
- (a) Informal individualized hand written contracts.
 - (b) Contracts between teachers and students only.
 - (c) Form contracts--students are given a specific form to complete by in-school suspension supervisor.
 - (d) No attempt is made to have students write contracts.
 - (e) Time limit contracts/no time limit contracts.

Yes No

___ ___

7. What rules have been "written" to guide student conduct within the in-school suspension center?

Response _____

- Categories
- (a) No rules have been written.
 - (b) Rules are verbalized to students, but have not been written.
 - (c) Rules are on tape (students are required to listen to the rules upon entry).
 - (d) Rules are written and presented to the students.
 - (e) Rules are posted in the in-school suspension center.

*Please provide the interviewer with the list of rules which guide student behavior within the I.S.S.P.

Yes No

— —

8. What system of follow-up and evaluation has been devised to assess the in-school suspension program?

Response _____

Categories

- (a) Interviews will be arranged with teachers.
- (b) Administrator, teacher or student surveys.
- (c) Suspension data. (1) reduction of suspensions
(2) reduction of dropout and absentee rate
- (d) Committee will review and assess I.S.S.P. (teachers and administrators).
- (e) Interviews with students.
- (f) Written case studies.
- (g) Group counseling sessions.

SUSPENSION DATA QUESTIONNAIRE I

Part I

Directions: Please fill in the information required in items (1) and (2).

- (1) Name of School _____.
- (2) Number of students enrolled _____.

Part II

Directions: Please complete the two grids below by filling in the number of suspensions that occurred during each semester specified.

- (1) Please begin by marking "X" to indicate the length (in months) of the in-school suspension program.
- (2) After you have marked "X" in the appropriate space, read the question at the top of each column, then, go back to the line where you marked "X" and begin to fill in the figures moving horizontally across the grid.

GRID #1 TOTAL NUMBER OF SUSPENSIONS "AFTER" IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION (I.S.S.)

Length of in-school suspension program (in months)	How many suspensions occurred during the first semester of I.S.S.?	How many suspensions occurred during the second semester of I.S.S.?	How many suspensions occurred during the third semester of I.S.S.?	How many suspensions occurred during the fourth semester of I.S.S.?	How many suspensions occurred during the fifth semester of I.S.S.?	How many suspensions occurred during the sixth semester of I.S.S.?	How many suspensions occurred during the seventh semester of I.S.S.?	How many suspensions occurred during the eighth semester of I.S.S.?	How many suspensions occurred during the ninth semester of I.S.S.?
1-10									
11-20									
21-30									
More than 30									

GRID #2 TOTAL NUMBER OF SUSPENSIONS "BEFORE" IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION PROGRAM (I.S.S.)

Go back <u>one</u> semester before I.S.S., how many students were suspended?	Go back <u>two</u> semesters before I.S.S., how many students were suspended?	Go back <u>three</u> semesters before I.S.S., how many students were suspended?
--	---	---

--	--	--

SUSPENSION DATA QUESTIONNAIRE II

Part I

Directions: Please fill in the information required in items (1) and (2).

- (1) Name of school _____.
- (2) Number of students enrolled _____.

Part II

Directions: Please complete the grid below by filling in the number of suspensions that occurred during each semester specified

TOTAL NUMBER OF SUSPENSIONS DURING THE PAST THREE SEMESTERS

How many students were suspended from September 1976 to January 1977?

How many students were suspended from January 1976 to May 1976

How many students were suspended from September 1975 to January 1976?

March 16, 1977

Thank you for your immediate response to my preliminary questionnaire concerning in-school suspension programs. A total of 28 schools in Area Education Agency 7 were identified as having an in-school suspension program.

The second phase of the study involved personal interviews with principals who indicated that they did have an in-school suspension program operating in their attendance center.

The third and final phase of the project will involve a brief suspension data questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire is to determine the trend or pattern of the number of suspensions that have occurred during the past few semesters in Area Education Agency 7 schools. This information is perhaps the most vital data to be collected in the study.

I would sincerely appreciate it if you would complete the brief questionnaire that has been enclosed and return it as soon as convenient.

I would be glad to furnish you with a summary of the results of the study upon your request.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Glass
Candidate for Ed.S. Degree
University of Northern Iowa

SDG/pb
Enclosure

APPENDIX B
PANEL OF EXPERTS AND CRITERIA
IN THE SCHOOLS

PANEL OF EXPERTS

Mr. Robert Schmidt, Principal
Jefferson High School
100 Sunset
Jefferson, Iowa 50129

Mr. William C. Jacobson, Principal
Jefferson High School
1243 20th Street S.W.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404

Mr. Richard Thompson, Principal
North Scott Junior High School
Eldridge, Iowa 52748

Mr. John Finnessy, Principal
Marshalltown High School
1602 South 2nd Avenue
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158

Dr. Joseph Przychodzin, Professor
Educational Psychology & Psychology
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

Dr. John McClure, Professor
College of Education
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Mr. Harold Blackledge, Principal
Benton Community High School
Van Horne, Iowa 52346

Mr. Larry G. Rowedder, Principal
Newton Senior High School
East 4th Street South
Newton, Iowa 50208

Mr. Norbert Meyer, Principal
Northwest Junior High School
1507 8th Street
Coralville, Iowa 52241

Mr. John Watson,
Assistant Superintendent
Muscatine Community School District
1403 Park Avenue
Muscatine, Iowa 52761

Mr. Richard Watkins, Principal
Central Junior High School
901 Cedar
Muscatine, Iowa 52761

Mr. Ronald Bickford, Superintendent
Danville Community School District
415 South Main
Danville, Iowa 52623

CRITERIA IN THE SCHOOLS

Ten Criteria	Schools																										Frequency
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	4
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
3	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	16
4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	10
5	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	20
6	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	7
7	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	7
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	5
9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1