DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 730 CG 016 032

TITLE	A Two-Phase Impact Study of In-School Alternatives to Suspension: Technical Analysis. Volume I. Second Year Report.
INSTITUTION	J W K International Corp., Annandale, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1 Oct 80
CONTRACT	78-C-1192; 400-78-0067; SB-4-4-8(a)
NOTE	70p.; For related documents, see CG 016 033, CG 016 384-385, and ED 187 002. Best copy available.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Discipline Policy; Educational Innovation; Educational Objectives; *Nontraditional Education; *Program Effectiveness; Racial Factors; *School Counseling; Secondary Education; Secondary School Students; Student Problems; Student School Relationship; *Suspension
IDENTIFIERS	*Impact Studies; *In School Suspension

ABSTRACT

A growing concern among parents and educators about the increasing incidence of out-of-school suspensions led to an exploratory study on the impact of in-school alternatives to suspension. Four school districts were visited and a directory of in-school alternatives was compiled. The four programs included the Intervention Room, the Student Temporary Opportunity Program, the In-School Suspension Program, and In-School Suspension/Restriction Rooms. In only two sites did in-school suspension replace out-of-school suspension while data from a third program documented a dramatic drop in the use of out-of-school suspension. Other schools also expressed feelings that alternative programs were successful. In-school suspensions were used with truant and tardy students. All districts displayed flexibility in determining their use of suspension policies as standards changed. Further research is needed in the area of the disciplinary referral process. (JAC)

A TWO-PHASE IMPACT STUDY OF IN-SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION

SECOND YEAR REPORT VOLUME I

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

October 1, 1980

Contract No. 400-78-0067
SB-4-4-8(a) 78-C-1192

Submitted to:

Department of Education
National Institute of Education
Washington, D. C. 20208

Submitted by:

JWK INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
7617 Little River Turnpike, Suite 800
Annandale, Virginia 22003
703/750-0500

The work upon which this report is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-78-0067 of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBITS

TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

A two-phase impact study of in-school alternatives to suspension is a follow-up to an April 1978 NIE sponsored conference on in-school alternatives to out-of-school student suspension. Attending that three day meeting were over 600 educators, parents, lawyers, social scientists, student advocates and interested citizens. This participation, well in excess of NIE expectations, attested to the growing concern of a wide range of individuals over the increasing incidence of out-of-school suspensions, particularly among non-white youth.

The problem was initially brought to light in the 1973 Office of Civil Rights Annual Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey. In that survey schools were asked for a total, by race and ethnic group, of the number of students suspended at least once during the 1972-73 school year. Analysis of the OCR data, representative of roughly 53 percent of the total school enrollment and almost 86 percent of the minority enrollment in the United States, showed that one in every twenty-four children enrolled in reporting districts, and one in every thirteen secondary students enrolled, was suspended at least once. It was further found that although black students represented 27.1 percent of the enrollment in the reporting districts, they constituted 42.3 percent of the racially identified suspensions (Childrens Defense Fund, 1975: 11-12). Finally, it is conceded by most experts that the OCR figures underrepresent the magnitude of the problem in that they do not reflect multiple suspensions. The report also noted that a large number of "racially unidentified" suspensions were reported by districts. The majority of these suspensions were probably minority students.

This two year project, initiated in October 1978, is an exploratory effort aimed at providing information on the organization, operation and impact of programs designed to lessen the incidence of out-of-school suspension. The potential audience for such information is school administrators seeking to establish such programs in their own buildings or districts.

We are attempting to meet the information needs of this audience through a series of eight in-depth case studies of currently operating in-school alternative programs. Case studies of sites visited during the second year are found in Volume II of this report. They are intended to be descriptive and not evaluative. Each case study is intended to provide the reader sufficient detail so that she/he might learn from the experience of each study site some of the issues which were addressed in establishing the program and which still impact its day-to-day operation.

During the second year of the project, a Directory of In-School Alternatives to Out-of-School Suspension was compiled. Information for the Directory was collected through a Program Description

Questionnaire. The questionnaire sought information on the background, history, philosophy and goals of the program, the organization structure and program operation characteristics, and general information and comments relative to in-school suspension. One-hundred and one program descriptions were included in the Directory and a planning model was presented. Common problems of in-school alternatives to out-of-school suspension and key elements of success were also identified.

Field research during the second year of the study was conducted in four school districts. Within each district, one or two building level programs were examined. Field sites were visited before selection and two times after selection. Specific locations visited were:

- District A: Southern/Urban
  Enrollment 1979-1980: 87,000
  .. one elementary school (K-6)
  .. one middle school (6-8)

- District B: Midwest/Urban and Suburban
  Enrollment 1979-1980: 8,000
  .. one senior high school (10-12)

- District C: Southeast/Suburban
  Enrollment 1979-1980: 55,000
  .. one junior high school (7-9)
  .. one senior high school (10-12)

- District D: North Central/Suburban
  Enrollment 1979-1980: 4,000
  .. one senior high school (10-12)
  .. two junior high schools (7-9)

- District E: North Central/Suburban
  Enrollment 1979-1980: 7,000
  .. two senior high schools (10-12)
  .. three junior high schools (7-9)

- District F: North Central/Suburban - Rural
  Enrollment 1979-1980: 7,000
  .. one senior high school (10-12)

Data were collected through unstructured interviews with program staff, administrators, and students, by direct program observations, through teacher, student, and parent questionnaires, and from a sample of student records. Approximately 100 interviews were conducted across all sites, data were extracted by school district employees from nearly 1,000 student record folders, and over 600 completed questionnaires were obtained from parents, teachers, and students.

A discussion of the study methodology is presented in Chapter II. Brief summaries of the programs operating in each of the four districts appear in Chapter II. A discussion of the study methodology is presented in Chapter III. An interpretive analysis of the second year findings and suggestions for future research are presented in Chapter IV. Appendices to this report contain the complete case studies of the districts visited during the second year, the instrumentation used to collect data, and the Directory of In-School Alternatives to Suspension.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study is an initial attempt to systematically study the option of in-school suspension. It constitutes exploratory research. The goal is to identify major variables and to generate hypotheses/assumptions about the relationship of in-school alternatives to out-of-school suspension programs that can then be tested in future research. No claims are made as to the generalizability of study findings beyond the eight study sites.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

In the NIE Request for Proposals, the objectives for Phase II of the project were:

- to conduct a study of 4-6 additional school systems with varying kinds of in-school programs in order to further illuminate (a) the history, philosophy, structure, and operation of in-school alternatives to suspension and (b) the impact of these programs on student behavior, achievement, and attitudes toward school in other kinds of in-school programs not studied in the first year;

- to develop a system whereby schools with in-school alternatives to suspension can monitor their own performance;

- to provide school districts contemplating the implementation of an in-school alternative program with a list of other schools and contact persons engaged in in-school programs across the country and also a description of these programs.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Through unstructured interviews and a review of student records we sought to answer the following questions concerning each of the in-school alternative programs being studied and the students who have participated in them.

Descriptive Dimension

1. What are the major events that led to the establishment of the in-school alternative program?

2. Is there a general statement of philosophy or mission which governs the operation of the program?

3. Are there specific performance objectives, with measurable outcomes specified, which govern the operation of the in-school alternative program?

4. How is the program administratively organized?

5. Where does the program fit in the district's administrative structure?

6. What are the staffing, funding and programmatic characteristics of the program?

7. What are the characteristics of students placed in the in-school alternative program?

8. Based on an analysis of these characteristics, does it appear that any particular type or class of student is disproportionately referred to the in-school alternative program?

9. What are the characteristics of students who are suspended from school?

10. How do students placed in the in-school alternative program differ

    (a) from students who have not been referred to the in-school alternative program or suspended out of school?

    (b) from students who have been suspended out of school?

11. What is the range and average duration of student participation in the in-school alternative program?

12. What are the major reasons for student referral to the in-school alternative program?

Impact Dimension[1]

13. What effect, if any, has participation in the in-school alternative program had upon a participating student's:

    (a) attendance?
    (b) tardiness?
    (c) academic grades?
    (d) conduct grades (where recorded)?

---

1 These questions should not be seen as implying causation. They are posed to permit investigation of probable relationships which might be studied more extensively and in a much more controlled fashion at some future point in time.

14. Has the in-school alternative program coincided with a reduction in the number of out-of-school suspensions? (This particular area will be examined for all years that the in-school alternative has been in effect.)

15. What effect has participation in the in-school alternative program had on the involvement of parents of participating students in the disciplinary process and other school related activities?

SITE SELECTION

The sample of in-school alternatives to suspension eligible for selection during Phase II were identified during Phase I. Through discussions and review of materials provided by Mr. Antoine Garibaldi of NIE, the External Review Panel of the project, Mr. Hayes Mizell, Project Consultant, and telephone interviews with program representatives, twenty programs were identified.

These twenty programs represented a variety of approaches to suspension. They included time-out rooms, behavior contracts, work study, tutoring, and prevention. Most were short-term programs. The twenty sites represented a cross-section of urban, suburban, small-city, and rural districts and a range of geographical locations and ethnic composition. They also seemed to vary most from the initial four study sites selected in Phase I.

Criteria used to select the four districts for Phase II visitation were:

- stability of program effort;
- on-campus location of program;
- integration of program into regular school procedures and instructional efforts;
- a specific strategy for intervention based on the typology of in-school alternatives to suspension presented at the Conference on In-School Alternatives to Suspension sponsored by the National Institute of Education in 1978;
- a unique or innovative aspect to the program.

Preselection site visits were conducted at five sites. Three of these five sites were selected as study districts. The remaining site selected as a study district, District D, was not previsited. Two building sites were visited in each district with the exception of District B. Selection of Districts B and D provided researchers on opportunity to study programs with a system developed to train and

assist other sites in implementing disciplinary alternatives, an objective of Phase II of the study.

DATA COLLECTION

Exhibit II-1 summarizes site visit dates and personnel assignments. Scheduling and travel arrangements precluded two visits to District D. However, the duration of the visits remained comparable at approximately five person days per building site.

Exhibit II-1

Site Visit Schedule

Site	Staff	Visit 1	Visit 2
District A	Ms. Karen Sagstetter Analyst	12/79	
	Ms. Sondra Cooney Associate		4/80
District B	Ms. Karen Sagstetter Ms. Sondra Cooney	1/80	5/80
District C	Mr. Richard Chobot Principal Investigator	3/80	5/80
	Ms. Sondra Cooney	3/80	5/80
District D	Mr. Richard Chobot	4/80	5/80

Four basic methods were employed in collecting project data:

- Discussions with individuals
- Direct observation
- Records review
- Questionnaires

Discussions

Interactions with individuals at the study sites were unstructured and employed discussion outlines as opposed to fixed questions (see

Volume III.) OMB clearance of the discussion outline was secured in mid-January 1979 during Phase I of the Project.

Data collection procedures were also reviewed by Ms. Margaret A. Hoppe, an evaluation specialist for the State of New Jersey during Phase I. Ms. Hoppe was fulfilling this reviewer role as a monitor for the Committee on Education Information System (CEIS) of the Council of Chief State School Officers.

During Phase II, three respondent groups were targeted for interviews:

- Project Staff: Staff members are the individuals who deliver the services to students in the program and who are often the link between the school, parents, and community agencies.
- School Principals: The building principal or her/his designee, often the assistant principal, frequently serves as the primary gatekeeper for the in-school alternative. Further, the support of this individual and the consistency with which the in-school alternative is utilized can be key to the successful functioning of the program within a building.
- Students: The reason for inclusion of participating students in the study is obvious in that they can speak to the personal effect which the programs have had on them.

Exhibit III-2 shows the actual number of contacts made in each district visited.

Exhibit II-2

PROJECT INTERVIEW CONTACTS

Position	Contacts			
	District A	District B	District C	District D, E, F
Building Principal	2	1	2	2
Other Administrators	5	3	3	14
Program Staff	3	6	2	3
Participating Students	20	8	20	30
Total	30	18	27	49

This exhibit does not include informal contacts with district and building level administrators and teachers. In District B there was only one building program site, thus the smaller number of contacts.

In preparing for our visit it was originally suggested to the sites that the students to be interviewed be randomly selected. However, selection and contact was more a function of who had the time and a signed parental permission to see us. Scheduling conflicts and a lack of written parental permission thus often defeated randomness in interviewee selection.

Student interviews averaged 10-15 minutes. Formal discussions with program staff and building administrators required between 45 and 60 minutes. However, there were many additional informal interactions during the course of the site visit.

Staff selected to conduct the site visits were carefully chosen. Interviewers were required to have teaching and/or administrative experience in public education, experience in program research, development, and/or evaluation, and a degree in a related social science area.

To ensure sensitivity of interviewers, training that emphasized the skills of listening, observing, questioning, notetaking, and reporting was required. Probing techniques, interpersonal skill development, and unobtrusive measurement strategies were modeled to assist interviewers in the data-gathering process.

Since the unstructured interview can easily lead observers in unanticipated directions, a monitoring device was built into the discussion flow. The discussion guides provided a topical orientation and an element of consistency in the interviews. However, as they were written in very general terms, some areas of inquiry were inappropriate for some of the sites. For example, most of the programs studied were not total alternatives to out-of-school suspension. Students continued to be suspended for the same types of offenses as they had been prior to the implementation of the program. The guides did not restrict the content of the discussions. The background, experience, and interest of the interviewees and the interpersonal skills of the observers served to enrich the quality and quantity of the discussions.

Direct Observation

During visits to each building site approximately four to six hours were spent actually observing the in-school alternative program. This was always done with the permission of staff and where appropriate and necessary, with an explanation to the students as to the researcher's

role and purpose for being there. Program observations were scheduled at different times of day and on different days during the visit. An attempt was made to observe all facets of a program from the actual referral by the assistant principal or other responsible administrator, through intake to discharge. While such complete observations were not possible in all buildings visited, our observations did provide a relatively complete view of each district program.

Observation at different times was particularly important at some sites, since most of the participating students came to the program only one period every day. Also, supervisory duties in one program were shared among different teachers.

Records Review

A review of data found in a systematically drawn sample of student records is a way to broaden the study perspective and verify some of the interview findings. The building populations of the seven buildings actually visited were divided into three sampling frames:

- students who had participated in the in-school alternative program;
- students who had been suspended out-of-school;
- all other students not falling into any of the above groups (i.e., the remainder of the general student population).

Since the actual data collection was to be done at various times during the school year, building programs might not have reached their projected service level for the year to date. Recognizing the possibility that offenses and the type of student assigned to the program might vary at different times of the year, it was decided to concentrate on the last completed program year (1978-79) so that a more complete picture of students served by the program might be secured.

Another factor that had to be taken into consideration in designing the Records Review was the policies and procedures developed by school districts as a result of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. These procedures make it difficult for outside researchers to gain direct access to student records, particularly where personally identifiable information is involved. It was therefore decided at the project's inception to use staff members at each building site on a consulting basis to sample student records and perform the necessary data extractions.

During Phase I it was found that portions of the student record review form were not answerable because data were not collected by the districts in any regular or consistent manner. As an example, we found

that many student folders contained no data on student promotion. We had originally hypothesized a category of student "assigned to the in-school alternative, but not actually placed in the program." No such class of students was identifiable in any of the Phase I districts which we visited. The net result of these deletions was a reduction in the length of the student record review form from fourteen to ten pages.

Frame Composition: The population being considered in this study was the student body of the school building sites served by the in-school alternative programs being studied. The three frames into which the building populations were divided have already been identified. As has also been stated, the development of the sampling frames, the actual sampling, and the data extraction were done by district employees who were reimbursed for their actual time by the contractor. The instructions which were provided to these individuals in performing these tasks, together with the actual Record Review form, are found in Volume III of this report. Time was spent with each of these reviewers during one of the site visits. At this meeting, usually lasting an hour or more, the record review procedures were discussed in detail with the staff person who would actually complete the data extraction.

Frame Structure: Each frame was composed of student names. Once selected, these names allowed access to the student records from which the requisite data might be extracted. In the case of students who had participated in the in-school alternative program, we asked that the list be arranged by date of entry into the program. For example, a student who entered the program on September 15 was listed prior to a student who was assigned to the program in October.

Other sub-frames were taken as they occurred in the school record keeping system. For example, the list of students suspended out-of-school was usually in chronological order. The list of regular students was either alphabetical, alphabetical by grade level, or alphabetical by homeroom.

Sample Selection: In all cases, lists of names were inspected for inherent bias before sampling. A sample of 50 participating students and 25 suspended students was obtained by using random sampling with nonreplacement. A sample of 25 non-participating students was drawn using systematic sampling with a random start. This resulted in a maximum of 100 student records per building (200 records per district) to be reviewed.

Sample size was not set for purposes of statistical generalizability to the population as a whole. Rather, it was based on what was considered a logistically feasible and acceptable burden to place on the school district.

Data Collection: Information on each student selected was extracted from their student record for the 1978-79 school year.

Background information sought on each student included:

- Age
- Sex
- Race (if available)
- Grade Level (in 1977-78)

Also recorded for all students sampled were the following data elements, when available:

- grade point average for each marking period;
- conduct marks (where given);
- attendance record (days absent);
- tardiness record (days late);
- number of disciplinary infractions noted in file for 1978-79;
- disposition of each infraction noted above.

Most schools keep such records, particularly the first three items, by marking period, quarter, and/or semester. Data based on the lowest unit of aggregation were recorded. For example, if a school had three marking periods per semester, the average grade for each marking period in both semesters (total of six marking periods) was recorded.

For those students sampled who were assigned to the in-school alternative program and/or suspended out-of-school, the following additional information was also secured:

- the date when the assignment/suspension occurred;
- the duration of the assignment/suspension (days);
- the specific infraction(s) which occasioned the assignment/ suspension;
- whether or not this was the first instance of assignment to the in-school alternative or to suspension; if not, the date(s), duration, and reason(s) for prior assignments/ suspensions.

Data were collected on individual forms for each student in the sample (see Volume III). The same form was used for students in each set. An individual form for each student was utilized instead of a master recording form because it directly provided the question and information flow to the person filling it out, as opposed to making them consult a separate instruction sheet at each decision point (e.g. if the student had prior suspensions or assignments to the in-school alternative program).

QUESTIONNAIRES

The RFP specified certain classes of respondent for the study. In a number of building settings during Phase I, regular teachers, non-participating students and parents appeared to lack substantive information on the program under study. While this in itself was a significant finding, it was also problematic in that setting up

and conducting interviews with these individuals sometimes proved to be the most difficult logistical chore for the site liaison person.

During the second year of the study, this problem was addressed through a two-stage data collection procedure which employed a brief descriptive survey with an overall sample from regular teachers, non-participating students and parents. Assuming that points of interest surfaced through this initial survey, they were followed-up through focused probes during the second site visit. This procedure saved about two days of field activity in each district site and reduced the time burden imposed on pupils and teaching staff.

Teacher questionnaires were distributed to all staff members in each building site. Student questionnaires were distributed randomly to two homerooms of each grade level served in the building site. Teachers in the selected homerooms administered the student surveys. No effort was made to control the type of student respondent (i.e., participating, non-participating, or previously suspended) since the purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the level of substantive information and individual perceptions of the disciplinary alternative. Teacher and student questionnaires were collected by the researchers when the first site visit was completed.

Parent questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of homes selected by building personnel from records of students assigned to the in-school alternative. Parent questionnaires were mailed and return postage was provided. Samples of the questionnaires may be found in Volume III.

In general, an effort was made to enter each of the second year sites more informed than during the first year. This was possible because of the preselection visits. The utility of the second site visit was enhanced because both program description survey and student records review data were in hand and analyzed prior to that event.

To complete the study objectives of Phase II, data collection and analysis were also required for compilation of a Program Directory and development of a system for planning and implementing disciplinary alternatives. A detailed description of this methodology is contained in the Directory, itself.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

In considering the design and data collection methods used in this study, these facts should be noted:

- Programs studied are not comparable.
- The ability of school district staff to construct sampling frames, draw samples and extract data from student records varies, but not by factors originally considered.

Programs Are Not Comparable

Each of the four programs was unique in its service configuration, the factors antecedent to program establishment and, to some degree in physical and staffing characteristics. While this fact was recognized at the beginning of the study, it was assumed that the concept of "in-school alternative to suspension" would be more of a unifying factor than it turned out to be. Even within a given school district, the emphasis was sometimes different. For example, in District C, the thrust at the high school site was preventive. In the same district, the junior high site used the disciplinary alternative primarily as a reactive measure for students who had accumulated a series of disciplinary referrals or who had committed certain specific offenses. Among the districts in the study there was also little program equivalence. In all instances the in-school alternative to suspension initiative existed in concert with other initiatives.

A similar problem of non-comparability occurred with reference to disciplinary records. We began the study with the assumption that, in light of state and federal regulations and court cases, there would be reasonably accurate district and building level records on out-of-school suspensions. For example, three of the four study sites were, and continue to be part of the sample for the Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey (Office for Civil Rights; Forms 101 and 102). In addition, District A would be expected to receive Form 532-2 titled, Supplemental Information for Local Education Agency Grants under the Emergency School Aid Act. The OCR Form 102 has requested district and building information on first-time suspensions since 1972-73, biannually from 1975 through 1979. Form 532-2 requires more detail on suspensions. Both require a breakout by ethnic group of students suspended. They also request the rates for expulsion and corporal punishment (See Exhibit II-3).

Site visitors found that building level statistics on out-of-school suspension were non-existent in most cases and difficult, at best, to secure at the district level. For example, we were told in District C that district suspension data was not compiled. In most cases, we depended on OCR data when available or on program data.

The following potential problems exist in statistics on suspension or other disciplinary actions:

- unclear or inconsistent definitions (e.g., suspension);
- unclear or inconsistent instructions (e.g., instructions that do not accommodate all possible alternatives);

EXHIBIT II-3
Figure 1

LIST OF RELEVANT ITEMS ON OCR FORMS AND WHERE THEY ARE COLLECTED

Items by Racial Ethnic Groups	DISTRICT LEVEL Date	DISTRICT LEVEL OCR Form	INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL LEVEL Date	INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL LEVEL OCR Form
1. No. of pupils (membership)	--	—	Oct. 1976, Oct. 1978 Oct. 1977, Oct. 1979	102 532-2
2. No. of pupils receiving corporal punishment	--	--	1975-76, 1977-78 1976-77, 1978-79	102 532-2
3. No. of pupils suspended[1]	--	—	1975-76, 1977-78 1976-77, 1978-79	102 532-2
4. No. of days suspended (in intervals) for one-time offenders	--	—	1976-77	532-2
5. No. of pupils expelled[2]	1975-76, 1977-78	101	1975-76	102
6. No. of students referred for disciplinary actions to juvenile court	--	—	1976-77	532-2
7. No. of students referred to alternate education programs as formal disciplinary measure	—	—	1976-77	532-2
8. No. of pupils in program for socially maladjusted	--	--	Oct. 1978 Oct. 1979	102 532-2
9. No. of pupils in specific special education programs, i.e.[3] a. Seriously Emotionally Disturbed b. Specific Learning Disability	--	—	Oct. 1976, Oct. 1978 Oct. 1977, Oct. 1979	102 532-2
10. No of principals, teachers and head coaches[4]	Oct. 1977, Oct. 1979	532-1	—	--
11. No. of pupils in compensatory or remedial instruction	—	--	1977-78, 1979-80	532-2
12. Grades Included[5]	—	—	1977-78, 1979-80	532-2

1 Suspension data are also available for 1972-1973 and 1973-74.

2 Expulsion data are available for all preceding years extending as far back as 1970-71.

3 These are special education programs which could be checked to see if they are used for severe discipline cases.

4 On OCR Form 532-1, these numbers are also reported by ethnic group for the year preceding the implementation of desegregation.

5 Grade Structure should be checked against suspicious changes in disproportionality.

Note 1: OCR Forms 101 and 102 were filled out in Fall 1976 and 1978; OCR Forms 532-1 and 532-2 were filled out in Fall 1977 and 1979.

Note 2: Forms 101 and 102 are sent to all ESAA applicants, to statistically-selected samples of school districts with specific characteristics and to districts operating under court order to desegregate. The number of districts within a state obviously varies. In some states, like Florida, all districts are eligible for the sample. The sample changes depend on the criteria used. All schools within a sample district must complete Form 102. OCR Forms 532-1 and 532-2 are mailed to all ESAA applicants - between 600 and 700 school districts.

- clerical and copying errors (e.g., transposing figures and listing figures in the wrong columns);
- classification errors (e.g., counting Hispanics as Blacks);
- arithmetical errors (e.g., sum of entries do not equal the total reported);
- illogical responses (e.g., total number of suspended students can be greater than the sum of the numbers in the individual ethnic groups due to ethnically unidentified students, but it cannot be less);
- lack of agreement between reports (e.g., disagreement between teacher records of student infraction and student referral forms);
- "deviant" cases (e.g., excessively high or low incidences)

The first item is a case in point. Do the districts visited count students assigned to their in-school alternative program as suspended students for purposes of federal reporting? If so, how does this reconcile with the fact that such students would be counted in completing state and local reports in those districts where aid is based on average daily attendance.

During the second year of this study of in-school alternatives, an attempt was made to control the programmatic variance among districts through a more controlled section of field sites. Preselection site visits permitted determination as to whether or not there existed an identifiable and viable in-school alternative to suspension program at the site. They also allowed assessment of the adequacy of the statistical data describing the program and the definition and application of other significant terms relevant to the disciplinary process.

In general, while disciplinary data were more often available at the district level and in more of the building sites in the Phase II study, little comparability, reliability, and validity of disciplinary data existed within and among study sites.

Capabilities of Site Personnel to Conduct Records Review

In the initial study design, the type of individual who might best do the Records Review was not specified. The initial tendency was to favor the use of counselors or other professionals who would understand

the nature of the task and would be familiar with the content of the student records. There was also the expectation that in large urban districts the study would benefit from some centralized record keeping system.

It was found that the best quality data, in terms of consistency, accuracy and completeness, occurred in the cases where record clerks completed the forms. The least complete data set was received from a site where professional program staff conducted the review.

It was also advantageous if the person completing the records review task was a staff member in the building under study. Such individuals were more familiar with the record system. They also induced less anxiety in the building principal and maintained contact with the researcher during and after visits if problems arose.

Volume III contains the explanatory material provided to each individual conducting the records review. On the whole, the material was considered to be clear and self-explanatory by individuals performing the records review task. However, in addition to providing the self-explanatory materials and reviewing it with a staff member during a site visit, the individual performed a trial data extraction on three or four student records for review by JWK staff.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The eight programs selected for study during Phases I and II are not presented as totally representative of the range of in-school alternative programs. There are other types of alternatives not included in this study that might be equally appropriate and effective in districts seeking an alternative to out-of-school suspension.

The programs selected for study did not always meet the generic definition of an in-school alternative to suspension; that is, a program to which students are referred in lieu of suspension from school or for accumulating offenses that may lead to suspension. Although reduction of out-of-school suspension was a major reason for program development in all study districts, all districts continued to suspend students. Some individual building sites, however, did use the alternative program in lieu of suspension. All study programs were multifaceted and were charged with preventing problems that lead to suspension in addition to acting as an alternative to suspension.

The descriptive nature of this study emphasizes the "what is" or state-of-the-art in the development of in-school alternative to suspension programs. It was not meant to be evaluative or to imply that one program, district, or building is superior to another. Each program responds to a unique set of site specific circumstances. Study findings that compare or contrast programs are presented to alert the reader to a point that seems significant in the conceptualization and/or implementation of an in-school alternative program. Similarly, data reported

from the student records review are presented to identify hypotheses and more precise research questions for future studies rather than to assess program worth.

It is likely that data generated by the student records review are not completely representative of students for whom the target programs served as alternatives to out-of-school suspension. The in-school alternative programs studied served students other than those who were referred in lieu of out-of-school suspension. It was not possible to isolate this subgroup in the sampling frame construction for in-school alternative program participants.

While it is assumed that individuals responsible for extracting data from student records did follow instructions and draw random samples, the same assumption of random selection cannot be inferred in the selection of students interviewed. Some degree of randomness in selecting teachers, non-participating students, and parents to respond to questionnaires was introduced during the second year of the study. However, the small number of responses by some of these groups precludes generalizing from the questionnaire data. Additionally, the individual building sites visited in districts with multiple sites were selected by the district. They may have been selected by district staff on the basis of convenience or as examples of sites that best met the program or study objectives. They did represent established programs designed to meet district and building needs.

Thus, project information from the study sample, is not applicable to all programs, nor can it be generalized to a total population. It was gleaned from districts and schools representing different geographic areas, socio-economic levels, enrollment patterns, and population groups.

III. PROGRAM SUMMARIES

This section provides a general, district wide overview of the programs selected for study during Phase II. Specific discussion of each program in the building sites visited and intensively examined are found in the case studies (Volume II).

The following definition of an in-school alternative to suspension programs has been employed in this study.

> An in-school alternative to suspension is a program to which students are referred in lieu of suspension from school or for accumulating offenses which may lead to out-of-school suspension. Such referral would constitute a disciplinary action; however, the program may include one or more of these: detention, counseling, academic work, work details, parent involvement, crises intervention. Students might participate for one or two periods, a few days, or in some ongoing manner (e.g., once a week for three months). Some schools which sponsor such programs also use home suspension as a disciplinary tool.

Garibaldi (1979) proposes a typology of programs serving as in-school alternatives to student suspension. These include:

- Time Out Room: A classroom or other facility within a school building where the student is assigned to "cool off" usually immediately following a classroom disruption. The student stays in this place only a short period of time, often less than one day.

- In-School Suspension Center: The student is assigned to the program for a specific offense, which in the absence of the program would have resulted in suspension or expulsion. The length of stay in an in-school suspension center ranges from one to three days.

- Counseling and Guidance Program: The program functions primarily as an extension of counseling services. Students can either be assigned to the program for specific offenses or can refer themselves for counseling.

There are other alternatives that sometimes exist as independent programs or which, on occasion, are components of larger programs. Among these alternatives are:

- Ombudsperson
- After School Counseling Clinics
- Hall Monitors
- Pupil Problem Teams

- School Survival Courses
- Work-Study Programs
- Saturday Schools and Evening School
- Peer Counseling Programs
- Alternative Schools

Many programs probably overlap into one or more types of alternatives. One example is found in the PASS Program (Positive Alternatives to Student Suspension) operated through All Childrens Hospital in St. Petersburg, FL and the Pinellas County Schools. Major activities of the PASS Program include: individual and group consultation for school faculties, affective education and personal development programs for students and teachers, time-out rooms, group and individual counseling for students experiencing serious interpersonal problems, as well as counseling for the parents of such students.

Two of the selected study sites had adapted components of the PASS Program to the disciplinary alternative implemented in their district.

INTERVENTION ROOM

School District A is located in the southern part of the United States and serves an urban area. The district boundaries are contiguous with the city and county boundaries, and the district serves a total student population as of October 1, 1979 of approximately 87,000. Of this population, eighty-four percent are minority students and sixteen percent are nonminority students. The city also has an extensive parochial and private school system that serves approximately thirty percent of the student population in the city or approximately 39,000 students. The private and parochial systems consist of sixty-five percent nonminority students and thirty-five percent minority students. The dominant minority group is Black.

There are 128 public schools in the city organized into five districts. Four districts are based on geographical boundaries within the city, and the fifth district includes most city-wide alternative schools and programs associated with institutions. The organization of the schools is generally in a K-6 elementary, 7-9 junior high, and 10-12 senior high pattern. However, some district areas have begun using a middle school organization, and there are some K-5 elementary, 6-9 middle schools, and 9-12 high schools in the city.

Intervention Rooms in School District A have been in existence since 1974. They are located in six schools in the district, two elementary schools and four middle schools, and they provide a supportive alternative to the regular disciplinary procedures and instructional efforts of the schools. They incorporate concepts and procedures used in Time-Out Room programs and Positive Alternatives to Student Suspension (PASS) programs. The Intervention Rooms are supported by Title XX funding, a source not commonly used by local educational agencies in the nation.

Goals and Objectives of the Program

The goal of the program is to reduce student suspensions that may lead to expulsions or drop-outs before the completion of high school. To accomplish this goal, the objectives of the program are to:

(1) separate the disruptive student from the classroom environment;

(2) provide a "cooling off" period for the student to reduce the probability of suspension;

(3) emphasize prevention of disruptive incidents through an identification process and concentration of program effort;

(4) experiment with different learning approaches and observe student reaction to behavioral change efforts;

(5) provide information to teachers and families on intervention methods that are successful in influencing desirable changes in behavior.

Incorporated into the Intervention Room Program are concepts and procedures used in Time-Out Room programs and the Positive Alternatives to Student Suspension (PASS) program. These concepts and procedures include:

(1) use of a "facilitative listener" to help students forecast consequence, explore alternatives, make decisions, and develop specific plans that will lead to more productive behavior in the regular classroom;

(2) use of professionals to provide individual and group consultation sessions to assist school faculties in the development of effective classroom management techniques;

(3) provision of assistance to parent(s) in developing communication and problem-solving skills to enhance family relationships;

(4) establishment of Time-Out Rooms;

(5) provision of individual counseling services to students with personal and interpersonal problems.

To assure effectiveness and success of the Intervention Room Program, philosophical and administrative support of the Principal was identified as a crucial element. Thus, School District A required that

the Principal request the program before site implementation could occur.

Program Staffing

Each of the Intervention Rooms in the participating schools is staffed by a Facilitator. The requirements for the Facilitator position as taken from the position vacancy notice include:

(1) a Master's degree, preferred but not required;

(2) a minimum of three years of successful teaching experience;

(3) ability to relate to teachers, aggressive students and parents;

(4) experience in individual and group motivation;

(5) philosophic commitment to development of self-discipline in students.

The duties of the Facilitator are:

(1) to assist individual students referred for a limited period to an intervention room for disruptive behavior;

(2) to provide regular group counseling sessions for students identified by principal and teachers as troublesome;

(3) to help teachers improve class management skills as related to individual needs;

(4) to coordinate efforts with and refer cases as needed to the Department of School Social Work;

(5) to help parents of disturbing youngsters acquire communication and attitudinal skills that will improve relationships in the home;

(6) to keep records as required.

External consultants are available to lend professional assistance to Facilitators and faculties of the participating schools.

Other Support Staffing

The Intervention Room Program cooperates closely with the guidance counselors and/or school social workers in the participating schools.

Students or families who need assistance beyond the scope of the program are referred to the Guidance and Social Work Services Departments in the schools and District. These departments also process referrals to other community agencies apart from the schools. The neighborhood surrounding the site observations has a settlement house that provides day care, recreational, mental health, family counseling, senior citizen, delinquency, bilingual, adult education, summer camp, and volunteer services under a single roof. School personnel are knowledgeable about these services and have frequent contact with the agency personnel delivering them. Program staff and administrators are well-informed about all disciplinary alternative programs operating within School District A. Utilization of other alternative programs is viewed as a valuable support tool for individual students with needs appropriate to other available alternatives. The needs of the student and family are emphasized in the Intervention Room Program, and administrative and program effort to identify and marshal resources to meet needs is encouraged.

Physical Space

The Intervention Room program requires a specific room assignment. The room must be able to serve at least fifteen students and the Facilitator comfortably at any one time. When the Principal of a building requests the program, space availability is an understood prerequisite.

Reasons for Placement

The Intervention Room program guidelines state that a student may be referred for services for the following reasons:

(1) The child is having difficulty in school;

(2) The child is disrupting the class to a marked degree and has not responded to the teacher's attempts to modify his behavior;

(3) The child's capacity to function in class is seriously impaired by some apparently acute personal crisis and the teacher is unable to reach the child;

(4) The child is engaged in a physical assualt;

(5) The child has a negative attitude toward school and school work;

(6) The child habitually leaves the classroom and wanders about the halls or building or leaves the school building--all without permission.

Within these guidelines, individual facilitators may develop other screening criteria and forms which meet the needs of the students and staff in individual buildings.

Referral Process

Referrals to the Intervention Room are made by the classroom teacher through the Principal under the program guidelines. In order to refer a child, the teacher must send the child through the Principal with a request for placement in the Intervention Room and with information identifying the student and describing the disruptive behavior. When the child is to be returned to the classroom, the Principal is so informed and the child is then returned to the classroom. The Intervention Facilitator is responsible for reporting any observations or findings that might help avoid recurrences of disruptive incidents to the appropriate school personnel. Within these parameters, program staff and Principals may design and implement procedures specific to the needs of the individual building.

Length of Placement

Program guidelines require that no student is to remain in the Intervention Room for more than three consecutive days. No limit is placed on the number of times a child is referred to the program, but no more than fifteen students may be in the Intervention Room during any one period of the school day. There seems to be little variation in length of placement guidelines from building to building.

The program as observed in two sites is deemed successful by students, staff, and administrators. Key elements to the success and effectiveness of the program as identified by those interviewed have also been identified in the literature of discipline by such authors as M. Hayes Mizell and Junious Williams. They include:

- Philosophical commitment of principal and program staff
  In the sites studied, the Principals and Facilitators believed that suspension was a reaction to symptoms that had no effect on the causes of inappropriate behavior. They viewed the program as a chance to change behavior of students and staff and were convinced that counseling techniques as opposed to punitive actions could reduce suspensions and improve the climate of the schools.

- Characteristics and qualifications of the program staff
  The Facilitators at both sites were trained counselors with extensive teaching experience at the age and grade level of the student population served. They were selected not only because of their paper qualifications, but also because of such humanistic characteristics as ability to relate to others, patience, respect for individuals, firmness in conviction, a caring nature, and a calm demeanor. No one interviewed felt that previous experience in the particular school was a crucial factor.

- Coordination of resources

  The availability of other support services and personnel such as social workers and counselors, and the accessibility of other alternative programs within the District and through community agencies were cited as important factors in an effective program. The commitment of School District A to seek causes and remedies based on cause requires cooperation and coordination of school and community resources. During a time of financial instability for schools, the ability of this district to access nontraditional funding sources has contributed to the success and tenure of new and alternative programs that are usually the first to be cut during a financial squeeze.

- Respect for due process

  While most schools have a due process procedure for students and parents, the commitment to informing and educating clients about the process varies widely. In School District A, all participants in the Intervention Room program must give written consent for service and acknowledge their right to due process. It may be argued that a signature is not informed consent, but it is also a signal that due process procedures are a concern of the school and that a program is not to be used to circumvent such procedures.

- Child advocacy commitment

  In both sites observed, the program staff were personally involved with students and their concerns. Contact with students did not end with a period or even a school day. The staff was involved as mediators with teachers, parents, students, and other agencies and as sympathetic listeners during evenings and weekends. At one site, the Principal and Facilitator represented a student when a residential change considered inappropriate by the student and school was proposed by another governmental agency. The Division of Child Advocacy and Instruction supports the efforts of schools and personnel who consider advocacy to be a proper role and function of education.

School District A has researched, piloted, developed and implemented programs in the priority area of discipline. These efforts, especially those observed in the Intervention Room program, have produced a sound basis for the District as they plan to reduce suspensions and improve the disciplinary climate and the public perception of

that climate in the schools. The lasting effects of such efforts and programs may be difficult to measure, but the staff of the sites observed have seen positive changes in behavior and feel certain they have touched individual lives in a beneficial way.

STUDENT TEMPORARY OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS (S.T.O.P.)

School District B is located in the middle of the country. The community it serves totals approximately 45,000 in population, is part of a larger socio-economic community of approximately 108,000, and is the seat of the county government. The economic base of the county consists of agriculture and agricultural-based industry, automobile-related industry, construction-related industry, education (a large university is nearby), and health-related services. There are three school districts in the county, and the boundaries of these districts are not contiguous with municipal boundaries. School District B has a total student population of 8,000 served by 13 elementary schools, grades kindergarten through six, three junior high schools of seventh through ninth grades, and one high school serving grades 10 through 12. Ninety-eight percent of the student population is nonminority, and two percent is minority, predominantly Black. Approximately forty-five percent of graduating seniors go on to some form of post-secondary education.

The initiative for S.T.O.P. began when the present Principal of the high school was one of the Assistant Principals responsible for discipline. A cadre of teachers decided that there were students who might be helped with their disciplinary problems through a one-to-one relationship with a teacher. The Teacher Advisory Program for Students (TAPS) was begun in 1976-1977. TAPS, while successful, did identify the need for a program that would provide more structured contact time and a process for follow-up. Research resulted in contact with the Florida program, Positive Alternatives to Student Suspension (PASS) developed by John Kackley.

The Positive Alternatives to Student Suspension (PASS) program has been in operation since 1972 in Pinellas County, Florida, and has been adapted or adopted by sites in 26 other states and 4 foreign countries. The purpose of PASS is to provide a sequence of intervention strategies designed to prevent or minimize nonproductive social behavioral acts on the part of secondary students.

Goals and Objectives of the Program

The primary goal of S.T.O.P. is to reduce out-of-school suspensions. To achieve this goal, two program components were implemented. They are the Survival Course and the Stop-Off Room. Each of these components includes goals and objectives.

The Survival Course is designed for students who have experienced frequent behavioral problems at school. Goals of the Survival Course are:

(1) to help the student understand that it is possible to survive in school and to receive positive feedback from teachers and other students.

(2) to help the student understand that it is necessary for him to accept the responsibility for assuming control of his life.

Specific objectives in Survival Courses are:

(1) to help students acquire the attitudes and skills necessary in order to achieve productive/acceptable social behavior at school.

(2) to help reduce the number and frequency of disciplinary referrals for students participating in the program.

(3) to help the student improve his academic standing through daily attendance and acceptable classroom behavior.

The Survival Course consists of regularly scheduled classes which are goal directed and focused on student strengths and specific target behaviors. The course outline includes materials and activities for twelve sessions based on the concepts of transactional analysis, role playing, reality therapy, and values clarification. Each session is one period in length and can accommodate six to eight students.

The Stop-Off Room is designed to provide an area in the school where a student, whose behavior is such that it is detrimental to the general school atmosphere or to the learning environment of a particular class, can be referred. While students are isolated from the mainstream of the school, the emphasis of the Stop-Off Room is to return students to regular classes as quickly as possible. The goal of the Stop-Off Room is to alter behavioral patterns and to improve self-discipline. Objectives developed to achieve the goal are:

(1) to permit an on-going learning situation within a strict structure of authority wherein students will be aware of the discipline being administered;

(2) to keep the student abreast of his class activities through cooperation between the STOP supervisor and the student's instructors;

(3) to help the student understand the rationale for of school authority;

(4) to reinforce positive study habits by structural supervision and instruction;

(5) to improve student achievement;

(6) to reduce drop-outs by making an effort to see that the student does not fall behind in school work.

(7) to reduce behavior problems;

(8) to insure more student success.

The Stop-Off Room is an adaptation of the Time Out Room from the PASS program and serves as an in-school suspension center in this program.

An Alternative Curriculum was designed and implemented for the student who is unable to continue in school for disciplinary reasons. Through a special program using State University High School Correspondence Courses, the student is provided the opportunity to continue an education. Assistance in the special program is provided by a S.T.O.P. teacher. The major goal of the Alternative Curriculum is to provide the student with the opportunity to exhibit an interest in continuing educational endeavors. Objectives designed to meet the goal are:

(1) to help the student understand that there are staff members interested in helping one achieve educational goals;

(2) to permit the student to continue to work toward high school graduation.

Program Staffing

Staffing arrangements for S.T.O.P. were designed by teachers who had participated in the Teacher Advisory Program for Students (TAPS). These teachers received PASS training through the NDN (National Diffusion Network) adaption process. The Stop-Off Room is staffed with six teachers, one for each period of the day. Assignment to S.T.O.P. is considered as one of the five teaching assignments in a full-time schedule. The teachers come from different disciplines and are able to provide academic tutoring in all curricular areas. Additionally, with six different teachers, the student has more choice in finding someone with whom a closer relationship can be developed.

A full-time teacher aide, a part of the staffing pattern for the Stop-Off Room, provides coordination and continuity to the program. Improved faculty acceptance of the program seems to have resulted from the staffing pattern as each department is represented in the program, and a member of the department is available to discuss discipline problems and solutions with their peers. The six Stop-Off Room teachers also provide academic assistance to students in the Alternative Curriculum component of the program based on their schedule in the Stop-Off Room.

Survival sessions are staffed by teachers who have been trained in the survival techniques of the PASS program. The course offered in the Survival sessions is scheduled as part of the regular instructional day for groups of six to eight students during their study hall time. A pool of approximately ten teachers has been trained and is available to provide staffing for the Survival sessions. There are no specific job descriptions, and the only prerequisite for participation is the completion of

training in program strategies and concepts. The selection process assumes that those who have volunteered to participate in training are those who are interested in relating to students and thus would be most successful in working with students in the program. No additional compensation for Survival teachers is offered.

Other Support Staffing

A major supportive role to the S.T.O.P. effort and the discipline climate of the school is provided by the Teacher Advisory Program for Students (TAPS). TAPS is designed as a positive approach to discipline. It is a one-on-one type of program in which a teacher who has volunteered is paired with a student who seeks entry into the program to receive help with three types of relationships: with self, with school, and with others. The program also provides an opportunity for a student to relate in a non-threatening situation with a teacher. The major goal of TAPS is to retain the student in school. TAPS predated the S.T.O.P. effort and continues to provide a service to students and to support the goals and objectives of S.T.O.P.

Physical Space

Implementation of S.T.O.P. requires a room that can provide comfortable space for a maximum of fifteen students, a teacher, and a teacher aide. Additional space such as a conference room that can be used for small group Survival Sessions during the day is also needed. The Coordinator of the program has an office appropriate for counseling and accessible to the area where student records and schedules and teacher mailboxes are located. Ideally, the Stop-Off Room should be nearby to facilitate communication.

Referrals to the Program

S.T.O.P. was initially designed to focus on students experiencing a crisis of some sort. Most often the crisis would result in an attendance or disciplinary infraction for which the student would be assigned by an assistant principal/disciplinarian to S.T.O.P. Crises of a personal nature could also result in a self-referral to S.T.O.P. Care was taken in the design of the program to not usurp the functions and role of the trained guidance counselor in the school to deal with student needs and concerns, thus S.T.O.P. does not begin to offer service until the regular guidance procedures have been utilized. As the program evolves, plans are being made to shift the emphasis of the program from crisis/remedial intervention to preventive/developmental activities as established through TAPS and other programs piloted through the related services framework.

Referral Process

The referral process and entry prerequisites vary with the type of service provided. Each component of S.T.O.P. has its own procedures. The Survival Course may be entered (1) voluntarily with the assistance of a counselor, (2) upon recommendation of a teacher, counselor or administrator, and/or

(3) as one component of a learning behavior agreement in order to stay in school. Entry to the Stop-Off Room is controlled by an assistant principal. Assignment is usually the result of disciplinary action or attendance problems. The Alternative Curriculum component is entered as a result of special problems such as expulsion, pregnancy, or dropping out. The student and parent(s) must see a guidance counselor to determine the course(s) to be taken and to complete the "Articles of Agreement" learning contract. The supportive TAPS service may be entered voluntarily by the student or the student may be required to enter TAPS as a follow-up procedure upon completion of the Survival Course or upon leaving the Stop-Off Room.

Length of Placement

Placement in the Survival Course is for six weeks with two sessions per week. Placement in the Stop-Off Room may be for one class period per day up to a full-time assignment. The maximum number of days a student may remain in the Stop-Off Room is not given in the program guidelines. The guidelines do state that the length of stay in the room is determined by the individual circumstances of each case. Prolonged isolation and segregation from the mainstream are described as detrimental to the student, and emphasis is placed upon returning students to regular classes as quickly as students can develop a plan to resolve their difficulties. No limit is placed upon the number of times a student may be assigned to the Stop-Off Room. If placement in the TAPS program is voluntary, the length of stay is determined by the student. If placement in TAPS is assigned, the length of stay is determined by the TAPS teacher and is usually a minimum of one semester. Courses in the Alternative Curriculum component are designed to be at least a semester in length. No limit is placed on the number of semesters a student may enroll. No age restrictions are stated, but students must show progress toward completing requirements for a high school diploma to remain in the Alternative Curriculum.

School District B has adapted the model PASS program from Flordia to meet the needs of the district at the high school level. Statistics compiled over a three-year period show a marked reduction in out-of-school suspensions.

The S.T.O.P. program has been designated as a state trainer for other districts who wish to adapt or adopt the PASS program. Through such recognition and evaluation data, S.T.O.P. is considered successful by parents, students, teachers, and administrators. Elements that seem to have contributed to the success of S.T.O.P. are:

- Integration of S.T.O.P. into the Regular Instructional Program

In the design and implementation of S.T.O.P., all of the resources in the regular program that are available to students but are not necessarily fully utilized have been assigned a role in solving disciplinary problems. Referral to the student's counselor is one of the steps in the disciplinary process, and counselors do counsel in School District B. In addition to the normal counseling role, the coordination of S.T.O.P. is assigned to a member of the Guidance Department. Scheduling, monitoring of attendance

patterns and academic achievement, and collection of evaluative data are familiar functions within a Guidance Department, and the expertise available has been coordinated for effective management of S.T.O.P. The standard complaint heard throughout the country that guidance counselors do paperwork and do not counsel is not valid in School District B and the S.T.O.P. model.

- Philosophical Commitment of Program Staff and Administration

Impetus for S.T.O.P. arose from teachers and an Assistant Principal/Disciplinarian who were concerned about students and wished to improve teacher-student relationships. A concern that all students need someone who will listen and to whom they can relate continues and is a key component of the services in S.T.O.P. The Assistant Principal has become the Principal of the school where S.T.O.P. is functioning, and strong administrative support of S.T.O.P. is evident to the program staff and faculty of the high school. "S.T.O.P.," in the words of the Principal, "is not a punitive program; it is a rehabilitative effort to help students improve their lives and keep them in school to complete their education." The program staff continues to seek other services, such as a Time-Out Room that adhere to the principle of providing a caring adult relationship for every student.

- Characteristics and Qualifications of the Program Staff

The staffing pattern of S.T.O.P. is viewed as crucial to the effort of improving the total disciplinary climate of the school as well as to providing rehabilitative service to students. Program staff were selected from teachers who originally volunteered their time based on a commitment to the principles of the program. The decision to use six teachers from different academic disciplines was a conscious effort to provide "change agents" who could increase faculty acceptance of the program and who could encourage behavioral change of their teacher-peers in classroom management and disciplinary strategies. As a result of this decision, no teacher association problems have been encountered, and other teacher-initiated pilot programs have begun to provide educational alternatives for students.

- Coordination of Supportive Services

When S.T.O.P. was designed and implemented, it was recognized that the immediate goal was to reduce suspension through a crisis/remedial intervention approach. It was also recognized that as the program developed the emphasis should shift to a preventive/developmental approach. New supportive services were initiated and existing services were coordinated with S.T.O.P. The Teacher Advisory Program for Students (TAPS) which had been in existence before S.T.O.P. began was linked directly to S.T.O.P. through a mandatory referral process. Other programs such as JOBS and the advisor-advisee plan for sophomores were begun to provide a framework on which preventive/ developmental services could be developed. Successful services in S.T.O.P. are being translated into supportive services for all students through the Self-Awareness Course, and the investigation into awarding credit for such developmental counseling is beginning to provide opportunity for the shift in emphasis previously planned.

• Preservice and Inservice Training Support

Extensive research and preplanning before the design and implementation of S.T.O.P. resulted in preservice training for the entire faculty of the high school on the concepts of disciplinary alternatives, reality therapy, and transactional analysis that form the basis of PASS. The preservice training served as an awareness activity for the new program, developed faculty acceptance and support, and encouraged interested teachers to volunteer for further training and service in the program. Follow-up training for the program staff and other interested teachers and supportive services staff has been provided annually by the PASS staff in Florida. With the designation of the program as a state trainer in PASS, ten staff members have received more extensive training and are now delivering technical assistance and training to other schools. The training model employed in the program has increased the sharing of new research, ideas, and techniques and prevented the routinization and stagnation of the program.

Student suspensions have been reduced through S.T.O.P. at the high school in School District B. The high school is committed to providing a caring adult for student-school relationships, and the district seems to have reinforced that commitment through its choice of an administrative leader for the school. Care, concern, and commitment of individuals may be the key in this district for an improved school climate.

IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION PROGRAM

School District C is located in the southern part of the United States. It serves an area of nearly 260 square miles which is incorporated into a municipality with an estimated population of 270,000 in 1979. The city has been named as the third fastest growing city in the country. The school population of the district totaled 55,000 students in sixty schools during the 1979-80 school year. The student population is approximately 90 percent nonminority and 10 percent minority, predominantly Black. The economic base of the community is in transition. Four military installations that employ 20,000 people are located within the city. The phenomenal growth of the area is converting land formerly used for agriculture to business and residential development. A large resort industry provides many service jobs on a seasonal basis.

The District has 41 elementary schools serving grades kindergarten through six, eight junior high schools serving grades seven through nine, and seven senior high schools serving grades ten through twelve. Additionally, there are special schools serving vocational-technical, special education, and gifted and talented students. A new Career Development Center opened in January of 1980 to serve students who need an alternative form of education that culminates in employment.

The In-School Suspension Program began as a pilot program in two schools during the 1975-76 school year. Seed money from the State Pilot Studies Program in the Division of Research, Evaluation, and Testing of the State Department of Education underwrote one/half the program cost. The Program

expanded in 1976-77 to five schools with continued State support, and in 1977-78 was adopted by all junior and senior high schools and was completely supported by local funds. Each school has an In-School Suspension Center that is a part of the disciplinary process and regular instructional program.

Goals and Objectives of the Program

The original impetus for the In-School Suspension Program arose from two Assistant Principals/Disciplinarians who were concerned about the number and the effect of out-of-school suspensions. With support from the Director of Program Development and Evaluation, they designed a proposal that had as its goal a test of the efficacy of in-school suspension as a replacement for traditional suspension in the public school. Objectives of the pilot program were:

(1) to reduce the number of out-of-school suspensions per year;

(2) to reduce the number of referrals to the Assistant Principal concerned with discipline;

(3) to determine what behaviors most generally lead to a student suspension;

(4) to develop a demographic-psychological profile of the suspended student;

(5) to determine the causes of student misbehavior;

(6) to influence in-school programs with the information compiled from other objectives that will help the misbehaving student develop a more positive attitude toward himself, toward attending classes, and toward learning.

Evaluation of the data collected from the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school years confirmed the efficacy of in-school suspension as a replacement for traditional suspension and as a positive disciplinary and corrective measure. Program objectives continue with no appreciable change to the present time.

Program Staffing

The In-School Suspension Center in each school is staffed by a full-time coordinator. During the first two years of the program, data were generated on the existing suspension center coordinators relevant to their formal training, work experience, length of employment, auxiliary duties, and attitude toward the role of coordinator. Profiles for each participant were developed. Success standards were established for the Program, and coordinators were evaluated relative to their performance in the role of coordinator. Coordinators judged as "successful" were interviewed and their profiles reviewed. Basic competencies and other criteria were identified for use in screening future suspension center coordinators.

Coordinators are hired at the building level and seem generally to have had teaching experience in School District C. The experience within the District is acknowledged to have increased the acceptance of the In-School Suspension Program in the building and in the District.

District Level Support

Before the 1976-77 expansion of the In-School Suspension Program, a three day preservice training for the coordinators was provided at the District level. Program guidelines and procedures were studied, and curriculum outlines for the interest inventory, social activities, values clarification, English, and mathematics were presented. In-service days during the school year were used to share materials and information and develop new materials. Further training for Coordinators has been provided through the Pupil Personnel Services Department on Glasser's reality therapy.

Physical Space

Each building participating in the In-School Suspension Program must provide a center or resource room appropriate for program activities and assigned students. No specific space requirements are mandated, and there are no maximum number of students to be served at any one time. One of the sites observed provided a mobile classroom for the Program while in other schools a classroom was assigned for the Program.

Reasons for Placement

By district policy, physical assault on a District employee, the sale of drugs on school grounds, and the possession of a weapon on school grounds are offenses punishable by expulsion. All other types of infractions are defined by individual school codes, and the consequences of infractions of the school code are at the discretion of the Principal and the administrative team. Most schools in District C suspend students out-of-school for drug use, but do use the In-School Suspension Center as an alternative for all other infractions.

Referral Process

The student enters the In-School Suspension Center after referral to the Coordinator by the Assistant Principal/Disciplinarian who sets the minimum length of time to be spent in the Center. The Coordinator contacts the teachers and counselor of the student. The counselor researches the scholastic record, test record, personal conference record, and parent conference record of the student and consults with any other appropriate support personnel as needed. Teachers evaluate the weaknesses, strengths, and interests of the student on a checklist provided for this purpose. The Coordinator meets with the counselor and other appropriate personnel to discuss and evaluate the student. The student enters the Center the day following the intial referral.

Program Operation Guidelines

Upon entering the In-School Suspension Center, students serving one day or the first day of a multi-day suspension will be scheduled for a conference with a counselor. Students will be required to do work assigned by the Coordinator from recommendations made by the Assistant Principal, counselor and teachers. The section of the curriculum designed for the Center that will be most beneficial in the attempt to foster a more positive behavior on the part of the referred student will be assigned. Students do not receive course credit for work completed during the time in the Center. Each student signs a contingency contract which must be completed prior to returning to regular classes. The contract outlines what specific assignments must be completed. The Coordinator determines if and when the contract is fulfilled. Students eat lunch at a time when no other students occupy the cafeteria and have a five-minute break during the morning session and another five-minute break during the afternoon session. All students referred to the Center for the first time are required to complete a Kuder General Interest Inventory and/or the Kuder Vocational Interest Inventory. Information obtained from the Interest Inventory along with other educational data can help develop an occupational profile for use by the student and Coordinator.

Exit Procedures

Students in the In-School Suspension Center return to regular classes after completion of assigned time and work. The Coordinator provides a report on the student to the Assistant Principal, the counselor, and each subject teacher. This report includes information on the general behavior of the student, work completed by the student, and general comments. A file is kept by the Coordinator on each student referred. A conference is held with the Assistant Principal, the student, and the parent(s) of the student prior to the student's return to class.

Length of Placement

There are no formal Program guidelines on the minimum or maximum length of stay in the In-School Suspension Center. The disciplinary needs of the students and each school affect the length of stay policy in each Center. The general practice has been a minimum of one day and a maximum of three days assignment to the Center. Some experimentation with specific assignment for periods of less than a day has begun to occur.

Findings from the original two-year pilot study of the efficacy of In-School Suspension as an alternative to the traditional suspension out-of-school showed a decrease of 18.6 percent in the suspension rate at the high school and a 9.2 percent decrease in the suspension rate at the junior high school. Thirty-eight percent of students in the experimental schools as compared to seventeen percent of students in the control schools reflected an improved attitude toward school. No significant gains in achievement were noted, and the drop-out rate fluctuated over the years of the study. Although not a planned effect of the study and collection of data, police

records did show an 85 percent reduction in daytime vandalism in the areas of the two experimental schools. These indications of success and the supportive attitudes of parents, teachers, and the community resulted in expansion of the In-School Suspension Program to all junior and senior high schools in School District C. Even though formal evaluation studies have not been continued, elements contributing to the continuing success of the program seem apparent.

- The Conceptual Foundation of the Model

Extensive research was conducted on disciplinary alternatives and other experimental programs throughout the nation. The results of the research, the assessed needs of the students and schools in the District, and the climate of the community were considered in the design of the In-School Suspension Program for District C. Implementation of the Program was conducted in phases that allowed formative evaluation data to be used effectively for the improvement and expansion of the Program. The commitment of the District to informed decision-making through planning, implementation, and evaluation has affected other educational efforts such as the Career Development Center and guaranteed the District success in educational programming and support of the community for its schools.

- Philosophical Commitment of Staff and Administration

An atmosphere seems to exist in School District C that encourages staff and administrators to develop solutions and responses to perceived and identified needs of the schools and students. Impetus for the In-School Suspension Program arose from the concern of two administrators that traditional out-of-school suspension provided no educational benefits to the school or students. The proposed solution to this problem was carefully researched, designed, implemented, and evaluated. When the Program was deemed successful, information was available to assist administrators and staff in expansion of the Program, but each school was allowed to make decisions on staffing and Program operation to meet the needs of the students in their school. By decentralizing Program decision-making, ownership of, and commitment to the Program principles are assured, and successful attainment of Program goals and objectives is more likely to occur.

- Characteristics and Qualifications of Program Staff

The careful consideration and evaluation of characteristics and qualifications needed by Program Coordinators reinforces the view of interviewees that the Coordinator is the key to the success of the In-School Suspension Program. Even though the profile developed informally from the pilot data has never been formally adopted by the District, the successful characteristics and qualities identified are used in screening procedures for new Coordinators by the individual schools. While prior experience in District C and/or the school was cited as a factor in the initial acceptance of the Program by the faculty of the school and the District as a whole, other characteristics and qualities such as consistency, dignity,

respect, and counseling knowledge are deemed more crucial to the success of the Program.

- Evaluation and Data Collection Efforts

Original evaluation studies identified shifts in attitudes and discipline problems in the schools and District C that affected the educational climate. Continuing data collection and analysis by some sites of the Program are useful in determining potential problems and changes that may be needed to improve not only the In-School Suspension Program, but also the regular instructional program. One site experienced a drastic increase in pupils assigned to In-School Suspension for tardiness. As a result of these statistic , faculty meetings were scheduled to discuss the tardy policy in the school, an administrative team conference was held to assess causes of the increase and to orient a new member of the team to the disciplinary philosophy and options of the school, and modifications of assignment practices to In-School Suspension such as a minimum assignment of less than a full day are being considered. Monitoring of the effects of the new attendance policy of District C is also being undertaken through statistical collection and analysis at some sites.

Statistical data and expressions of support from students, teachers, parents, and the community indicate that the In-School Suspension Program in School District C is successful. The success may be summed up better through one of the students interviewed, who after having been assigned to In-School Suspension five times during the 1978-79 school year before expulsion, returned to the high school this year and became an honor roll student. The student attributed this change in behavior to "the help my best friend, (the Coordinator), and the Principal gave me through listening and helping me understand myself."

IN-SCHOOL SUSPENSION/RESTRICTION ROOMS

Districts D, E, and F are considered as a set in this study. District D developed the initial in-school suspension--or in-school restriction, as it is called District F--that was adopted by the latter two districts during the 1979-80 school year.

All three districts are within the metropolitan area of a city located in the north central United States. Two of the districts are relatively small in size, ranging in pupil population from 3,000 to 7,000 students; both are experiencing declining enrollment; and each has a single in-school suspension program which serves both junior and senior high schools. In both instances, the ISS room is located at a senior high school.

The third district (F) is one of the five largest in land area in the state. It is the district located farthest from the central city area, but it is experiencing rapid growth as people move farther out in search of less expensive housing or a less crowded area. At present the district has one consolidated senior high and two junior highs, but the in-school referral program only serves grades 10 through 12.

While both District E and F's programs are basically modeled after that of District D, it is interesting to note that the new high school principal in District F had formerly been an assistant principal in the District D high school where the in-school suspension program was housed. There are contacts among districts in the area having in-school suspension rooms. The coordinator in District D has been quite generous in sharing his expertise with other districts wishing to start an ISS type program.

District D and the other spin-off sites were selected for inclusion in this study for two reasons:

- They appeared to be relatively inexpensive, effective programs which might appeal to the small school district.
- Districts E and F provided an opportunity to see how transportable the ISS concept was to a slightly different setting.

Goals and Objectives of the Programs

The basic goal of all three programs appears to be reduction in the number of out-of-school suspensions. In District D, this goal appears to have been accomplished. Districts E and F, which are in the first year of their programs, still use out-of-school suspension in serious or chronic cases. However, ISS/ISR provides, in the words of one administrator, "a positive alternative without which, the out-of-school suspension rate would undoubtedly be higher."

The other "goal" shared by the three programs was to develop an unpleasant consequence for student misbehavior. The ISS/ISR room is definitely punitive in its design. However, it is socially rather than academically punitive. In most cases it achieves the desired effect--deterrence of inappropriate behavior with no loss of academic standing. In fact, many of the students commented that the structure and quiet allow them to remain current or get ahead in their school work. For some students who have chronic school problems, the praise from a teacher which sometimes accompanies submission of an assignment completed in ISS is a positive spin-off of the ISS program.

Program Staffing

Each room is staffed by one male teacher. The common backgrounds of the ISS/ISR coordinators were interesting to note.

- Each is either a district graduate and/or a district resident.
- Each is involved in athletics as a coach.
- Each was selected by the interviewing committee on prior knowledge of the coordinator as either a student or a substitute teacher in the district.

- Each met stated selection criteria as:

  - firm, but fair;
  - understanding of student needs.

Each of the districts has a slightly different administrative line in controlling the ISS/ISR program. In District D, the coordinator is placed in a separate teaching category but is still subject to being bumped in the event of a major reduction in force (RIF). He reports directly to the building principal. The ISS coordinator in District E is protected from a RIF through a supervisory position classification. He reports directly to the Assistant Superintendent, but he also receives guidance from a committee of secondary school assistant principals. In District F the ISR coordinator is placed on the regular salary schedule and reports to the two assistant principals at the high school.

Other Support Staff

No support staff are directly involved in the ISS program in District D. When the coordinator must be away from the room, he arranges for a neighboring teacher to monitor it, or leaves a non-ISS student in charge.

Four hall monitors provide back-up coverage to the coordinator in District E. One covers the room while the coordinator transports students from other district secondary schools who are assigned to the ISS. A monitor also supervises lunch in the room so that the coordinator is able to get a half hour break.

In the event that the District E coordinator is going to be out of school for an entire day, students assigned to the ISS are either kept in their own buildings under supervision of the assistant principal, or supervised in the ISS by assistant principals from all of the secondary schools on hourly rotations.

The District F In-School Restriction room coordinator is covered during his lunch period by another teacher who is assigned that responsibility on a regular basis.

Physical Space

All programs are housed in standard single classrooms. Each room is housed in an area of the building somewhat removed from the mainstream of student traffic. Equipment consists of standard desks or tables. In most cases, at least one complete set of textbooks for each subject are placed in the room. A telephone has been installed in each of the rooms and greatly facilitates contact between the coordinator, parents, and other district staff. Each of the rooms has windows opening to the outside. Only in one situation were the blinds purposely drawn to isolate the students.

Reasons For Placement

Two of the districts, D and E, tended to place students in the ISS for serious offenses that in other districts automatically result in out-of-school suspension. These offenses fall into three categories:

- Alcohol/Drugs/Tobacco
- Truancy
- Discipline Related Offense

In these districts smoking by students was a major problem that served as a catalyst for implementation of the ISS. However, recent statistics show that truancy is rapidly becoming the major significant issue.

Alcohol and drug offenses represented a minor but significant reason for assignment to ISS. Discipline problems (e.g., insubordination) and smoking were shown to be the significant reasons for assignment to the ISS from the junior high.

Skipping school and smoking were the significant reasons for assignment in District F. Serious offenses (e.g., drug use or drug sale) still resulted in out-of-school suspension in most instances in District F. However, there were few incidents in these two areas.

Referral Process

An assistant principal makes the assignment to the ISS in all three districts. However, in District E we noted that most of the referrals to the central office come from the Hall Monitor.

Upon being assigned to ISS the student is either:

- sent directly to the ISS,
- sent home to parental supervision for the rest of the day, or
- held for the remainder of the day in the building office.

Entry into the program is accompanied by an intake interview conducted by the coordinator. At this time the student also selects specific ISS assignments and executes a behavior and work contract with the coordinator.

Upon initial assignment, the student's regular classroom teachers are contacted by form and asked to send classwork sufficient to cover the student's absence. Roughly half of the teachers actually send work. Sanctions for teacher non-compliance appear basically ineffective. The most effective strategy seems to be a direct call from the ISS coordinator to the teacher.

The work of each student in the room is monitored by the coordinator on an ongoing basis. Shoddy work is returned, and extra time is added for laxity. The coordinator attempts to provide assistance in basic skill areas. All contracted work (essays, reading assignments) and assigned classwork must be completed before the student is readmitted to the regular program.

An exit interview with the student is held when ISS assignment is completed. It focuses in part on what he/she learned from the ISS experience. While an informal file (primarily ISS related work) is maintained for each student assigned to the ISS, follow-up on individual students after they have left ISS is totally dependent on the individual coordinator. Most do not have time for it. Further, and this is in our minds one of the weaknesses of the ISS/ISR program, there is limited follow-up between the coordinator and the student's assigned guidance counselor. We believe such interaction would contribute to a further reduction in student offenses.

Length of Placement

Placement is usually two or three days for first offenses and longer--initially four or five days--for second and subsequent offenses. In all districts, but District F in particular, the chronic offender can face expulsion or exclusion if behavior doesn't significantly change after repeated assignments to the ISR/ISS.

Length of ISR/ISS assignment is the same for drug, alcohol and tobacco offenses. It would seem that the more serious offenses (e.g., drugs/alcohol) should include referral to a local or regional support group, formal counseling, or some type of abuse program as a condition of reentry.

In the three districts visited, it was not unusual to have students repeat ISS, but assignments longer than ten days at a given time were quite rare.

All coordinators have authority to assign up to five additional days for non-cooperation/non-performance by a student. However, in practice, rarely are more than one to two days added in this manner.

Program Effectiveness

While no formal evaluations are made by any of the three districts visited, it is possible to draw the following conclusions on program effectiveness based on interviews and observations.

- The programs have significantly reduced the number of out-of-school suspensions, particularly those for such offenses as truancy and smoking.
- The "punishment" of assignment to ISS is socially unpleasant to students and does deter most from committing repeat offenses.
- Contrary to the thought that they might "gain status" from assignment to the ISS at the senior high, junior high students find the experience particularly unpleasant since they are out of their element and generally not accepted by the high school students.

- While socially punitive, assignment to the ISS can generally be considered a positive academic experience. Students do gain positive reinforcement for work completed. There is some concern, however, that the ISS specific assignments can very easily become busy work, particularly when used as punishment for infractions of ISS/ISR rules.

- All three districts plan to continue the programs during the 1980-81 school year in spite of widely felt pressures to reduce or eliminate such "special programs."

SUMMARY

This section has presented descriptive summaries of the four programs examined during Phase II of the contract. Detailed case studies for each district are found in Volume II. The next chapter, Summary and Analysis, reports commonalities and contrasts in programs.

IV. SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

Building level data were generated during this study through unstructured interviews, direct observation of programs, a review of three samples of student records for the 1978-79 school year, and teacher, student, and parent questionnaires. Interview and direct observation data have been synthesized and categorized.

Data from the review of student records and questionnaires were in all four basic forms--nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio. Nominal and ordinal data for the three independent samples--students suspended out-of-school, students assigned to the in-school alternative, and students neither suspended nor assigned to the in-school alternative--were analyzed using the chi square (X^2) test for independent samples. Alpha (α) was set at .05 for rejection of the null hypotheses of independent measures. Goodman and Kruskal's tau (T) was computed for each significant chi square. In the statistical portion of the analyses the objective was to identify the degree to which knowledge of:

(a) A student's grade level, age or sex yielded a reduction in error in predicting assignments to one of the three sample groups (i.e., assigned to the in-school alternative, suspended, or neither suspended nor assigned to the in-school alternative).

(b) Group membership resulted in a reduction in error in predicting student grades, conduct marks or attendance.

Tau was selected as the measure of association because, unlike other measures of association--phi squared (Φ^2), contingency coefficient ($\hat{C}$), Tschuprow's $\hat{T}$, and Cramer's $\hat{V}$-- it can be meaningfully interpreted. For example, a Ty value of .25 indicates that using X as the predictor leads to a 25 percent reduction in predicting categories of Y. Values of T range from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating total independence and 1 implying total dependence of the two variables in the contingency table. As a general rule, the greater the variation in both the dependent and independent variable, the greater the numerical value of association. An additional advantage to Tau is that it is less sensitive than other PRE measures to variation within the contingency table.

Given the unequal sample sizes in the Records Review component of the study, all tables of observed frequencies were smoothed by percentaging the sample groups. Each cell was converted to percent values and these values were then treated as if they were raw frequencies. Percentaging effectively standardizes a variable because it assumes that the variable has exactly 100 cases. However, the proportional relationship between the variables remains the same.

In the instructions to the individual responsible for sampling student records in each building, the following sample sizes were requested:

- Students assigned to the in-school alternative program (n=50).
- Students suspended out-of-school (n=25).
- Students neither suspended nor assigned to the in-school alternative program (n=25).

The following completed, usable Record Review forms were received:

Site / Group	Students assigned to the in-school alternative	Students suspended out-of-school	Students neither suspended nor assigned to the in-school alternative
District A			
Elementary School	46	16	25
Middle High School	47	23	25
District B			
Senior High School	25	NA	25
District C			
Junior High School	50	25	25
Senior High School	48	20	30
District D			
Senior High School	36	NA	20
Junior High	12		5

In any data reduction exercise there is a risk of being lulled into a false sense of security through the application of statistical treatments. The student records data in this study are suspect as regards their quality and the possible lack of adherence to proper sampling conventions during data collection. Quantitative analyses have been performed not to hide this fact, but to identify areas where further analysis or more controlled follow-up research might be undertaken.

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted first to the narrative presentation of summary findings on the history, philosophy, structure and operation of the program visited. This will be followed by a general discussion of the quantitative data generated by the review of student records.

PROGRAM HISTORY

The four districts visited during Phase II of the study represent a range of program experience. Pilot disciplinary alternatives were initiated in 1972 in District D, 1974 in District A, 1975 in District C, and 1978 in District B. Impetus for the disciplinary alternative in three of the four districts can be traced to one or two individuals or a small group who were concerned over growing numbers of out-of-school suspensions and the ineffectiveness of suspension as a disciplinary action. An assistant administrator in charge of discipline was a common initiator in all three districts.

A somewhat different pattern of initiation was evident in the large urban district. At the central administrative level, a Division of Instruction and Child Advocacy headed by an Assistant Superintendent. is responsible for medical and health services, psychological testing, school social work, special education, and student discipline. This division responded to increasing numbers of out-of-school suspensions, truancies, and a public perception of disciplinary laxity by developing disciplinary alternatives to be implemented in city schools. The program under study was but one of several alternatives developed. Two of the four programs expanded after the pilot year(s) to include all junior and senior high schools in the district.

Concern about out-of-school suspension was a primary reason for creation of the programs stated in all four Phase II study sites. However, it was also evident that all of the districts studied and

five of the seven sites visited still employ out-of-school suspension as a disciplinary consequence. A majority of the sites did document and compare program services from year-to-year, but data on out-of-school suspension rates were generally not collected, analyzed, and compared routinely after the initial evaluation of the pilot year(s) of the program. In only two sites did the in-school suspension alternative replace out-of-school suspension. Another site was able to document a dramatic decrease in the use of out-of-school suspension. Other sites did express the feeling that their in-school alternative had reduced the use of out-of-school suspension, or at the very least slowed its increase.

Disciplinary policies and practices varied widely from district to district and from school to school within districts. Three of the four districts had written disciplinary codes in force. Two of the four disciplinary codes prescribe disciplinary actions for specified infractions, and all three district codes describe guidelines for actions that may occur upon rule infractions. Distribution of the district codes vary from required mailing to all parents, students, and administrators to an orientation for students to the code by homeroom teachers. All of the district codes were subject to review with varying amounts of parent and student involvement. One district had a mandated review process that required building committees of parents, students, teachers, and administrators to meet four times yearly to discuss disciplinary matters and recommend revisions to the district code.

All of the sites visited had building disciplinary codes that conformed to state and federal law and district policy where applicable. All of the building codes mentioned due process rights, and in one district, all building codes contained a detailed grievance process.

All of the sites used in-school suspension to some degree to affect truant and tardy students. In two of the four districts, offenses such as fighting, substance use or possession, and smoking remained as out-of-school suspension infractions at the discretion of the building administrator. The other two districts used the disciplinary alternative program as a component of a continuum or hierarchy of disciplinary actions available to disciplinarians.

All of the districts displayed a flexibility in determining the use of in-school suspension as student populations and community standards changed. For example, in one district where substance possession was supposed to result in immediate out-of-school suspension, one site visited was experimenting with using in-school suspension for the first substance possession offense.

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY AND GOALS

Three of the four programs studied had written program goals and objectives. All of the programs had a major goal, whether written or inferred, of reducing or replacing out-of-school suspension with a more constructive alternative. None of the study districts had a written statement of program philosophy, and those with written program goals and objectives did not disseminate them beyond program staff and supervisors.

While no written statements of program philosophy were found, discussions and observations enabled researchers to determine inherent philosophical assumptions. Two of the four programs viewed their role as one of treatment of disciplinary problems, one program emphasized prevention of such problems, and one program tried to combine prevention and treatment functions. One expressed goal of the latter program was to move toward a greater prevention effort. Those programs that were based on treatment also relied on punitive measures such as strict supervision and student isolation in implementing the alternative program. The program based on prevention relied much less on punishment and emphasized interpersonal skills and development not only for students, but also for faculty. The program that combined treatment and prevention used the "stick" of treatment first and "the carrot" of prevention last in its efforts. Program staff were not satisfied with the arrangement and were hoping to modify the program through an earlier emphasis on interpersonal development.

Specific program objectives available in three of the districts had been formulated before initiation of the pilot effort to obtain Board or administrative approval and a funding commitment. They remained as they were initially written even though in two instances program modification had occurred.

Internal program evaluations based on goals and objectives had occurred in all of the study districts. The frequency and timelines of the evaluations depended upon the funding source and level of administrative responsibility for the program. Three of the programs evaluated statistical data yearly, and one of these three included staff, student, and parent perceptions of program efforts. One program conducted a formal, thorough evaluation of the program's pilot years but has done no other evaluation since that time even though the programs expanded to all secondary schools. All of the program evaluations examined were positive and documented successful achievement of the major goal. Use of the district evaluations to modify specific objectives was infrequent. Building site evaluations were used in four of the seven sites to modify program implementation at an individual site.

PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Although formal lines of authority and accountability varied in the four study districts, the building principal exerted the most influence on the operation of the disciplinary alternative at each site. This finding reemphasizes other current research that identifies the building principal as the key to effective implementation of any educational program. Even in those districts that did not involve principals in the planning and evaluation of the program, guidelines and procedures were flexible enough to allow the principal to modify the program operation to match the school needs and climate.

Two of the four programs vested some coordination and supervisory responsibilities in the central administrative office, but these programs also required a request from a principal to establish the alternative on-site and a measure of control over staffing assignments. District A supported six program sites with a Supervisor and a Coordinator in a division headed by an Assistant Superintendent. These individuals were responsible for monitoring and preparing financial and service evaluations required by the federal funding source. Additionally, they coordinated consultant assistance and staff development activities for all sites and were responsible for the integration and coordination of the program with other alternative efforts and curricular development in the total district.

In District C, an individual in the Central Office assigned to pupil personnel services provides support for the program sites through staff development activities. This individual has no supervisory or reporting responsibilities for the program.

In the two districts with no central office support, the program is responsible to the building principal who reports to the Superintendent. In one instance the line of responsibility is through the Director of Guidance who serves as program coordinator.

All of the Phase II study programs were controlled by the school systems. Those programs with written goals and objectives stated formally the importance of coordination with community services. In practice, the coordination and linkages that occurred were dependent upon the personal philosophy, efforts, and relationships of the program staff with their community agency counterparts.

PROGRAM OPERATION

Within this area of analysis, key subtopics to be addressed include staffing, program emphasis, program support, the referral process, day-to-day operation, participant follow-up, and program evaluation.

STAFFING

All of the four study programs used credentialed teachers as program staff. The overriding criterion in staff selection was an ability to relate positively to student, teachers, and parents. Counseling skills were another important requirement, but a degree or certificate in counseling was not necessary in any of the programs to meet that requirement. One program, during the pilot years, gathered data on in-school suspension coordinators relative to their formal training, work experience, length of employment, auxiliary duties, and attitude toward the role of coordinator. Profiles for each participant were developed, and success standards were established for the program. Coordinators were then evaluated on their performance; those judged as "successful" were interviewed, and their profiles were reviewed. Basic competencies and other criteria were identified through the evaluation process for use in screening future coordinators. Since responsibility for hiring coordinators is vested in the building principals, it was difficult to determine the importance of the profile in the selection process on a district-wide basis.

Three of the four study programs were staffed by teachers with experience at the program sites. There was general agreement among interviewees of these three districts that teaching experience within a site prior to initiation of the alternative program did foster greater acceptance of the disciplinary alternative by students, teachers, and parents. However, interviewees in all districts also stated that the personal qualities and style of the program staff were the most critical factors to program acceptance.

Integration of in-school alternative programs into the total school program was generally viewed as successful in the four Phase II study districts. Two of the study districts specified procedures to assure maximum integration, and one district, through its staffing configuration, ensured wide staff exposure to the program. One study site used the alternative program to address not only the needs of students, but also provided counseling, materials, and strategies to meet staff needs.

All of the Phase II study sites were remarkable for the staff stability in their alternative programs. None of the staff in sites that had a program in operation for four years or more had less than three years experience in the program site.

Three of the four districts assigned one full-time staff member to each program site. The other district assigned a full-time certified aide to complement a staff of six teachers assigned to the program. These six teachers represent all academic disciplines and are assigned to the alternative program for one period each day as part of their

teaching load. The aide provides coordination and continuity throughout each day. The other three programs have no support staff assigned to the program.

PROGRAM EMPHASIS

Academic and counseling assistance were a combined emphasis in three of the four programs studied. The other program emphasized counseling as its main service, although some academic assistance was provided, at times, as part of an individual student counseling plan.

The nature and range of academic assistance varied widely in three study programs. The program with a rotating staff provided excellent tutorial service in all academic areas each day. Regular faculty cooperation in providing specific assignments was excellent, perhaps due in part to the presence of department colleagues on the program staff. One program combined academic assistance on regular school assignments with academic work related to the specific infraction causing assignment to in-school suspension. For instance, students assigned for smoking infractions are required to write an essay describing why smoking is hazardous to one's health and read and discuss the book, How To Stop Smoking. The third program requires assigned students to complete an in-school suspension contract based on a specific in-school suspension curriculum. This curriculum includes written descriptions (1) of the incident leading to suspension, (2) of the incident from the viewpoint of another person, (3) of a dialogue between the student and parents during a readmittance conference, (4) of how such an incident could be avoided or handled differently in the future, and (5) of effective disciplinary strategies that encourage self-discipline. Additionally, students must complete at least one learning packet designated by the coordinator. Nine learning packets have been developed that include exercises on self-discovery, interests, math, English, consumer education, values clarification, employment, and social activities. If regular teachers provide assignments, completion of classroom work is mandatory before readmittance to regular classes. However, the alternative curriculum receives precedence, and no credit is earned for regular classwork. Since this district has adopted a new attendance policy that mandates loss of graduation credit after a specified number of absences, a reevaluation of the alternative curriculum policy may be needed.

A range of counseling services and techniques was also evident in the four study programs. The two programs based on a punitive philosophy provide individual counseling by the program coordinator during the course of each day and group counseling activities by the coordinator when appropriate. Interestingly, in these two districts, the alternative program coordinator seems to replace the regular school

counselor for many students assigned to the program even after their return to regular classes. In the program that combines punishment and prevention, counseling is provided in a group setting of one period twice a week for six weeks. These group sessions constitute a structured course that is goal directed and focused on student strengths, weaknesses, and specific target behaviors. Techniques used in the course are based on transactional analysis, role playing, reality therapy, and values clarification. Since this program is coordinated through the Guidance Department, counseling efforts by the program staff are supported by school counselors and regular staff involved in other guidance programs.

The study site that emphasizes prevention provides intensive counseling services for students, staff, and parents. Group and individual counseling occur, and the counseling techniques vary according to the training and personal style of the Facilitator. Behavior contracts, values clarification, reality therapy, transactional analysis, and activities designed around Adlerian theory are all used to develop decision-making skills and feelings of self-control and self-worth. Program staff at this site collaborate closely with school counseling and social services and community agencies and programs. An emphasis on child advocacy stimulates cooperation and coordination of all available services. If academic assistance is required, the program staff identifies the most appropriate source for such assistance and coordinates the service.

PROGRAM SUPPORT

Program support can be divided into three basic components: space, material resources, and human resources. All of the four programs operated in a designated space with full-time staff. The space was usually a regular classroom within the main school building. In one district, detached mobile classrooms were used for the alternative program. None of the space configurations were considered to significantly enhance or inhibit the operation of the programs studied. The site using detached mobile classrooms felt that the physical isolation reinforced the social isolation imposed by the program. Program staff at one site did express a desire to be nearer the central office area to improve the coordination of the alternative program with the regular school administrative and guidance functions. All rooms in the study sites appeared to be adequately equipped to support program goals.

Material resources and the cost effectiveness of programs are difficult to define. In general, costs of the four study programs were expressed as salary of full-time staff assigned to the program. Variations in district salary schedules and experience of program

staff are reflected in the range of $20,000 - $30,000 per program site. Supplies and equipment for most programs are usually a part of regular building funds. Three of the four programs were supported entirely by local funds. One program used federal funds and matching local funds for program support and did include materials, consultant services, and administrative support in a total program budget. Two of the districts had also received initial seed money from state or federal resources to pilot the program for one or two years before local funds became the sole source of support.

Computing a unit cost per student served by the programs could be misleading because of the differing service delivery configuration found in each site. One district had a computer capability and data available to provide a unit cost for the alternative program and other disciplinary alternatives for comparative purposes. However, there were no plans to perform such analyses. Likewise, districts receiving state aid based on average daily attendance (ADA) did not compute the extra benefit accruing due to increased attendance provided by the alternative program. This could be a significant amount in larger districts with high suspension rates and could be used to offset some of the cost of the alternative program.

Human resource support systems necessary for an in-school alternative program exist in most school districts. Counselors, teachers, administrators, and community agencies, both public and private, can provide valuable knowledge and services to enhance alternative program efforts. The key to full utilization of existing human resources seems to reside in the planning process for the alternative program. If people understand the program philosophy, goals and objectives, and operation, they are more likely to commit their time and services more actively. New and creative linkages with individuals and organizations can be formed to assist students and program staff. In all sites visited, program staff had volunteered for or accepted extracurricular responsibilities as a way of maintaining relationships with colleagues and students outside the scope of the alternative. One staff member said, "I have to have contact with students who have no disciplinary problems to keep a healthy perspective on schools and students." Staff "burn-out" in the study programs was not a problem which may have been due to the availability of supportive interpersonal relationships.

While extensive and expensive district level support systems were not considered necessary for successful operation of an in-school alternative to suspension program, districts with six or more building sites may need to provide a district monitoring and communication system to collect and use data associated with the program for evaluative purposes.

REFERRAL PROCESS

A smoothly functioning referral process is crucial to the success of an alternative program. It provides a control that keeps the program from being used inappropriately as a "dumping ground" and assures that the services offered reach those who would benefit most from them. Five of the eight individual program sites required coordination and approval of the principal or other designated administrator for program entry. Those programs that used punishment through isolation as a treatment for disciplinary problems were characterized by administrative control of assignment. In the three sites where prevention was emphasized, teachers, parents, and students, themselves, could make a direct referral to the program without administrative coordination. The overriding decision in these sites was based on the appropriateness and potential benefit to the student of the service. Release from the program followed the same pattern, but it was characterized by more active consultation among affected parties. The formality of the referral process seemed to be directly dependent upon the administrative style of the building principal rather than on any written guidelines or procedures.

Formal parental involvement in the in-school alternative assignment and release process was usually limited to a letter of notification or personal conference prior to assignment and/or after completion of the assignment. Two of the programs did provide group discussions and counseling for parents upon request. If parents objected to the alternative assignment, other options ranging from out-of-school suspension to other alternative programs were provided. Response rates to the questionnaires mailed to parents were too low to provide data on parental perceptions of alternative programs. Parents who did respond seemed satisfied with their children's experience in the program but were unable to identify specific effects that were helpful to their children or themselves. The level of parental involvement seemed most dependent on the commitment and style of the program staff and building administrators. Access to a telephone was cited by all program staff as the one thing most helpful in maintaining parental contact.

DAILY PROGRAM

In analyzing the in-school alternative daily program, it is necessary to divide the building sites into two groups:

- Full-time assignment--4 buildings
- Part-time assignment--3 buildings

In those buildings where a student is assigned to the in-school alternative program full time, most students enter the program on the

day of the actual offense or on the day following the offense. An intake interview is conducted by the program staff. During this interview, the reason(s) for the student's assignment to the program are discussed, and the program rules and restrictions are reviewed.

When a student is assigned to the program, regular classroom teachers are contacted, either by the central office in the building or by the program staff, and requested to send the student's assignments to the program staff. These assignments are completed during the term of the assignment and are returned to the classroom teacher for grading and recording. Classroom teachers are expected to provide assignments for the duration of the student's stay in the alternative program. Satisfactory completion of the assignments is a condition for the student's release from the program. Teacher cooperation in providing and grading assignments is crucial to the success of the in-school alternative academic component.

During the assignment period, students are expected to report directly to the in-school alternative facility at the beginning of each day. In those programs that service students from other school buildings, arrangement for transportation to the program site is the responsibility of the student's building principal. Transportation difficulties may limit the program's effectiveness for some buildings in some districts.

While assigned to full-time programs, students are restricted from participation in some school activities. Restrictions usually apply to extracurricular activities, such as dances and athletics, and socializing during lunch and classbreaks. Removal from a school's social life is considered a major deterrent to repeat offenses by program staff, administrators, and some students.

All full-time sites had some type of daily counseling activity. Activities varied from formal group discussions and multi-media activities to individual student conferences and behavioral modification activities. Most program staff members are quite sensitive to informal contacts that can be used for counseling reinforcement during each day. Unstructured, independent time is often used as a reward for satisfactory progress.

Length of assignment varied by building site and according to student offenses and needs. Minimum assignment to a full-time program was one day and the maximum assignment ranged from three days to an indeterminate amount with an average of approximately three days across all full-time sites. All full-time sites acknowledged potential deleterious effects of prolonged student isolation and the stigma attached to in-school alternative assignment. However, perceptions on the actual existence of a stigma varied greatly among staff and students. Some denied a stigma existed and stated that such a stigma might have a positive effect as a deterrent. Others did feel full-time assignment was a negative "labeling" of students and were considering ways to avoid it.

Those sites that assigned students to the alternative program part-time varied in day-to-day operation. In one site, students were in the same room with students assigned full-time and followed the same schedule for the period(s) they were assigned.

In the other two sites, students were assigned individually and by groups for certain periods during a day or week. Program staff consulted with building administrators and regular teachers on program and student scheduling. Time for program staff to plan and consult with school personnel and parents was included in each daily schedule. In extremely rare instances at one site, students could be assigned full time for no more than three days if everyone concerned felt it the most beneficial and appropriate placement for the student.

Part-time assignment generally met student needs through providing counseling activities, time for empathetic listening, and supervision and structure when self-discipline was lacking. Restrictions on extracurricular activities or social exchanges were not usually placed on students assigned part-time. Students, staff, and administrators also agreed that no stigma seemed to be attached to part-time assignment. One student who attended a structured counseling activity two times a week at the site where full-time and part-time assignment coexisted routinely did feel that "kids look at me funny when I go to counseling." When asked to elaborate on that response, the student suggested that other students probably thought she was assigned to the room for in-school suspension.

Length of assignment to a part-time in-school alternative varied from a minimum of one period for one day to a maximum of one period every day for a school year. No average length of assignment could be calculated.

Class size among the four programs varied as a function of program type and facility. Full-time programs generally accommodated a maximum class size of 20 to 25 students. None of the programs reported any problem staying within the limit. Part-time programs limited class size to no more than 15 students per period. While this limit was perceived as realistic, some program staff were concerned that students who could benefit from part-time service should be accommodated without limit.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

In the records review component of the study, data were secured and analyzed to, among other things, examine the following relationships:

- Grade level by sample group (i.e., assigned to the in-school alternative program, suspended out of school, neither suspended nor assigned to the in-school alternative).

- Sex by sample group.
- Race by sample group.
- Sample group by grades.
- Sample group by grade retention.

For each of the contingency tables derived from the above nominal or ordinal data sets for a given district, chi square (χ^2) values were computed. For each significant χ^2, various measures of association (lambda, tau) were also derived. In tables IV-1 through IV-5, the data from individual contingency tables for each building site where record review data were collected are summarized. Given the wide range of variation within most of the contingency tables, tau is the preferred measure of association.

TABLE IV-1

GRADE LEVEL BY SAMPLE GROUP

		df	χ^2	λ_y	λ_x	T_y	T_x
District A	Elementary Site	12	81.312*			.0481	.1387
	Middle School Site	4	27.412*			.0681	.0461
District B	High School Site	2	15.108*	.0360	.6231	-	-
DISTRICT C	Junior High Site	4	47.753*			.0622	.0713
	High School Site	4	18.657*			.0313	.0314
DISTRICT D	High School Site	5	38.007*			.0348	.1750

* $p < .05$

TABLE IV-2

SEX BY SAMPLE GROUP

		df	χ^2	λ y	λ x	T y	T x
District A	Elementary Site	2	.389*	-	-	.0013	.0007
	Middle School Site	2	8.634*	-	-	.0347	.0315
District B	High School Site	1	41.087*	-	-	.2054	.2054
DISTRICT C	Junior High Site	2	57.416*	-	-	.2297	.0948
	High School Site	4	34.216*	-	-	.0944	.0576
DISTRICT D	High School Site	1	.086*	-	-	.004	.004

* $p < .05$

TABLE IV-3

RACE BY SAMPLE GROUP

		df	χ^2	λ_y	λ_x	T_y	T_x
District A[1]	Elementary Site						
	Middle School Site						
District B[2]	High School Site						
DISTRICT C	Junior High Site	4	19.880*	-	-	.0338	.0331
	High School Site	6	9.182*	-	-	.0068	.0154
DISTRICT D[2]	High School Site						

* $p < .05$

1 over 95 percent of students black
2 over 95 percent of students white

TABLE IV-4

SAMPLE GROUP BY GRADES

		df	χ^2	λ_y	λ_x	T_y	T_x
District A	Elementary Site	6	157.152*	-	-	.5078	.5594
	Middle School Site	8	50.704*	-	-	.0535	.0866
District B	High School Site	3	26.003*	-	-	.0454	.1328
DISTRICT C	Junior High Site	4	72.548*	-	-	.1211	.1234
	High School Site	6	96.673*	-	-	.1095	.1632
DISTRICT D	High School Site	3	67.203*	-	-	.1482	.3377

* $p < .05$

TABLE IV-5

SAMPLE GROUP BY GRADE RETENTION

		df	χ^2	λ y	λ x	T y	T x
District A	Elementary Site	2	38.612	-	-	.1291	.0647
	Middle School Site	2	48.406	-	-	.2025	.1275
District B	High School Site						
DISTRICT C[1]	Junior High Site	2	73.143	-	-	.3035	.1864
	High School Site	2	20.171	-	-	.0889	.0611
DISTRICT D	High School Site[2]						

All but two of the X^2 values--both in Table IV-2--demonstrated significance at the .05 level, and thus a dependent relationship between the two variables. However, in considering the magnitude of the X^2 value, one must allow for the effect of percentaging the contingency tables, which effectively increased the cell size and overall N but maintained the proportional relationship among cells.

The more meaningful statistic is tau, which gives an indication of the degree of association between the two variables in the contingency table. Tau is a proportional reduction in error (PRE) measure. It is interpreted as follows:

- In table IV-1 the tau values for District A--Middle School site are Ty = .0681; Tx = .0461.
- The first value: Ty = .0681 indicates that using variable x (Grade Level) as a predictor results in roughly a seven percent reduction in predicting categories of variable y (Sample Group).
- The second value: Tx = .0461 indicates that using variable y (Sample Group) as a predictor results in roughly a five percent reduction in predicting categories of variable x (Grade Level).
- Thus, while the interrelationship of the variable has been conferred by the chi square analysis, no clear pattern of dependence has emerged on these variables for this particular site.

In all tables the first variable of the table heading is the x variable and the second is the y variable.

However, it should be cautioned that measures of association by themselves do not prove the relative explanatory power of variables. Their impact upon each other is also a function of the relationship of each variable to other, often unmeasured variables. Therefore, the tau values should be used very conservatively as gross indicators of association around which perhaps more focused research might be constructed. No explanatory importance should be attached to these statistics.

Table IV-6 is a frequency distribution of tau values.

TABLE IV-6

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TAU VALUES

Measure / f	Ty	Tx
.005-.009	1	0
.01-.049	6	5
.050-.099	5	6
.10-.19	4	7
.20-.29	3	1
.30-.39	1	1
.40-.49		
.50 and above	1	1
TOTAL	21	21

Values for tau appear to show weak to moderate relationships. Prior to an analysis and based on our review of the literature, it was hypothesized that:

- In senior high schools, students in lower grades would tend to have a higher rate of either out-of-school suspension or assignment to the in-school alternatives program.
- Male students would be more likely than female students to be assigned to the in-school alternative or suspended out-of-school.
- Non-white students would be disproportionately assigned to out-of-school suspension or to the in-school alternative program.
- Participation in a particular group (i.e., suspended out-of-school, assigned to the in school alternative) will influence a student's grades.
- There will be a relationship between being held back a grade (student retention) and participation in a particular group.

Inspection of Tables IV-1 through IV-5 shows individual buildings where these assumptions are supported, but the support is not consistent either in direction or magnitude throughout any one table. The only possible exception is found in Table IV-5 where the pattern in all

four sites for which data were reported suggests a weak to moderate relationship between group membership and student retention; that is, knowledge of a person's group membership (i.e., in-school alternative, suspended) tends to slightly reduce error in predicting whether or not a student will be retained in grade.

PROGRAM FOLLOW-UP AND EVALUATION

None of the programs visited had any systematic, formal procedure for following students after assignment to the in-school alternative program. Staff in all programs reported a number of students who maintained personal contact with staff on their own initiative and others with whom the staff initiated a continuing relationship.

V. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

After two years' research, the question regarding impact of in-school alternatives to suspension on out-of-school suspension rates remains unresolved. An absence or paucity of reliable and valid disciplinary data in schools and districts studied and surveyed suggests that before this question can be answered, a broader understanding of educational record keeping systems must be gained by educators and researchers alike. Problems in this study caused by the quality of quantitative measures on students and student performance and the inability to control situational and assignment factors should be considered in future research study designs.

Study findings do suggest an area in need of further research. All study programs were viewed by educational personnel as preventive in nature regardless of the stated objectives or philosophy of the program. Since most disciplinary actions originate in the classroom and are controlled by administrative staff, further ethnographic research concentrated on the disciplinary referral process would be highly recommended. Such factors as administrative leadership, classroom management practices, and disciplinary code formulation that affect the disciplinary referral process should be considered in hypothesis development.

If in-school alternatives are to serve a preventive function, they may need to do more than treat symptoms manifested by students. The causes and complexities of disciplinary offenses should be identified and understood. Recent and current research on effective schools should be compared with results of research on discipline to determine if guidelines for successful school programs and practices can be developed to apply to all facets of a school community.