DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 567 EC 307 153

AUTHOR Tenney, Mark G.
TITLE The Effects of Block Scheduling on Students with Emotional Behavioral Disorders and/or Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder.
PUB DATE 1998-11-11
NOTE 153p.; Master's Thesis, Notre Dame College.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Attention Deficit Disorders; *Behavior Disorders; *Block Scheduling; *Emotional Disturbances; Performance Factors; School Schedules; Secondary Education; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; *Time Factors (Learning)

ABSTRACT

This study discusses the outcomes of a survey of 23 educators from 19 high schools on a block schedule in New Hampshire. Educators from each school were asked their perceptions of the effects of the block schedule on students identified as having emotional/behavioral disorders and/or attention deficit-hyperactivity disorders (ADHD) in comparison to the regular education students. The responses were concerned with the effect of the schedule on the special education students' level of performance. Educators were asked to delineate the positive and negative aspects of the block schedule. On average, regular education and vocational/technical teachers viewed the students with emotional behavioral disorders and/or ADHD as demonstrating no change or improvement in their performance while maintaining a satisfactory current level of performance. Administrators problems caused by dysphagia, causes, how it is treated, research that is and special educators saw a more negative effect. Special education teachers had concerns about the ability of students to sustain attention for a 90-minute period and stressed the need to structure the class time. (Contains 57 references.) (Author/CR)

The Effects of Block Scheduling on Students with Emotional Behavioral Disorders and/or Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder

By

Mark G. Tenney

Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillments of the requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Emotional and Behavioral Disorders

Notre Dame College, 1998

The Effects of Block Scheduling on Students with Emotional Behavioral Disorders and/or Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder

By

Mark G. Tenney

Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillments of the requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Emotional and Behavioral Disorders

Notre Dame College, 1998

Nancy R. Cook, Ph.D. — 11/30/98

Major Professor — Date

Committee Member — 11/11/98 — Date

Committee Member — 11/11/98 — Date

Acknowledgements

This thesis was undertaken more by accident than by design. The seed was planted two years ago during graduate level class discussion of how instructional methods and school organization impact students with emotional behavioral disorders. I made a simple comment about what effects the block schedule might have on these students. Laura Wasielewski, the department chair for the EBD program and instructor, for the class responded that she did not know, but that it would be a very timely topic for a research project. Several times over the next few months we spoke about it, but I was not sure that I wanted to write a thesis. While in the research seminar class I decided that I would give the thesis a shot. The rest, as we say, is history.

I would like to thank Laura Wasielewski, Kelly Moore-Dunn, and Larry Bourgoine for their ongoing support and encouragement. Their desire to see the finished project kept me going by knowing that this research was important and could make a difference. Two school administrators, Principal Alan Chmiel of Fall Mountain Regional High School and Assistant Principal Dr. Robert Lister of Portsmouth High School provided me with general encouragement and support without which this would have been a far harder task than it was.

Special thanks goes to Dr. Nancy Cook without whom this thesis would still be a "maybe someday I'll do something like that" dream. The time, counsel, guidance, and commitment on her part was truly impressive. The teaching and mentoring which happened along the way was of inestimable value.

Finally, to my family who understand that my obsessive characteristics went into overdrive. They understand the rest of the reasons why I did this. "Enuf said!"

Abstract

This study presents the results of a survey of educators (n=52) from the 26 high schools presently on a block schedule in New Hampshire. Five educators from each school were asked their perceptions of the effects of the block schedule on students identified as having emotional/ behavioral disorders and/or attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder in comparison to the regular education students. The responses concerned how the schedule had affected these students' level of academic, behavioral, and social change or improvement and current level of performance. They were asked to delineate the positive and negative aspects of the block. On average, the responding regular education and vocational/ technical teachers view the students with emotional behavioral disorders and/or attention deficit-hyperactivity disorders as demonstrating no change or improvement in their performance while maintaining a satisfactory current level of performance. Administrators and special educators see a more negative impact. The effects of the block depend almost solely on the individuals implementing it.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

"If block scheduling is the answer, what is the question?"

Since the late 1980's the use of a school schedule referred to as block scheduling has been steadily gaining acceptance throughout the country as the possible venue for improving education in the United States. On a daily basis with this schedule, there are fewer classes of longer duration which may last for a semester, a full year, or a trimester (Carroll, 1987; Canady and Rettig, 1995.). By 1994 when Gordon Cawelti surveyed high schools throughout the United States he found that, of the responding schools, 23% were either fully or partially on a block schedule . At present, educational research is being conducted from numerous perspectives to determine the effects of this type of schedule. However, at this time, there is little empirical evidence as to what effects the schedule may have on students with special needs, particularly those students identified as having emotional behavioral disorders (EBD) and/or diagnosed with attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

This opening chapter is presented in three parts. The first part deals with the block schedule in terms of its evolution and the hypotheses of educational improvements advanced by proponents. Part two describes the behavioral, emotional and educational characteristics of those students identified as emotional behavioral disordered (EBD) or diagnosed as having attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) that may be affected by this schedule. The final part explores the relationship between these two sets of variables to develop specific research questions.

The Evolution and Nature of Block Scheduling

Block scheduling's proponents generally consider it all or at least part of the answer to calls for the restructuring of the traditional American secondary education system. For decades the American secondary school system has been based on credit given for time-in-class criteria called the Carnegie unit. This unit was derived from a school day that consists of 6 to 8 classes (potential units or credits), each 40 to 50 minutes in length, meeting 180 +/- days per year. When a student completed four years of school it was expected that the average student would earn 20+/- units or credits by graduation.

This traditional system has always had critics which have led to isolated school reform movements, but publication of *A Nation at Risk* presented by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983 created an impetus to pursue basic, systemic changes in order to stimulate improvement. It identified four fundamental problems in American schools: (a) diluted and diffused curriculum, (b) low expectations, (c) ineffective use of school time, and (d) inadequacy of teacher preparation as problematic areas. (U.S. Department of Education, 1983) A decade later *Prisoners of Time* presented the argument that students in America were being kept from a meaningful educational experience because of the way time was being utilized in the learning process. (U.S. Department of Education, 1994) The block schedule was and is viewed as a way to address the ineffective use of school time.

Over the past 20 years block scheduling has begun to change the educational landscape in many areas of the country. At the core of the schedule's philosophy is the hypothesis that: longer class sessions will allow the students more time to cover material in depth, acquire a better understanding, and develop the ability to use the material. Implementation plans for the schedule need to address such varied issues as configuring days to accommodate this schedule, facilitating

development of appropriate teaching methods and strategies, providing time for curriculum review and augmentation, and addressing changes in the total number of credits required to graduate (Canady and Rettig, 1995a.)

Although forms of block scheduling have been tried sporadically over the years reaching back as far as 1892, the first wide spread attention to the schedule happened in 1987. A Massachusetts School Superintendent Joseph Carroll presented his school restructuring proposal called the Copernican Plan. Carroll's plan presented block scheduling as an integral part of a systemic change utilizing such components as:

1. Student evaluation based on a mastery credit system.
2. Differentiated diplomas.
3. Longer blocks of time for classes with decreased student teacher ratios.
4. An individual education plan for each student.
5. Emphasis placed on such issues as attendance and conduct. (Carroll, 1987)

While the Copernican Plan is not block scheduling per se, it does change the relationship between time in class and learning. Encompassed within his plan was the principle that educators need to build a schedule which accommodates and promotes quality instruction. Carroll (1987) hypothesized that trying to implement improved instructional practices, which he viewed as better practices, a traditional system of education would not work. In defending his position, Carroll points to the successful use of longer time blocks in private schools, vocational schools and programs, military instructional situations, summer remediation or makeup courses.

Carroll (1987) also likened a block scheduled class to the environment of self-contained special education programs. These classrooms allow a single teacher long blocks of time, with substantially reduced student numbers, and a clearly defined set of individual objectives to create

a simplified, concentrated instructional environment. This environment is designed to allow teachers time to deal with the individual educational, social, and behavioral needs of the students.

In 1994 Gordon Cawelti designed and produced a study which surveyed 10,365 accredited high schools throughout the United States. He collected data on 7 components he identified as indicators of a school's progress towards meaningful restructuring. One of these indicators was block scheduling. Cawelti defined it as "A daily schedule organized into larger blocks of time (more than 60 minutes for example) so as to allow flexibility for varied instructional activities." (Page 23) Of those schools responding to his survey, 23% were either on a block schedule or partially employing it and another 15% were preparing to implement it.

Cawelti's survey also found several strengths indicated by the block scheduling component, specifically:

1. Teachers were using varied instructional activities and techniques.
2. Teachers had more preparation time.
3. A feeling of team effort had evolved.
4. Teachers felt that relationships with their students had improved.

It is important to consider that as with Carroll's plan, Cawelti's survey included block scheduling only as a piece, not the key, to restructuring or change.

Dr. Robert Canady and Dr. Michael Rettig, two recognized authorities on block schedules, began serious publication of block scheduling literature in the mid-1990's. They promoted the idea of the block schedule being the pivot in restructuring. In their two major works *Block Scheduling: A Catalyst for Change* (1995) and *Teaching in the Block: Strategies for Teaching Active Learners* (1996), Canady and Rettig primarily focused on demonstrating the benefits and desirability of offering a decreased number of daily classes with increased time in each class .

They described alternative block schedules such as :

1. The 4X4 - semester schedule which accommodates students taking 4 -90 minute classes per day for a quarter, half, or full year.
2. The 4X4 - Alternating day (A/B Schedule) accommodates students taking up to 8 different classes (4 meeting on day A and 4 others meeting on Day B) meeting every other day usually for a half or full year.
3. Trimester schedule which builds three varying semesters of two different configurations (two long and one short semesters) throughout the year (Canady and Rettig, 1995a; 1995 b; 1996.)

Canady and Rettig (1995a; 1995b) contend that by configuring school days around a time-in-class model where classes were lengthened, the number of classes per day reduced, curriculum reviewed and changed, teaching methodologies and strategies augmented to meet the challenge of longer classes, and administration supported inservices and training, specific outcomes naturally follow. Examples of these outcomes include: (a) decreased disciplinary problems; (b) an increase in the variety of teaching methods used; (c) students have fewer subjects (per day) to study; and (d) student/teacher ratios are reduced.

Canady and Rettig (1995b) identify several characteristics of a block schedule which could enhance the school experience of students with special needs.

1. Many disciplinary referrals result from schedule transitions, when large numbers of students spill out into hallways, lunchrooms and common areas. If they are not dealt with in the office, teachers must take time to deal with them in the classroom.
2. The assembly-line, traditional period schedule contributes to the depersonalizing nature of high school. Teachers having to deal with 100 to 180 students per day do not have the time to develop close relationships which may help to reduce discipline problems.
3. Short instructional periods may also contribute to a negative classroom climate. When students who misbehave do not respond to quick correction, many teachers send them to the office. With only 45 to 55 minute class periods, teachers view any time taken away from class work as unacceptable. (Page 5)

In addition, Canady and Rettig posit that since educational research indicates that all students

learn at different rates, a block schedule will provide all students with the time they need to learn. Reviewing articles and literature about block scheduling provides an indication of the full impact Canady and Rettig have made. In almost all articles and studies on the block scheduling these two researchers are quoted extensively.

Figure.1 Benefits to identified groups

Group	Benefits
Students	Fewer classes per day to prepare for. Fewer disruptions throughout the day. Can retake a failed class in the same year. Program can be accelerated. Smaller class size.
Teachers	Fewer classes per day to prepare for. Smaller class size. Better chance to get to know their students. Use of a greater variety of teaching techniques and methods.
Administrators	Decreased disciplinary issues Less disruption during school time. Curriculum reviewed and assessed on a routine basis.
Community	Improved student performance. Potential for decreased costs.

(Carroll, 1987; Carroll, 1994a; Canady and Rettig 1995a; Cawelti, 1994 ; Eineder, 1996; and Embriano and Ryan, 1995; Short and Thayer,1995.)

Throughout the United States, the intuitive appeal of the benefits for students, teachers, administrators and the community have struck positive reactions with all groups, especially the school's decision makers. Figure 1 summarizes those benefits. In the state of New Hampshire 26 high schools have adopted a block schedule. Of those 26, 19 are using the 4X4 semester schedule and another 4 are using the 4X4 alternating day.

Though time usage is the crux of the block schedule, there are many stated reasons proponents give for adopting the block schedule. Given the popularity evidenced by the schedule's rapid adoption by so many districts, there is a clear need to study the effects of the schedule on those living with it from the perspective of both the education professionals and, more importantly, all of the students in these schools.

Characteristics and Nature of EBD and ADHD

In contrast to the newness of the block is the decades long evolution of the field of emotional behavioral disorders. It is critical to know the methods by which to identify and deal appropriately with students who have emotional behavioral problems. By whom and according to what criteria are students identified as either EBD or just socially maladjusted? The Federal definition of Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act identifies a number of characteristics which students must manifest in order to be considered for services. The definition itself offers insights as to why the percentages of students identified as "SED" vary so much from school to school and state to state. After years of professional disagreements, by basing the definition's premise on data and information derived from the research of Eli Bower (Kauffman, 1989), the present following wording was agreed upon for the reauthorized IDEA.

Emotional disturbance is defined as follows:

(i) The term means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree, which adversely affects educational performance:

(A) An inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors:

(B) An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with

peers and teachers
(C) Inappropriate types of behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances:
(D) A general, pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or
(E) A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems.
(ii) The term includes children who are schizophrenic. The term does not include children who are socially maladjusted, unless it is determined that they are seriously emotionally disturbed. (Federal Register 55069, 1997)

There have been long standing arguments and heated debates as to what "long period of time" and "to a marked degree" mean. Who determines when someone is simply socially maladjusted? The definition seems to raise as many questions as it answers, but interpretations must and are being made. It remains, for the most part, up to individual districts to interpret the definition and implement it.

As school districts look for clarification, James Kauffman (1989) wrote that it must be emphasized that most professionals recognize that a given definition is never adequate for all purposes. Beyond the five identified characteristic in the federal definition, there are a series of behaviors and educational issues which, for accommodation and remediation purposes, can be identified to assist in planning. Upon review there appear to be ten identifiable characteristics or attributes of the SED diagnosis:

1. Hostile aggressive response
2. Defiance of authority
3. Feelings of inferiority
4. Withdrawal /isolation
5. Overactivity/restlessness
6. Dependence and anxiety
7. Inappropriate Affect
8. Self injurious behaviors
9. Immaturity
10. Learning problems

(Cohen, 1994)

Given all of the general and specific categories and definitions of these students, identification of these students still remains a point of contention among professionals (Greenbaum, et al. 1996.)

Many school districts will use evidence of several frequently demonstrated attributes in the identification, but different emphasis will yield widely differing numbers.

Since there is such contention and diversity about who is being identified as SED, the prevalence of emotional behavioral disorders has been contested for many years. Comparison on a state to state basis shows rates of identified students with emotionally behaviorally disorders typically fluctuate from 0.5% to 15% with a high of 20% (Kauffman, 1989). The Federal government placed the "accepted" estimated rate at between 1% and 2% through the late 1980's, but now the Department of Education no longer publishes estimates because of the wide diversity of identifying procedures. As an educational benchmark, most school officials usually accept the 1% to 2% range (Kauffman, 1989.)

The reality is that, though their numbers are relatively small, the complexity of this cluster of students and their individual needs is great. According to Paul Greenbaum, et al (1996) in a National Adolescent and Child Treatment Study of students with EBD in 6 states, the dropout rate for this group is about 40.4%. 27% of students who dropped out for behavioral reasons identified frustration in the classroom as the largest single issue that led to their actions. Clues to the source of their frustration might be that 75.5% of the students had reading levels below grade level and 94% had math skills below grade level. (Greenbaum, et al, 1996)

Another area of frustration for students with EBD is lack of social skills. These students have a hard time initiating, establishing, and continuing appropriate peer and teacher interactions. They view themselves as different, not fitting in, and often act out in order to avoid meaningful or positive transactions with others. (Gunter, 1994; Meadows, 1996; Cheney and Muscott, 1995.) Academic deficits plus the lack of acceptable social skills lead to a feeling of isolation and low self

esteem which may precipitate the high dropout rate and other disruptive behaviors. Accommodations and remediations for these students must encompass all of these issues and more.

In many respects students who have been diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) closely resemble the students with EBD. This disorder has emerged only recently as a fully described, delineated syndrome or disorder with general agreement about what it is, though there is general disagreement about the causes. The *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual IV* (DSM-IV) divides ADHD into three categories:

1. ADHD predominantly inattentive type.
2. ADHD predominantly impulsive type.
3. ADHD with combined inattentive and impulsivity.

(DSM IV, 1994)

For educational purposes the diagnosis must be made by clinicians with specified expertise, such as a Doctor of Psychology, Physician, or Psychiatrist using the DSM-IV criteria.

The prevalence of ADHD, as with emotional behavioral disorders (EBD), has been a source of disagreement. Research and articles report the prevalence of all types of ADHD to range from a very conservative 1% up to a high of between 9% to 15% of the student population (Faigal and Heilgenstein, 1996; Zentall, 1993; Harper & Stormont-Spurgin, 1993). While these numbers are mired in discussions of under or over-diagnosis, most researchers conclude that the prevalence is best adjusted to between 3% and 5% (Barkley, 1991: Zentall, 1993; Silver, 1990).

Russell Barkley (1991) describes the essential feature of ADHD as a blend of developmentally inappropriate degrees of inattention, impulsivity, and overactivity with behavioral disinhibition and poor self-regulation as the disorder's essence. In a classroom situation, these behaviors create

difficulties with the students' ability to pay attention or focus concentration over short and long periods of time. Methods of intervention and remediating these behaviors typically require behavior modifications, behavior plans, and medication. Beyond behaviors many students with ADHD experience academic deficits as well leading to a double-barrelled set of problems.

Much research shows that up to 20% of students with ADHD experience academic difficulties in learning severe enough to be classified as learning disabled (Zentall, 1993; Dykman and Akerman, 1992.) Depending on the academic area these students can be anywhere from just below grade level up to 2 years behind. This is especially true in reading comprehension with 38% experiencing significant deficits, though over time with appropriate intervention and remediation that percentage drops to about 8% (Zentall, 1993.) In terms of math calculation, up to 50% have severe difficulties which seem to worsen over time (Zentall, Smith, Lees, Wieczorek, 1994.)

Dr. Sydney Zentall (1993) cautions that research points to ADHD students being at two to three times greater risk of failure in regular academic settings than students without disabilities with equivalent intelligence. ADHD create behavioral and educational difficulties which lead to a dropout rate of 33% (Fletcher, et al, 1991; Zentall, et al, 1994.) Planning interventions with these students requires appropriate amounts of attention be given to both deficits.

Block Schedules and Students with EBD and /or ADHD

Students with EBD and/or ADHD have a hierarchy of complex social, emotional and behavioral needs which must be met in addition to recognized academic difficulties.(Gunter, 1995; Meadows, 1996; Zionts, 1995.) Across most settings, these students' deficiencies in social

skills have profoundly negative impacts on their peer and staff interactions. Socially and behaviorally, these students are the most likely the first to be removed from class, placed in a self contained program, and are often the last to be returned to a regular education setting (Cheney and Muscott, 1995.)

Whether students are in special education, socially maladjusted, or at risk, they must remain in school if they have any hope of attaining their maximum possible educational potential (Eineder, 1995.) The following 10 factors were identified as serving as incentives for these groups of students to stay in school rather than drop out.

1. Positive adult relationships which may serve as parental substitutes.
2. Flexible scheduling.
3. Individualized curriculum.
4. Treating students as adults.
5. Relevant curriculum.
6. Acceptance and a sense of belonging.
7. Being known by name.
8. Nurturing environments.
9. Reduction in student stress.
10. Making learning fun.

Proponents of block scheduling will assert that by its design many of these incentives are provided to students. Their assertions rest on the following hypotheses.

1. By reducing the number of transitions in a given day, students will substantially reduce the opportunities to become involved in negative behaviors. Given that a traditional schedule requires as many as 9 to 10 transitions per day in location, teachers, structure and rules, the times during those transitions are often when students get into trouble.
2. Keeping a student focused and on task for longer periods will reduce the constant jarring interruptions which create havoc with their need for stability. The lengthened class time provided by the block should allow the student to become more thoroughly engaged in the learning process by limiting disruptions caused by the " Our 45 minutes is over. Wrap up the

project. See you tomorrow." mindset.

3. Students and teachers will have more time to get to know and understand each other which in turn could or should lead to an improved relationship and decreased disruptive behavior.
4. With longer classes and smaller numbers of students in class, the students will have the time to become successfully involved, leading to increased self esteem and improved social skills creating more effective, consistent, prolonged peer and staff interactions.
5. There will be an improvement in attendance, a decrease in the overall disciplinary eferrals, and a decrease in the dropout rate.
6. Grades will improve.

It is not clear to what extent any of these six hypotheses are valid. Researchers have not examined how students at present involved in block schedules are progressing. The present study comes out of this lack of knowledge concerning the effects of the block schedule on students.

The essential questions for this research study are:

1. What are the perceived effects of the block schedule on students identified with EBD and/or ADHD as compared to regular education students?
2. What changes/improvements have occurred in the performance levels of regular education students , and students with EBD and/or ADHD students in block scheduled schools?
3. What are the current performance levels for regular education students and students with, EBD and/or ADHD students in block scheduled schools?
4. Do the different groups of educators see similar effects across all three groups of students?
5. What do the different groups of educators see as the positive and negative aspects of the block for the students with EBD and/or ADHD?

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This chapter is divided into three sections. Using a study by study structure, the first part presents background information and a review of pertinent studies about block scheduling. Part Two focuses on research concerning emotional behavioral disorders (EBD) and attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). The final section addresses the relationship between the two sets of variables and its implications for this and future studies.

Part I: The Block Schedule

Educationally, the block schedule has generated the impetus for change in many high schools. Nationally, as of 1994, 38% of high schools in the United States were either already on or planning to adopt the schedule (Cawelti, 1994.) By the fall of 1997, 33% of high schools in New Hampshire had chosen one of the forms of block scheduling to restructure their day (Department of Education, 1997.) Numerous articles, reviews and evaluative reports have been published, which for the most part, attest to the success and desirability of using the schedule. However, research studies with empirical data which consistently support this are difficult to find. Studies focusing of how any of the block schedule formats affect students with special needs, are non-existent.

Proponents of block scheduling contend that through its very design the schedule addresses many of the concerns about educational, social and behavioral deficits inherent with students who have EBD and/or ADHD. Though not directly attributable to any one source these proponents identify discussions of best practices when it comes to defending the schedule as able to provide

an appropriate educational setting for special education students. Does the review of any current, published study support this thesis?

In *The Effects of Block Scheduling in a High School*, Dale V. Eineder (1996) addresses the effects of block scheduling on academic achievement, student behavior and the student teacher relationship in a descriptive, quantitative study of 640+ students and 35 faculty members in Philo High School in Philo, Ohio. Data on the two variables of academic achievement and behavioral performance provide insights into the effects of the block schedule in terms of the student body as a whole; however, no evidence is evident that special education students and particularly those with EBD or ADHD were included as a sample.

Behaviorally, Eineder (1996) found that there was a significant drop in the frequency of disciplinary referrals (19%), tardies (43%), in-school suspensions (49%), out-of-school suspensions (57%), fights (40%). These findings were in line with and supported by Buckman, et al. (1995) and Guskey and Kifer (1995). Eineder drew tentative inferences that: (a) extended class periods gave teachers more time to employ proven behavior modifications; (b) the 4 X 4 block schedule had fewer class changes creating fewer opportunities for issues like tardiness and disruptive behaviors to occur; and (c) more time in class promoted interpersonal communications.

In the category of student-teacher relationships, 85% of the students and 95% of the teachers acknowledged that they felt that they knew each other better. Eineder (1996) stresses the importance of this finding because he believes that it is one of the key outcomes of the block schedule. He posited that this improved relationship has the potential to unlock the cause of and lead to more effective remediation of anti-social behaviors in students. He is supported by the

40% decrease in the number of fights. He infers from his data that, when students are in a block schedule with a structured classroom environment, genuinely engaged in educational activities, fewer disruptions, and adult direction, the students will learn and use appropriate conflict resolution strategies. Unfortunately by way of a rival hypothesis, Eineder admits that though improved social skills can explain decreases in behaviors, it can just as easily be explained away by lack of opportunity.

Academically, in terms of earned grades, students at Philo High School did much better on a block schedule. There was a 24% increase in the number of A's and a 15% decrease in the number of F's. These numbers are statistically significant for Philo High School, but the use of internal grading systems as opposed to standardized, published, normed or criterion referenced assessment tools leaves those numbers debatable because of subjectivity and validity issues. Also, an argument could be made that those numbers are subject to a Hawthorne effect attributable to the novelty of the schedule. There is also a potential halo effect as teachers and administrators may hope to show the schedule works.

Generally, Eineder (1995) found benefits from the block schedule at Philo High School. Teachers found they had more time to prepare, used a greater variety of teaching methods, felt they had an increased rapport with their students, had smaller classes, and were able to teach material in more depth. Students felt they had a better relationship with their teachers, learned as much or more, were less stressed, liked school better, and attained better grades.

Mona Hamdy (1996) presented a *Study of Block Scheduling in the Palm Beach (Florida) County School District* as her doctoral dissertation. This was mainly a quantitative, descriptive study designed to collect data on the perceived effects on academic achievement and

social/behavioral issues of traditional, 4 x 4 block, and alternate day block scheduled schools.

In terms of academic achievement, Hamdy (1996) found that on four standardized norm referenced and criterion referenced tests students in the traditionally scheduled school achieved the highest score followed by the alternate day school, then the 4-X-4 school. She hypothesized that due to the newness of the schedule teachers were not effectively using the time for instruction. This is an interesting point in that it seems to contradict the fact that 64.4% of the teachers and 75.4% of the administrators said that the staff had received adequate training to institute block scheduling. Also, since many of the tests were criterion referenced and it is generally accepted that less material is covered in blocked classes, students in the block scheduled schools would be at a distinct disadvantage; ergo, the lower grades are explained away. Most teachers felt that class size had not decreased and that class size played a large part in the negative test scores. Analysis of the grades showed that day-to-day classroom performance yielded 15% fewer failing grades. Review of her data does not lend itself to any inference from this information.

Behaviorally, Hamdy (1996) found that 40.6% of the students felt that their rapport with teachers had improved. 48.7% of the teachers felt that their relationships with the students had improved. Administrators, by an overwhelming 82.6%, felt that student/teacher relationships had improved. One of the factors which proponents of the block schedule point to is that smaller class sizes should lead to improved student-teacher relationships (Carroll, 1984, Canady and Rettig, 1995a, 1995b, Buckman, 1995). Teachers in both blocked schools felt that classes had not decreased in size. This might also answer the question as to why the student-teacher relationship percentages were substantially lower than other studies and reviews.

Hamdy's study showed that the number of disruptive behaviors dropped and school suspensions decreased at the alternate day school; whereas, there was an increase at the 4 X 4 school. Similarly, the drop-out rate achieved mixed results, with a decrease occurring at the alternate day school and a slight increase at the 4 X 4 school. The results of questions about the school having a safer environment were interesting. While Canady and Rettig (1995b) and Shore (1995) have agreed that because there is a decrease in unstructured time (i.e. time between classes) in block scheduled schools negative behaviors should subside, if for no other reason than lack of opportunity. This was not substantiated by Hamdy's study.

These Eineder (1996) and Hamdy (1996) studies are not unlike many of the other reports and articles which have been published. Positive, negative, mixed and conflicting results can be found in all of them, but certain basic conclusions can be drawn:

1. Teachers and students like the system and would not want to return to the traditional format.
2. Though the percentages change from study to study, teachers and students feel that the rapport and understanding between them have improved.
3. Teachers feel they have more time to prepare and use new teaching styles and techniques. Students, however, indicate that teachers may not be using them as consistently as they might.
4. Grades have improved, attendance generally has gone up, and the drop-out rate has decreased.
5. Disruptive and aggressive behaviors have decreased, office referrals are down, suspensions have dropped.

Part II: Studies of Students with EBD and ADHD

Depending on the combination of prevalence numbers used, the percentage of students with

emotional behavioral disorder when combined with students diagnosed with ADHD can differ from a low of 4% to a high of 7%. (Kauffman, 1987; Kauffman, et al, 1995; Barkley, 1991; Zentall, 1993). Since ADHD is a defined disorder and a diagnosis is required, it is relatively easy to determine its prevalence within a specific school. Given the current Federal definition used to determine who has a serious emotional disorder and the professional debate about the subjective nature of identification procedures, determining the very existence of emotional behavioral disorders in students and officially identifying them is difficult.

This controversy takes a practical turn when regular education teachers refer students, such as those with ADHD and borderline EBD/socially maladjusted students, for special education evaluation and services. Though these students present with social, behavioral, and educational deficits severe enough for referral many are not eligible. Students with a diagnosis of ADHD must usually be classified as EBD, LD, Other Health Impaired or Speech/Language Impaired in order to receive services. Most students who are identified as socially maladjusted or at risk are legally excluded from receiving the spectrum of services available to special education students.

Students with EBD and ADHD often have very similar behaviors and educational weaknesses. They also are a segment of the school population with whom regular education teachers seem to have a great deal of difficulty. Inclusion, though not mandated, is becoming increasingly the routine way that special education students are being taught in school today (Cheney and Muscott, 1996; Kauffman, 1995). The following studies address the academic, behavioral and social competencies of these students in order to establish patterns of learning and behaviors which can indicate how the block schedule affects them.

In the *National Adolescent and Child Treatment Study (NACTS): Outcomes for Children*

with Serious Emotional and Behavioral Disturbance, Paul Greenbaum, et al, (1996) present a descriptive, longitudinal (7 years), mixed study of the educational and life outcomes of children with serious emotional and behavioral disturbances. They collected data from geographically and demographically stratified populations from 6 states on four variables: (1) adaptive functioning, (2) levels of psychological functioning, (3) services required, and (4) educational outcomes over time. For this study the most important variable provides information about the outcomes over time in educational attainment. The sample consisted of 628 students (paid volunteers) ranging in age from 8 to 18, minimum IQ of 69. All of the subjects had been identified as SED under the current federal definition.

Test results, using standardized measures, on the students who were 18 years old or older showed that 75.4% were below appropriate grade level in reading and 96.9% were below appropriate grade level in math skills. The data showed that reading deficits had leveled off, whereas, math deficits deepened over time. Greenbaum et al hypothesized that as math classes advance, reading becomes a more intrinsic part of the process creating a dual problem for these students.

Greenbaum, et al. (1996) presented data showing that 40.4% had dropped out of school with no diploma, 25.1% had achieved a high school diploma, 17.4% had attained a GED, and 13.4% were still attempting to finish school. The data also showed that 66.5% of the sample had at least one contact with the police as the suspected perpetrator of a crime. It was found that students' adaptive behavior functioning declined when it was determined that the students did not lose skills they had learned, but that new skills were increasingly difficult to acquire. Identified situations and problems occurring at school were grouped into 3 global categories: Behavioral: students felt

bored, disinterested, unhappy, frustrated (26.6%); suspended/expelled (16.4%); alcohol and drugs, runaway (6.5%). Programmatic: arrested (14.6%), mental health facility (10.6%). Situational: work, married, or moving. Reasons for problems with 20.7% could not be determined.

The conclusions reached in the study were relatively negative. Greenbaum, et al. (1996) found that the academic, behavioral, and social problems experienced by these students were persistent throughout their entire school years. The persistence of these problems and in some cases deterioration of adaptive behaviors coupled with negative educational outcomes created a bleak future. Recommendations were made to: (a) avoid short term interventions which focused on narrow remediation patterns, (b) deal with each on a case-by-case basis with an articulated plan addressing the specific issues, (c) provide transition plans to optimize chances for success as adults.

In the study *Academic Performance , Social Competence and Mainstream Accommodations: A Look at Mainstreamed and Nonmainstreamed Students with Serious Behavioral Disorders* by Nancy Meadows, Richard Neel, Catherine Scott, and Gerilyn Parker (1994), the stated purpose was to address the effects which the independent variable of school programs, mainstreamed or self-contained, had on the three identified dependent variables of academic performance, social competencies, and accommodations necessary for students with emotional behavioral disorders. The study included 19 sixth through eighth grade students classified as having behavioral problems. Also included were 16 teachers: 3 special education and 13 regular education teachers (recommended by the special education teachers as having at least two months worth of experience working with these students.)

Meadows, et al. (1994) concluded that students in mainstream situations made better academic progress and had more positive behaviors than those who were in the self-contained program. They pointed to higher reading and written language scores, better work habits, and higher grade point averages. They also determined that the behaviors of those students in self- contained programs were more aggressive than those in regular education settings.

Data from teachers in mainstreamed situations indicated that 79% did not alter the material or method of delivering the content because those students were present. 57% said that they did alter the way tests were given to these students. Teachers also indicated that 53% of the students got along with their peers. Academically, 52% of the students received a "C" or less for a grade. 36% received no report of a grade - an issue which elicits no explanation.

Meadows, et al.(1994) determined that teachers assumed that the students who were mainstreamed had received the necessary training and instruction in order to learn in a regular class room. Their inference was that once the students are in the regular education program that differential programming ceases. This assumption may explain, in part, the relatively poor performance of EBD students in the general education settings. Their conclusion and recommendation are that there needs to be more clarification of what basic and advanced skills an EBD student needs in order to succeed in general educational settings.

In *What Puts Pupils at Risk? An Analysis of Classroom Teachers' Judgment of Pupils Behavior*, James Kauffman, Kathleen Wong, John Willis Lloyd, Li-Yu Hung and Patricia Pullen (1991) surveyed 54 general education classroom teachers during an inservice training session about teaching students who were at risk. The purpose was to determine the relationship between teachers' judgments and expectations of students based on the absence of certain adaptive

behaviors and the presence of certain maladaptive behaviors of those students being considered at risk. "At Risk" was defined by the authors to be that the student was likely to fail either in school or life. The students' "At Risk" identification was considered the independent variable and with the dependent variable being teachers' judgments and expectations based on the presence or absence of adaptive or maladaptive behaviors.

In behavioral terms, this study goes to the heart of what behaviors teachers will or will not tolerate in a classroom setting and how they view those behaviors as impacting on themselves, the class, and individual students. The results show that teachers saw risk as a function of behavioral characteristics which would make success in not only their classroom but any classroom difficult. James Kauffman, Kathleen Wong, John Willis Lloyd, Li-Yu Hung and Patricia Pullen identified behaviors at two levels: (a) critical, based on positive effects and (b) unacceptable, based on negative effects. They found that the more demanding a teacher was, the more willing they seemed to accept the responsibility for critical and unacceptable behaviors.

60% of teachers:
Viewed as critical or acceptable behaviors:
1. Good academic performance.
2. Good work habits.
3. Conduct which was compliant and motivated
4. The ability to work cooperatively with peers individually or in small groups.
5. Coping skills - especially in dealing with failure.

Viewed as unacceptable behaviors those that:
1. Were disruptive to classroom order.
2. Led to challenges of teacher authority.
3. Were aggressive and/or intense.

Specifically the authors found that teachers viewed as unacceptable: disruptive or disturbing behaviors (90.4% of teachers); defiance of teacher authority (90.4%); ignoring warnings or

reprimands (88.5%); silly attention seeking activities (86.5%); followed by stealing, cheating and lying.

Each of the responding teachers had a classroom with 25 students. On average the teachers viewed 5 (20%) of their students as being at risk. Kauffman, et al (1995) determined that most of the teachers viewed themselves as able or capable of dealing with the academic needs of these students, but were not sure about their abilities or capabilities to deal with the social/behavioral issues. They expressed the need for technical assistance to deal with those issues.

Kauffman, et al. (1991) raise the issue in their implication for future research that studies need to address the issue of how teachers respond to different levels of specific behaviors. For this study, they felt that teachers appeared adequately able to react properly with appropriate personal or professional responses to an identified behavior. This was identified as an area that future studies need to be done in order to address how teachers' personal beliefs impact on the management of student behaviors.

One significant finding was the teachers' response concerning their direct relationship with the students. Kauffman, et al. (1991) found that teachers wanted to distance themselves from the student in terms of interpersonal relationships. As a group they felt that the interpersonal relationship they had with the students was of little concern. This is in direct conflict with the proponents of block schedules contention that fostering improved student teacher relationships is a desirable and significantly important outcome of using the schedule.

The study *Who are the Children with Attention Deficit-Hyperactivity Disorder? A School-Based Survey* (1994), Robert Reid, et al, presented information about the phenomenology of medically diagnosed students with ADHD in a school-based sample. Their study examined the

relationship of ADHD on school performance, comorbidity with other disabilities, range of placement and services options, academic achievement, and treatment methods employed. The study was initiated in an effort to help schools evaluate the need for special programming and allocate resources to meet the needs of students diagnosed with ADHD.

Reid, et al. (1994) selected students in the first through sixth grades from 34 elementary and middle schools in a Midwest city of 200,000 people (N=14,229) . It was determined that 136 students (less than 1%) met the requirements of identification by an appropriate medical professional. The authors hypothesized that the unusually low incidence could be explained through site related variables such as geographic and social factors along with psychosocial stressors which might increase the likelihood of an ADHD diagnosis. They also posited that if behaviors representative of ADHD are not perceived by parents as deviant, reflecting a disability or requiring medical evaluation, then children were likely not to be identified.

Of those students who were identified as having ADHD, Reid, et al. (1994) found that 77 (57%) had been identified under existing categories and were currently receiving special education services. Over half of those students were receiving services as behaviorally disordered. The authors determined this to be unremarkable in that behaviors symptomatic of ADHD overlap many of the behaviors which could lead to an EBD identification. Of the students classified as learning disabled, 15 out of 33 manifested a discrepancy in reading, 13 out of 33 manifested a discrepancy in math, 10 out of 33 manifested a discrepancy in both reading and math. After a thorough review of 22 students identified as learning disabled only 10 actually met the standards for this disability.

Students who were classified as mentally retarded made up about 5% of the sample, and

special language and other health impaired made up the remaining 9% . The mental retardation classification may only be a best assumption because of the difficulty in assessment procedures with these students.

An important fact presented in this study is that 80% of students diagnosed with ADHD spend most of their time in regular education settings. The evaluative assessments for students with ADHD at present receiving special education services yield scores of Reading 87.83; Math 87.78; and IQ 95.04. Students with ADHD in general education settings scored: Reading 101.01; Math 103.41; and IQ 112.89 These scores led Reid, et al. (1994) to infer that the ADHD sample represents a relatively heterogeneous group in terms of potential academic achievement and that the behaviors might in fact be the real issue of immediate concern with these students. Advocates for students with ADHD point to the fact that standardized tests do not take into consideration the quantity of poor grades, incomplete assignments, and homework not passed in.

Reid, et al. (1994) concluded that the best instructional method for use with these students is a multimodal approach with related services such as medical management (drug therapies), psychological supports, educational monitoring, and behavior modification. While participating in this study, 90% of the students were on medication for the ADHD . Because of the multiple layers of problems, teachers need to know: (a) academic modification practices; (b) effective behavior modification processes and practices; (c) effects of medication on student behavior and academic performance; (d) that no one intervention plan works for all - individual plans are essential. One anecdotal remark mentioned that it is essential for all participants in the planning for these student to recognize and realize the difference between planning for students who are missing homework assignments and those who are openly aggressive or have poor social skills.

In the *Mathematical Outcomes of Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder*, Sydney Zentall, Yvonne Smith, Young-bin Lee, and Cheryl Wieczorek (1994) addressed the dependent variables of the academic and behavioral performance of 121 non-disabled boys and 107 boys with ADHD. The researchers collected data on the identified levels of reading abilities, math computation, math problem solving skills, attention and concentration criteria. In this one shot battery of assessments within a controlled environment using the two different forms of schema as an independent variable, it was determined that:

1. Between the two groups when the schema was not changed throughout the testing, students with ADHD produced a statistically significant lower rate of correct work problem answers.

2. When the schema was changed, it was determined that, initially, reading comprehension was more at issue that the math problem solving abilities.

3. Students with ADHD were identified as having a significant lag in basic math skills and concepts especially in multiplication, but also in addition and subtraction.

4. Students with ADHD had a slower speed for retrieval of basic information than peers without disabilities.

5. During the performance of the tasks, movements and vocalizations for students with ADHD were significantly higher than for their peers without disabilities.

6. As the age of the participants increased the reading abilities increased so that the students were viewed as close to their peers' abilities, though not necessarily on an equal footing .

7. Students with ADHD exhibit inherent organizational weaknesses which hampered transformation of information in math problem solving situations into usable blocks..

8. Beyond the wide range of the constant, inherent externalizing behaviors of ADHD required for diagnosis, this study dealt with the constant motion and vocalizations demonstrated by these students as well as deficits in the academic areas of reading and math.

Though findings here infer that reading abilities with these students improved over time as supported by Larry Silver (1990), they also infer that math deficits were multiple in nature stemming from weaknesses in basic math facts and functions exacerbated by reading and organizational weaknesses.

Discussion of the Literature Reviews

The research reviewed here shows that there are three distinct areas of need involved with students who have either EBD and/or ADHD: academic, social competence, and behaviors. The exact blend varies from student to student requiring specific, individual planning to deal with these issues.(Kauffman, 1989, Kauffman, et al., 1995; Meadows, et al., 1994; Reid, et al., 1994) Academically, students with EBD and/or ADHD have similar patterns of deficits. Both groups of students manifest externalized behaviors which peers and staff find unacceptable. Aggressive and impulsive behaviors set these students apart and inhibit behavioral growth and social improvement. Considering the three indicators of academic, behaviors, and social competence the inferences are as follows.

Academic Performance: Challenging behaviors, attention and concentration deficits in tandem with a number of specific learning disabilities which occur in varied degrees create a pattern of lower than expected grades, attendant lower self esteem, and growing isolation from the rest of the class or peers. Two academic areas seem most vulnerable to potential deficits: reading and math problem solving which some studies show may be interrelated.(Greenbaum,et al. 1996; Reid, et al. 1994; Zentall, 1993; Zentall, et al., 1994) Students with heightened behavioral issues often will strike out in frustration in a preemptory strike to avoid or get away from the situation.

As the NACTS study shows, 40% of students identified as SED (Greenbaum, et al., 1996) and 33% of students with ADHD will drop out (Silver, 1995; Zentall, et al., 1993). Disruptive behaviors in many cases are a manifestation of academic frustration which Greenbaum , et al.(1996) point to as one of the major reasons why these student terminate their education..

Studies show that the block schedule should allow the time for teachers to deal with learning deficits and remediation. Block schedules would also provide the extra time to help students develop better organizational skills, deficits identified by Kauffman et al (1991) and Zentall, Smith, Lee, and Wieczorek, (1994). If we allow the discussion of grades to enter, data shows that most grade went up, with a large jump in the number of failing grades that improved. Though the numbers did not indicate whose grades went up, it would be possible to infer that at least a few of the EBD and ADHD students saw some benefit.

Social Competence and Behaviors: As externalizers, students with EBD are often disruptive, combative, defiant, and rude As internalizers, students with EBD can easily become invisible in a classroom environment. Students with ADHD are usually externalizers categorized as either inattentive or impulsive types.(DSM IV, 1994) Students with emotional behavioral disorders and/or ADHD have common problems adapting to the demands of social situations. They often cannot initiate or sustain successful interactions or transactions with staff or peers (Kauffman et al, 1991; Harvey, 1996; Lewis, Chard, and Scott, 1994). These students often use negative behaviors as a way of avoiding situations which they feel are threatening or frustrating (Cheney and Muscott, 1996; Cheney and Barringer, 1995).

Teachers rate the ability to work with others either in a one-on-one, small or large group as a critical skill that students need in order to be successful (Kauffman, et al., 1991.) Theoretically,

the block schedule should give teachers time to get to know students, plan varied activities which engage and ultimately draw these students into more acceptable, longer working and social relationships with both adults and peers. Meadows, et al. (1994) found that these students generally did better in regular education settings than when taught in a self-contained environment. However, a Hallenback and Kauffman (1995) study indicates that just placement into controlled environments where acceptable role models are present does not mean that they will respond. Their study shows that this use of observational, incidental, or vicarious learning is not always effective because these students view themselves as different and do not readily identify with the role models. Also, it is important to remember that Kauffman, et al. (1991) found that teachers did not want interpersonal involvement with the students.

The relationship which is to be researched here is how the block schedules affects students with EDB and/or ADHD as measured through the three sets of identified indicators: academic performance, social competencies, and general behaviors. The measurable components of each indicator included in the data are:

1. Academic performance: grades, attention and concentration on tasks, completed assignments, following classroom procedures, performance on standardized tests (particularly normed and criterion referenced tests).

2. Social Competencies: Attention and concentration on task, completion of work, positive relationship with the teacher (staff), positive interpersonal relationships with peers, ability to work or attend in small or large groups for sustained periods of time, coping with adverse situations.

3. Behaviors: Able to maintain attention and concentration, cope with frustrations, follow classroom rules and procedures, respond positively to corrective measures, decrease negative attention seeking activities, avoid disruptions and disrupting behaviors, avoid physical and verbal aggression

Review of the empirical studies about the block schedules yields some suggestions as to the

outcomes in schools using either the 4 X 4 or Alternate Day format. These include:

1. Improvement of Teacher/student relationships.
2. Decrease of disruptive behaviors.
3. Decrease in disciplinary activity e.g. office referrals, in- and out-of-school suspensions.
4. Days less disrupted and stress reduced.
5. Teachers used a variety of teaching methods.
6. Improved Attendance.
7 Improved grades.

(Eineder, 1995; Hamdy, 1996; Reid, 1995; Guskey and Kifer, 1995; Fletcher, 1997)

Students with EBD or ADHD are being included in high school classrooms throughout the country every day. 30% or more of those schools use one or another of the block schedule format. This study needs to combine the perceived benefits of the block schedule with the academic, social, and behavioral needs of these students to measure what effect, if any, the schedule has on them.

The implications of this literature review on future research in the areas of block scheduling, emotional behavioral disorders and attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder are clear.

1. Studies need to base assessment of academic achievement more on normed or criterion referenced test rather than grades.

2. Studies need to be done on the effects of the schedule on students with all types of disabilities.

3. Studies need to be done in order to determine the emerging areas of best instructional practices to be used with disabled students in block scheduled classes.

4. Based on Hamdy's study, research needs to be done on the effectiveness of different forms of the block schedule.

5 . Research is needed on inclusionary classrooms containing students with EBD and/or ADHD to establish the existence and effectiveness of differential instructional practices .

6. Research is also needed to establish what if any relationship there is between the skills levels of students with EBD and/or ADHD entering regular education classrooms and their

potential or real achievement levels.

Though there has been much research done on EBD and ADHD, there is a need to establish research-based practices which can ultimately improve the educational experience of these students. As inclusion becomes more established the concept of best practices must be refined to meet their needs. Block Schedules are another layer of conditions for these students which must be studied and have recommendations formulated.

Chapter 3

Methodologies

This chapter describes the research methodologies of the present study. As presented in the previous chapter, the reality is that there are few research studies done on block scheduling. Studies focusing on defined groups or sub-groups of students within school settings are even harder to find. In New Hampshire high schools using a block schedule have an average experience range from 1 to 3 years. The present research study examines the perceived impact of the block schedule on two defined groups: students identified as EBD and students diagnosed with ADHD.

Scarcity of prior research and limited experience with the schedule dictated that specific methodological decisions be made as described in each section of this chapter. As background research was completed and information collected about the schools in New Hampshire, the following research design evolved. To present the methodologies used, this chapter is divided into seven sections describing the design, sampling procedure, the sample, data collection, data analysis, ethics and delimiting factors.

The Design

The research design is descriptive, mainly quantitative, and one shot in nature. Given the relative newness of the schedule in most districts, the focus of the study is to determine the professional staff members' perceptions of the performance and achievement of regular education students and students identified with EBD and/or ADHD within this new context. As

can be seen in Chapter II, research studies have identified academic, behavioral, social achievement and performance as indicators of how these students are functioning in school.

Sampling Procedures

Using a State Department of Education list (New Hampshire State Department of Education, 1997), the researcher generated a list of New Hampshire high schools at present using forms of a block schedule. Within the 26 identified high schools: 19 were on the 4X4 schedule, 4 were on the alternate day A&B format, and 3 were on modified forms of rotating longer periods. These 26 schools range in size from 187 to approximately 1500 students. The school sample is, therefore, stratified by size, geographic location, and demographic backgrounds. The sample was composed of convenient clusters of certified professionals at present employed by those schools who interact with identified EDB and diagnosed ADHD students on a daily basis. Each school's cluster was further stratified by position and included one administrator, two regular education teachers, one vocational/ technical teacher and one special education teacher yielding a pool of subjects totaling n = 130. The ultimate response rate was 52 or 40%.

The Sample

As previously stated, the sample consisted of convenient clusters of professionals in each district who have day-to-day contact with students officially identified as emotional behaviorally disordered or diagnosed with attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder. Part four of the survey questionnaire (described later in this chapter) requested specific biographical and professional information in order to establish a more complete profile of defining characteristics for both the

individual schools and staff.

The School

Using the questionnaire responses the following collective and individual attributes of the responding schools were determined. The average school has been on a block schedule for 2.318 years. Of those schools surveyed 19 (73.076%) have chosen to implement a 4X4 schedule, followed by 4 (15.384%) using an alternate day, and 3 (11.538%) using a rotating long period schedule. School enrollments, based on administrative responses, ranged from 187 to 975 students. The median school size was established at 427 students with a mean of 444.3 students.

The numbers of identified students with special needs, all disabilities combined, ranged from 12 to 142, with a median of 63 and a mean of 70. The total number of students diagnosed with ADHD ranged from 3 to 53 with a median for 14, a mode of 15, and a mean of 15.777 students. Students officially identified with EBD ranged within those same schools from 5 to 20 with a median of 13, a mode of 18, and a mean of 13.111 students. In the responding schools, 6.501% of the students are in the category EBD and/or ADHD which tends to be well within the established limits of previous research. Based on these data, the responding schools seem to be a reasonable reflection of New Hampshire schools on the block schedule.

As to the delivery of services to special education students, three administrators identified their schools as using a full inclusionary model. This model specifies no special classes with essentially all special education services being delivered within a regular classroom setting. Six administrators identified their schools as using a modified inclusionary model, meaning that 50% or more of the students' instructional program is delivered within regular education settings.

Finally, one administrator identified the participating school as a modified self contained model with 50% or less of the students' education delivered in regular education settings. No school responded that they were using a full self-contained model. 7 respondents stated that students with EBD and/or ADHD were routinely included in their inclusionary model, while 3 answered they were not. Respondents described support programs ranging from resource room assistance to an off-site program.

The Administrators

Specifically, the survey inquired about personal data concerning years of active teaching, administrative service, degrees earned, length of time as an administrator and in their present positions. They were also asked to provide general school information in order to build a profile of individual and composite schools. Of the 26 schools surveyed, 10 administrators responded: 7 were principals and 3 were assistant principals. They were evenly split as to degrees earned with 50% holding Masters degrees and 50% holding advanced graduate degrees or doctorates.

As teachers, the administrators' experience ranged from 3 to 23 years, with a mode of 10, a median of 10, and a mean of 11.333 years. Their years in administration ranged from 2 to 18 years, bimodal at 7 and 10 years with a median of 10, and a mean of 10.111 years. They had been in their present positions for a median of 5.5 years and a mean of 6.4 years

Regular Education Teachers

The regular education teachers in the sample indicated that they had been teaching for an average of 16.565 years and at their present schools for 11 years. By a two-to-one margin they

have either masters or advanced graduate studies degrees. They typically taught three classes per day. They maintained a 70 regular education student contacts rate-per-day. In addition to that 70, they taught an average of 4.5 students with EBD and 5 students with ADHD per day, with only 11.761% having any teacher assistants in the classes.

Twenty three (44.230%) regular education teachers responded. In the introductory letter, the administrators were asked to distribute one survey to an English teacher and a second to a teacher from a discipline of their choice. The profile of these teachers is that they had been instructing for a range of 2 to 28 years, with a median of 14 years, bimodal at 14 and 25 years, and a mean of 16.565 years. They have been at their present schools for a range of 1 to 16 years, with a median of 11 years, bimodal at 11 and 20 years, and a mean of 10.565 years of service. As a group 7 (30.434%) have Bachelor's degrees, 14 (60.869%) have Master's Degrees, and 2 (8.695%) have advance graduate studies degrees.

Current teaching assignments show that 13 (56%) of the teachers were teaching in the English/social studies areas and 10 (44%) were teaching in the math /science area. All teachers had corresponding certifications for those content areas. Data showed that 16 (69%) at present taught freshman classes, 21 (91%) taught sophomore classes, 16 (69%) taught junior classes, and 13 (56%) taught senior classes. The number of classes taught per day varied, but 3 was the median and mode at 15 teachers (65.21%), followed by 3 (13.043%) who taught 5 classes, 2 (8.695%) who taught 4, 1 (4.347%) who taught 2 classes, and 1 (4.347%) taught 1 class.

Within those classes the total number of student contacts per day ranged from 18 to 135, with a median of 69, a mode of 25, and a mean of 70. The number of students with EBD per day ranged from 0 to 15, with a median of 3, mode of 3, and a mean of 4.5. The number of students

median of 25 and a mean of 22.777 students.

Four of the teachers stated that they had daily contact with the regular education population in an instructional capacity which ranged from 1 or 2 to a small class of 16 students. Their caseload of EBD students ranged from 0 to 20, bimodal at 4 and 20, a median of 6 and a mean of 8.250 students. Their caseload of diagnosed students with ADHD ranged from 0 to 10, bimodal at 2 and 6, a median of 6, and a mean of 5.250 students. Eight responded that they have teacher assistants or tutors working with them at levels ranging from 1 to 14 full time equivalents for a median of 3 and a mean of 4.937. Seven answered that their access to a psychologist ranged greatly from a .2 full time equivalent to 2 full time equivalents.

In summary, the overall sample has:

1. It had 2.4 years on a 4X4 block schedule.
2. It has a 444.3 student population of whom 70 are special education students with 28.888 identified as either EBD or diagnosed with ADHD.
3. A professional staff which is fully certified, though in special education not always carrying the preferred endorsements to deal with the students in their caseload.
4. Administrators (principal or assistant principal) who have 10.116 years administrative experience and 6.4 years in their present position, and have a master's, advanced graduate or doctoral degree. These administrators also bring 11.333 years of teaching experience to their positions.
5. A regular education or academic teaching staff with 16.565 years teaching experience of which 10.865 years is at their present school and 70% have Master's or advanced graduate degrees . Per day, each teachers meets with 3 classes (blocks) with a total of 70 regular

education students and 9.5 students with EBD and/or ADHD.

6. Vocational/technical teachers with 14.5 years of teaching experience, with 7.7 years at their present position, and 70% have Master's or advanced graduate degrees. Per day, they teach 3 classes (blocks), have 51 regular education and 8.644 students with EBD and/or ADHD.
6. Special education teachers with 9.333 years experience with 5.222 years in their present position with a 50% at Bachelor's level and 50% at Master's level. 4 hold endorsements in EH and 5 in LD. They have a caseload of 22.222 students handled with 4.937 assistants, and a psychologist.

Data Collection

Data were collected in survey form from identified professionals in 26 school districts (Appendices E-I) throughout the state of New Hampshire. As stated, those schools currently use one of the three types of the block scheduling commonly referred to as 4X4, Alternate A&B Day, or a rotating system of longer blocks throughout a multiple day rotation. The basic list of schools was provided by the state department of education and one more school was added as it had gone on the block after publication of the list. It was determined that all schools would be involved with the survey rather than a representative sample in order to provide as deep and comprehensive a sample as possible.

Initial phone contacts with the schools were made with four objectives in mind. First, it allowed the researcher to introduce and outline the nature of the research. Second, the contact provided the researcher a chance to confirm basic information about the school such as the schedule used, length of time on the block, size of the school. The third objective was to provide

information about what the survey would entail in terms of respondents, time required to complete the survey, a time frame for completion, and confidentiality. The fourth and final objective was to ask for their participation in the survey. Of the 19 districts contacted directly, all agreed to participate in the survey.

Instrumentation:

In order to assess the effect of the block schedule on students with EBD and/or ADHD a system of "paper and pencil" parallel forms was developed to elicit responses from each of the four groups included in the sample. It was designed to be a combination of limited and open ended responses encouraging respondents to elaborate on any or all items or issues. The survey was designed to take about 30 minutes to complete depending on the length and depth of the open ended responses.

Parts IA for Regular Education students, 1B for Students with ADHD , and 1C for Students with EBD utilized a series of ten indicator/ prompt statements concerning the effects of the block schedule on these students. The prompt was preceded and ended with a Likert-type response scale. Column A asked the sample to respond to how they perceived the students' improvement in specific areas with 3 = Improved, 2= Same, 1 = Worse, 0 = No Opinion. Column B asked the sample to respond about how they perceived the students' present level of class performance with 3= Excellent, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Poor, and 0 = No Opinion. Figure 2 illustrates the limited response item format with the entire questionnaires included in Appendices F-I.

Figure 2: Parts 1A, 1B, and 1C sample response

Column A	Indicator	Column B
3 2 1 N/O	Follows classroom rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O

At the bottom of each response list was a question which asked for how many students teachers were in contact with on a daily basis and to add extra written comments as needed or desired.

Part 2 of the survey utilized a series of open ended items designed to elicit more information concerning each group's' perceptions of how the block had affected the educational process for students with EBD and/or ADHD. Three common questions were asked of all four groups with an additional open ended question added to the administrators and Special Education Teachers. The three core questions were:

1. What are the most positive aspects of block scheduling for students with EBD and/or ADHD?
2. What are the most negative aspects of block scheduling for students with EBD and/or ADHD?
3. In order to improve the system, what would be the one thing you could or should provide for students with EBD and/or ADHD?

The fourth question added to the administrator's and special education teacher's form was:

4. In order to improve the system, what would be the one thing you could or should provide for teachers of students with EBD and/or ADHD?

Part 3 was made up of 10 items to inquire how the respondents perceived overall behavioral

issues with students with EBD and/or ADHD. This again used a Likert type response scale of 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = undecided, 2 = disagree, and 1= strongly disagree. The focus for these items included attendance, in and out of classroom disciplinary actions, behaviors requiring removal from school, perceived student frustration levels, and parental impressions of students' behaviors. Figure 3 presents a sample of the limited response format with a full version included in the questionnaires in appendices F-I.

Figure 3: Part 3 limited response sample item

4. Longer class periods allow teachers more time to deal with disciplinary issues in their classes	5 4 3 2 1

As with other response lists space was provided and encouragement given to elaborate on any or all of the items.

Part 4 was designed to collect background information concerning the sample's educational history, educational experience, school settings, and instructional day. The objective was to construct a composite profile and defining characteristics of each group involved in the sample as well as the parameters of each group. Depending on their position each respondent was asked for information as to years of experience, years in their present position, degree level, areas of certification, class size, classes taught per day, and availability of instructional assistants.

Administrators and special education teachers were also asked for added information concerning the philosophical model used in the school (e.g.. inclusionary model vs. self contained.) Administrators were asked about drop-out rates for the school as a whole and the EBD and ADHD populations in specific. Special Education teachers were asked about

specialized endorsements, caseload data, areas of primary responsibility, staff management issues and student-to-staff ratios.

Once the mechanics of the parallel forms were completed, the distribution issue was addressed. Each group's questionnaire was color-coded in order to aid in distribution and tabulation of data. Blue copies were for administrators, pink for regular education teacher, green for vocational/ technical teachers, and yellow for special education teachers. Packets were made up with 1 blue, 2 pink, 1 green and 1 yellow for each school. The packets included a letter of introduction or reintroduction (depending on the previous contact made with the school), directions for distribution of the questionnaires, and a time line for returning the form (hopefully 2 weeks from receipt of the form).

A self addressed stamped envelope was included which had an identifying color-coded, numbered dot affixed where the return address would normally have been. The color coding of the envelopes was done to allow for tracking of responses without having to open the questionnaires, something which this researcher wanted to avoid until absolutely ready to deal with the data. It was also planned that this coding would allow for interschool analysis of the results. The number entered on each of the dots allowed only the researcher to know what school and what type of response was enclosed. These envelopes were physically attached to the forms to avoid any loss or mishandling.

All the respondents had to do was complete the survey, place it in an envelope and drop it in the mail. All 26 packets were mailed within 24 hours of each other. Responses began to arrive within 7 days and within 4 weeks 44 responses were accounted for from 12 schools. Phone contacts were made with as many schools as possible which had no returns. This became

increasingly difficult to determine as many of the respondents had removed the identifying school codes from the outside of the envelope.

Because it was determined to be critical to get more respondents two packets of response forms were hand delivered to two schools and distributed in this researcher's presence. Within two days the level of responses had risen to 52 which, though not what we had hoped for, was determined to be sufficient for this study. The total number of schools represented in the sample finally closed out at 14 (60.8595%.)

Reliability and Validity

The reliability of the survey was established by analysis of the quantitative items once they were coded and processed through the SYSTAT statistical software. Internal consistency data were derived for the Spearman-Brown Coefficient at 0.745, and a Coefficient Alpha for all items at 0.608. Content validity evidence was collected by a pilot test of the instrument using inservice teachers who are at present in the graduate education program at Notre Dame College. Minor editorial changes were made in wording of directions after review. A second review was by 4 experts in education and special education. No changes were recommended.

Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected from the sample. All of the surveys were opened at the same time in order to ensure that none of the information was used prior to the time that the statistical analysis of the data was done. At first all responses were carefully noted

to at least keep track of what schools and educators had replied. By the end of the return time 14 (27%) of the respondents had removed the identification labels so that the tracking system was abandoned in terms of potential school-to-school comparison. Based on the remaining identification codes, however, it is known that at least 14 of the 26 schools responded with at least 1 survey.

Each survey was given an identification code and results were recorded in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet text version. Upon printing the first run of resulting numbers, all data were verified and changes were made to 2 entries. The data for Parts 1A, 1B, 1C, and Part 3 of the survey were entered into and processed by SYSTAT statistical software to obtain both descriptive and inferential results.

The first data analysis produced descriptive statistics which addressed the Parts 1A, 1B, 1C and Part 3 of the survey. The first set of results concerned the Change/Improvement section of the Parts 1A, 1B, and 1C, Items 1-10. The results, based on n = 52, were the frequencies, means, and standard deviations for each indicator based on the 3 point scale used for responses. The next results were those for the Current Level of Performance, a parallel set of responses using Parts 1A, 1B, and 1C Items 11-20 . Frequencies, means and standard deviations were derived for these responses using n = 52. For Part 3, the same procedures for frequencies, means and standard deviations were conducted, but this time the 5 point scale was used.

Next, a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient matrix was done for all the pairs of responses for the items. This was done to ascertain the degree of relationship between the responses concerning the three groups of students. Again the data used were based on the entire sample. The test for significance was for the null hypothesis where rho represents the population

parameter for the correlations. The critical value for r was determined at 0.650 with an alpha level of significance $p = < .001$.

The final statistical procedure was to establish the differences between the 4 groups of educators, n = group membership, frequencies were determined. These data were analyzed in a two way contingency table with alpha = 0.05. Chi square was used to test the null hypothesis that there was no association between group membership and responses to each item.

The qualitative data were handled by reviewing the written responses to the open ended prompts and assigning all respondents an identification code. The data were then transcribed verbatim. They were reviewed by the researcher for common words and themes and each response was placed on a matrix according to that common word or theme. They were then combined and are used throughout Chapter 4 and 5 as supportive data for the quantitative results or their own in the findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations sections.

Ethics

The research meets the ethical standards for human subject research established by the American Psychological Association. The only person who really knew who the respondents were was the administrator who chose them. The responses were completely anonymous. . Unfortunately, 14 of the respondents removed the identifying label on the envelope which immediately negated the possibility of a school by school analysis.

Delimiting Factors

There are a number of delimiting factors that may affect the results of this research. First is

the length of time which many of the schools have been on a block schedule. Many schools have only just begun the process of switching over. Administrators, as determined through initial phone conversations, are optimistic but hesitant to claim success. Next, the size of the sample is limiting in that only 40% of the forms were returned. This was partly because of the time of year for the survey. Phone conversations had been encouraging, but the results were less than had been hoped for.

Another factor is that block schedules vary greatly from school to school. A 4X4 Schedule in one school may very well not be the same in any other school. Each school is using various methods to adapt the schedule to meet their specific needs. With some math, foreign language, music, and English classes being broken down into 45 minute sections depending on the class and level of students, comparisons can be difficult.

The final factor is the issue or self reporting. Most of the respondents probably have a high degree of professional and personal effort invested in the transition process from the traditional schedule to the block. This can alter their view or assessment of the schedule and their school based on a socially desirable response elicited from those respondents.

Chapter 4

Findings

This chapter presents the findings of this research study. It is divided into 5 sections focusing on the following research questions.

1. What are the perceived effects of block schedules on students identified with EBD and/or ADHD as compared to regular education students?
2. What changes/improvements have occurred in the performance levels of regular education students, and students with EBD and/or ADHD in block scheduled schools?
3. What are the current performance levels for regular education students, and students with EBD and/or ADHD in block scheduled schools?
4. Do the four individual groups of educators see similar effects across all three groups of students?
5. What do the four individual groups of educators see as the most positive and negative aspects of the block for the students with EBD and/or ADHD?

The first section examines the level of change or improvement in student performance for each student group while on the block schedule. The second section focuses on the current level of performance each group of students has achieved under the block schedule. The third section addresses the perceived relationships between the indicators for the 3 student groups. The fourth section addresses how the 4 groups of administrators view the 3 groups of students. The fifth section addresses the positive and negative aspects of the block schedule as they relate to students with EBD and/or ADHD.

Section 1: Has the block schedule affected the day to day performance of regular education students and students with EBD and/or ADHD in school situations?

Do the longer class periods of the block schedule produce an environment in which all

students improve in academic achievement, behavioral performance, and social competence? Monitoring student performance is essential for any school, but following changes in performance and achievement in these domains is critical for effective programs involving students with EBD and/or ADHD. The educators responded to indicators with their observed improvements for each of the three student groups. The data presented for this question utilizes the responses on items 1-10 on Part 1A, 1B, 1C and all of the items in Part 3. These results are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 : Whole Group Response to Survey Items 1-10 in Parts 1A, 1B, and 1C (N =52)

Indicator/ Prompt Statements		Responses: 3= Improved, 2 = Same, 1= Worse		
Item #	Indicators	Reg. Ed Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students
1	Followed class rules consistently	Mean 2.347 SD 0.561	Mean 1.902 SD 0.781	Mean 2.045 SD 0.834
2	Attention to class activities	Mean 2.408 SD 0.674	Mean 1.725 SD 0.874	Mean 1.744 SD 0.902
3	Focusing concentration on class work	Mean 2.224 SD 0.715	Mean 1.980 SD 0.836	Mean 1.977 SD 0.821
4	Disruptive behaviors requiring removal from class	Mean 2.347 SD 0.631	Mean 2.098 SD 0.855	Mean 2.114 SD 0.868
5	Participation in class activities	Mean 2.592 SD 0.643	Mean 1.745 SD 0.821	Mean 1.773 SD 0.711
6	Consistently producing required assignments	Mean 2.082 SD 0.640	Mean 1.824 SD 0.793	Mean 1.932 SD 0.780
7	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	Mean 2.265 SD 0.569	Mean 1.961 SD 0.622	Mean 2.023 SD 0.628
8	Maintaining positive interactions with me	Mean 2.469 SD 0.544	Mean 1.941 SD 0.835	Mean 1.864 SD 0.852
9	Daily attendance	Mean 2.306 SD 0.683	Mean 1.902 SD 0.781	Mean 1.886 SD 0.841
10	Grades	Mean 2.347 SD 0.723	Mean 1.694 SD 0.713	Mean 1.630 SD 1.258

For the most part, educators see regular education students improving in response to the block schedule. Table 1 displays the mean and standard deviations for each indicator for the regular students. At the low end of the continuum, few educators saw improvement on Item 6 (consistently producing required assignments). 62% of the educators responded that the regular education students were performing at the same level as they had been previously. At the high end, on Item 5 (participation in class activities) 62% responded that students had improved, with an additional 29% rating it as the same. Previous studies had indicated that maintaining positive interactions with peers or classmates (Item 6) was an important skill for all students. For the regular education students, 57% of the educators see the regular education students as being the same, while 31% see students as improved. Although block schedule proponents stress that the improving the student/ teacher relationship is important, these educators split evenly (46% for same and improved) on students being able to maintain positive interactions with the them (Item 7). Essentially the same split occurred on Item 10 (grades).

Part 1C of the survey examined the areas of improvements for students with EBD with those results found in Table 1. For the most part these students were viewed as staying the same. On the continuum, the area of least improvement was in Item 10 (grades) with 48% of the educators seeing their progress as the same with only 17% seeing improvement. The next lowest was Item 2 (attention to class activities) with an identical 48% same, 17% improved split. At the high end, 40% of the educators see Item 4 (disruptive behaviors requiring removal from class) as the same with 23% seeing improvement. The level of positive interactions with classmates (Item 7) was seen by 52% of the educators as being the same. 64% of educators agreed that the level of positive interactions between the students and them had remained the same.

Part 1B elicited responses about the third ranked group, students diagnosed with ADHD. For the most part few educators saw any improvement in the 10 indicators. In overall responses those for students with ADHD closely matched those for the students with EBD. At the low end, 62% of the educators see improvement in grades in the low, same range. The students' with EBD highest perceived level of improvement is on Item 5 (participation in class activities) and Item 4 (disruptive behaviors requiring removal from class) with 50% of educators seeing those items' levels as the same. 58% of the educators see these students' ability to maintain positive

Table 2 : Whole Group Responses for Part 3 (N = 52)

Indicator/Prompt Statements Part 3: Items 1 - 10	Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Undecided 2 = Disagree, 1 = Agree

Item #	Indicator	Group Response
1	Students with ADHD are less likely to be absent from school than in the past.	Mean 3.356 SD 1.209
2	Students with EBD are less likely to be absent from school than in the past	Mean 3.422 SD 0.995
3	Average daily attendance has improved throughout the school population.	Mean 3.504 SD 0.898
4	Longer class periods allow teachers more time to deal with disciplinary issues in their classes.	Mean 3.324 SD 0.974
5	Teachers refer ADHD students less often to the office for disciplinary actions.	Mean 3.445 SD 1.026
6	Teachers refer EBD students less often to the office for disciplinary actions.	Mean 2.760 SD 0.993
7	Within the regular school population, behaviors or situations requiring removal from class have been reduced.	Mean 3.543 SD 1.060
8	Within the ADHD population, behaviors and situations requiring removal from class have been reduced.	Mean 2.936 SD 1.126
9	Within the EBD population, behaviors and situations requiring removal from class have been reduced.	Mean 3.664 SD 1.843
10	Parents of students with either ADHD and/or EBD seem to feel that their children's behaviors are better.	Mean 3.079 SD 0.988

interaction with classmates (Item 7), as remaining the same. At the same time 73% of those educators view these students' ability to maintain positive interactions with them (Item 8) as the same.

Though behavioral issues impact all sections of the school population, students with EBD or ADHD are generally more apt to be involved with behavioral issues than regular education students. Part 3 focused on the behavioral effects of the block schedule on the three groups of students. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for the data collected in this part of the survey. Most educators agree that regular education students have demonstrated improvements in behaviors while on the block schedule. 58% either agree or strongly agree that attendance (Item 3) for these students has improved. 54% agree or strongly agree that behaviors or situations requiring removal from class (Item 7) have been reduced.

There was less agreement about the improvements in students with ADHD, but agreed that there had been some improvement while on the block schedule. 49% (28% agree, 21% strongly agree) observe that these students have improved their attendance (Item 1). 45% agreed or strongly agreed that students with ADHD are less likely to be sent to the office for disciplinary actions (Item 5). The results indicate that the educators were split evenly, 27% agree and 27% disagree, on Item 8 (behaviors and situations requiring removal from class). 25% of the respondents were undecided on this item.

Most educators identified students with EBD as demonstrating the least improvement on these behavioral items. 46% of the educators see students with EBD as now being less likely to be absent from school (Item 2). The most negative response was to Item 6 with 47% of the educators disagreeing that these students are sent to the office less often for disciplinary actions.

59% of the respondents agree that behaviors and situations requiring removal from class (Item 9) have been reduced.

There are two questions in part three which do not focus on students. These address teacher and parent issues. Item 10 examines how the parents view their children's behaviors since being on the block schedule. 38% of educators agree that parents believe their children's behaviors are improving. Item 4 examined effects of longer class periods on the time teachers have to deal with behavior and disciplinary issues within their classes. 50% agreed that it did allow them time to deal with disciplinary issues within the classroom, while only 15% disagreed. This may account for the improvement in removal from class and office disciplinary actions responses.

In summary, based on responses to the indicators in Parts 1 and 3 of the survey, most educators see an improvement in the performance levels for regular education students on the block schedule. Students with EBD were seen as remaining at the same level that they had been, while students with ADHD demonstrated a slightly decreased level of performance. The results were significant in that educators as a group gave similar responses to all the items for students with EBD and/or ADHD.

Section Two: What are the current levels of performance for regular education students, and students with EBD and/or ADHD on the block schedule?

The current level of performance is an important qualifier for the level of improvement. The desirable outcome is obvious: if the students demonstrate improvement in their performance then a corresponding current level of performance should reflect that improvement. Data derived from Parts 1A, 1B and 1C Items 11 -20 are presented in Table 3 as means and standard

deviations.

Table 3: Responses to Survey Items 11 - 20 in Parts 1A, 1B, and 1C (N=52)

Indicator/ Prompt Statements		Responses: 3= Excellent, 2 = Satisfactory, 1= Poor		
Item #	Indicators	Regular Ed Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students
11	Followed class rules consistently	Mean 2.191 SD 0.576	Mean 1.673 SD 0.658	Mean 1.756 SD 0.734
12	Attention to class activities	Mean 2.170 SD 0.564	Mean 1.521 SD 0.772	Mean 1.512 SD 0.746
13	Focusing concentration on class work	Mean 1.915 SD 0.583	Mean 1.816 SD 0.755	Mean 1.714 SD 0.742
14	Disruptive behaviors requiring removal from class	Mean 2.188 SD 0.571	Mean 1.837 SD 0.733	Mean 1.762 SD 0.656
15	Participation in class activities	Mean 2.362 SD 0.673	Mean 1.531 SD 0.767	Mean 1.500 SD 0.672
16	Consistently producing required assignments	Mean 1.957 SD 0.588	Mean 1.673 SD 0.689	Mean 1.643 SD 0.618
17	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	Mean 2.128 SD 0.575	Mean 2.000 SD 0.677	Mean 1.976 SD 0.643
18	Maintaining positive interactions with me	Mean 2.234 SD 0.560	Mean 1.898 SD 0.823	Mean 1.810 SD 0.804
19	Daily attendance	Mean 2.000 SD 0.626	Mean 1.714 SD 0.677	Mean 1.762 SD 0.726
20	Grades	Mean 2.087 SD 0.551	Mean 1.932 SD 0.728	Mean 1.630 SD 1.258

The responding educators, as a whole, see the current performance of the regular education students on the block schedule as satisfactory. On the continuum, the lowest item was focusing concentration on classwork (Item 13) which 71% of the educators reported as satisfactory and 23% as excellent. The highest was Item 15 (participation in class activities) with 44% responding as satisfactory and 40% responding as excellent. Interactions with classmates (Item 17) were

seen as satisfactory by 59% and excellent by 21% of the educators. 57% of these respondents also see interactions between themselves and the students as satisfactory with another 27% seeing them as excellent. The educators generally felt that the student grades were satisfactory.

Though with somewhat more mixed responses, students with ADHD were ranked second in current levels of performance. They were seen to be more on the low end (less than M=1.900) of the satisfactory scale. The lowest response was to Item 12 (attention to class activities). At (M=1.521, SD=0.772) 67% of the educators responded that attention to class activities was satisfactory, but 23% viewed it as poor. Item 15 (participation in class activities), the strongest for regular education student was the second lowest for students with ADHD even though 59% of the educators responded that they were satisfactory. At the high end of the continuum was Item 17 (maintaining positive interactions with classmates), seen as satisfactory by 69% of the educators. On Item 20 (grades), a majority of responses placed them in the satisfactory range.

The responses to students with EBD indicators were just slightly below the students with ADHD. These were, on average, in the lower satisfactory range. As with the students with ADHD, Item 15 (participation in class activities) was the lowest indicator, yet 60% of the educators responded that the current level of performance was satisfactory. The highest rated performance level was on Item 17 (maintaining positive interactions with classmates) to which 52% of the educators responded that the level was satisfactory. 60% of the educators rated Item 18 (maintaining of positive interactions with me) as satisfactory.

The data place the current level of performance of regular education students solidly in the satisfactory range and ahead of the other two groups of students. On average, the students with ADHD did slightly better on the current level of performance than the students with EBD

. This is a reversal from level of improvement responses. Again, as with the level of improvement, the ADHD and EBD responses were closely matched in their position on the continuum of indicators. Only one of the responses for these two groups matched any of the regular education students' responses. The highest rated item (#15: participation in class activities) for regular education students was the lowest or second lowest rated indicator for students with EBD and/or ADHD.

Section 3: What is the perceived relationship between the 10 indicators for the 3 student groups?

This section examines the correlations drawn between the 10 indicators used in Part 1A, 1B and 1C of the survey. As early analysis of the data proceeded, a pattern began to develop concerning the potential for the three groups being seen as more nearly two groups: Regular education students and students with EBD combined with students with ADHD. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient matrix was generated using indicators A1-A20, B1-B20, and C1-C20. Each of the combinations to which it was applied yields a potential 380 positive correlations.

The correlation of A1-20 to A1-20 (regular education student indicators) yielded only 2 correlations at the $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level , and 52 at the $r>0.400$, $p=0.01$. Examining A1-20 and B1-20 found even smaller numbers of correlations with 0 at $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level and only 8 at $r>0.400$, $p=0.01$. When the A1-20 and C1-20 indicators were compared there were again 0 at $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level and 27 at $r>0.400$, $p=0.01$. Comparing the responses for both the students with EBD and/or ADHD with the comparable indicators resulted n only 2

combinations with r values of statistical significance. The regular education students were clearly not correlated with the other two groups.

There was a distinct difference when the correlation matrix was performed on indicators B1-B20 looking at the students with ADHD. The B1-20 and B1-20 matrix yielded 31 correlations at $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level with another 122 at $r>0.400$, $p=0.01$. When the procedure was applied to B1-20 (ADHD) and C1-20 (EBD) the numbers of correlations rose to 49 at $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level, with another 223 at $r>0.400$, $p=0.01$. The final combination of C1-20 and C1-20, looking at the EBD students only, yielded 36 correlations at the $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level and 135 at $r>0.400$, $p=0.01$. There was a positive relationship between the ADHD and EBD indicators.

A review of the correlated items for the B 1-20 (ADHD) and C1-20 (EBD) students only, at the $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level was completed. A typical example of the type of correlation experienced is the one between Item B10 (grades) and C15 (participation in class activities). This correlation achieved an $r=0.761$, $p=0.000$ which placed it near the middle of those items which showed the $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level or greater. An analysis of this correlation show that 22 responders rated the current level of performance for students with EBD and/or ADHD items as satisfactory. At the same time, 6 responders rated grades as excellent while rating participation in class as satisfactory, 3 rate grades as satisfactory while rating participation in class a worse. 3 responses rated both grades and participation in class as worse. This accounts for 34 of the responses with 10 not answering for a total of 44 of the 52 responses. This is typical of the correlation responses. Across all correlations the central point of the regression line was at the 2.000 by 2.000 response intersection: satisfactory and the same.

Table 4: Items and the responses to correlations at or above the $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level on correlations for items B1-B20 and C1- C20

Indicator	Correlated Indicators
1. Consistently follows rules:	Attention to class activities Focusing concentration on class work Disruptive behaviors Maintaining positive interactions with classmates Maintaining positive interactions with me Grades
2. Attention to class activities:	Focusing concentration on class work Disruptive behaviors Participation in class activities Maintaining positive interactions with classmates Grades
3. Focusing concentration on class work	Attention to class activities Consistently produces assigned work Maintaining Positive interactions with classmate Grades
4. Disruptive behaviors requiring removal from class	Consistently follows school rules Attention to class activities Participation in class activities Maintaining positive interactions with classmates Grades
5. Participation in class activities	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates Consistently produces assigned work Grades
6. Consistently produces assigned work	Focusing concentration on class work Grades
7. Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	Attention to class activities Consistently follows school rules Maintaining positive interactions with me
8. Maintaining positive interactions with me	Attention to class activities Participation in class activities Maintaining positive interactions with classmates Attendance
9. Attendance:	Maintaining positive interactions with me
10 .Grades	Attention to class activities Focusing concentration on class work Participation in class activities Consistently producing assigned work

Table 4 presents a list of the item numbers and indicators followed by alist of the items which they correlated with at a level of $r>0.650$, $p=0.000$ level .

Upon review of the items, the correlations state what would be expected. For example, grades on the whole should correlate with attention to class activities, focusing concentration on class work, participation in class activities, and consistently producing assigned work.

The data were examined to establish a relationship between the indicators using the levels of improvement and current performance as the criteria. There are three categories: 1. Improved performance level to improved performance level (e.g. B3 - B8 or B5-C7), 2. Improved performance level to current level of performance (e.g. B1 -B14 or B16-C4), 3. Current level of performance to current level of performance (e.g. B13 - 19, C16-C20). Examination of correlated items showed 36% were of improvement to improvement items (e.g. B1-B3, B3-C5), 30% were of combined improvement to current performance levels (e.g. B1 - B17, C1-C18) and 34% of current performance to current performance levels (C11-C14, C11-C18).

The analysis of the data for this section indicates a unified perception that there is a relationship between the response of students with EBD and/or ADHD within the context of the block schedule. These educators see two distinct groups of students: regular education and EBD and ADHD combined. There is little differentiation between the EBD and ADHD groups. The correlations show relationships between related indicators for these two groups. The influence of improvement in performance and the current level of performance seem to influence each across all indicators evenly.

Section 4: Do the 4 groups of educators view the 3 groups of students similarly?

This section compares the way each group of educators see the three groups of students.

When divided into the four groups: administrators, regular education teachers, vocational/ technical teachers, and special education teachers, do those groups see the student groups similarly in terms of the level of improvement and current level of performance? Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 present the data for each group of educators on the 3 groups of students in means and standard deviations. The regular education students' data provide the comparison standard for the response pattern on all sets of an item.

When the four groups of educators' responses for Parts 1A, 1B, 1C, and Part 3 were compared there were no instances where all groups of educators ranked the 3 groups of students exactly alike. More routinely 3 groups of educators would come to close agreement with the remaining group being either more or less negative. There were three specific instances which came close in terms of finding the groups of students similar, six if you consider the level of change/improvement and the current level of performance categories.

The item which drew the closest agreement between the 4 groups of educators was on Items 6 and 16 (consistently produces required assignments). For both the level of change/ improvement and current level of performance all four groups responded that this was an area of weakness. The level of change/ improvement indicates a slight difference between groups, but they placed it at the lower end of the "same" range. It was the lowest ranked for the regular education students followed by low ranking ADHD and EBD. The current level of performance for the 3 groups of students was seen as the lowest or second lowest ranked of the 20 categories..

On Items 3 and 13 (focusing concentration of class work), administrators, regular education teachers, and special education teachers placed all 3 groups of students in low satisfactory to

Table # 5: Individual group responses to Part 1A Regular Education students prompt statements - Means and Standard Deviations

Responses A1-A10: 3=Improved, 2=Same, 1= Worse					Prompt Statement	Responses A11-A20: 3=Excellent, 2=Satisfactory, 1=Poor				
ID#	Administrator	Classroom teachers	Voc/Tech teachers	Sp. Ed. Teachers	Indicator	ID#	Administrator	Classroom Teachers	Voc/Tech Teachers	Sp. Ed. Teachers
A1	Mean 2.400 SD 0.699	Mean 2.318 SD 0.568	Mean 2.300 SD 0.483	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Follows class rules consistently	A11	Mean 2.111 SD 0.610	Mean 2.286 SD 0.561	Mean 2.000 SD 0.471	Mean 2.286 SD 0.756
A2	Mean 2.400 SD 0.699	Mean 2.364 SD 0.790	Mean 2.500 SD 0.527	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Attention to class activities	A12	Mean 2.000 SD 0.500	Mean 2.143 SD 0.655	Mean 2.200 SD 0.422	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535
A3	Mean 2.500 SD 0.707	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 2.300 SD 0.483	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Focusing concentration on class work	A13	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.762 SD 0.539	Mean 2.200 SD 0.422	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488
A4	Mean 2.400 SD 0.690	Mean 2.364 SD 0.492	Mean 2.400 SD 0.516	Mean 2.143 SD 1.069	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	A14	Mean 1.900 SD 0.568	Mean 2.238 SD 0.625	Mean 2.300 SD 0.483	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488
A5	Mean 2.600 SD 0.966	Mean 2.591 SD 0.590	Mean 2.500 SD 0.527	Mean 2.714 SD 0.488	Participation in class activities	A15	Mean 2.111 SD 1.054	Mean 2.381 SD 0.590	Mean 2.400 SD 0.516	Mean 2.571 SD 0.535
A6	Mean 2.200 SD 0.919	Mean 1.909 SD 0.526	Mean 2.100 SD 0.568	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Consistently produces required assignments	A16	Mean 1.778 SD 0.667	Mean 1.857 SD 0.478	Mean 2.100 SD 0.738	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488
A7	Mean 2.400 SD 0.699	Mean 2.273 SD 0.550	Mean 2.100 SD 0.568	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488	Maintains positive interactions with classmates	A17	Mean 1.889 SD 0.333	Mean 2.143 SD 0.655	Mean 2.200 SD 0.632	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488
A8	Mean 2.600 SD 0.516	Mean 2.455 SD 0.596	Mean 2.400 SD 0.516	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Maintains positive interactions with me	A18	Mean 2.000 SD 0.500	Mean 2.333 SD 0.658	Mean 2.200 SD 0.422	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488
A9	Mean 2.200 SD 0.632	Mean 2.364 SD 0.658	Mean 2.200 SD 0.919	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Daily school attendance	A19	Mean 2.000 SD 0.500	Mean 1.952 SD 0.590	Mean 1.900 SD 0.876	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488
A10	Mean 2.500 SD 0.972	Mean 2.273 SD 0.550	Mean 2.500 SD 0.527	Mean 2.143 SD 1.069	Grades	A20	Mean 2.000 SD 0.866	Mean 2.000 SD 0.459	Mean 2.200 SD 0.422	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488

Table #6: Individual group responses to Part I B ADHD students prompt statements - Means and Standard Deviations

Responses B1-B10: 3=Improved, 2=Same, 1= Worse					Prompt Statement	Responses B11-B20: 3=Excellent, 2=Satisfactory, 1=Poor				
ID#	Administrator	Classroom teachers	Voc/Tech teachers	Sp. Ed. Teachers	Indicator	ID#	Administrato	Classroom Teachers	Voc/Tech Teachers	Sp. Ed. Teachers
B1	Mean 2.100 SD 0.994	Mean 2.000 SD 0.617	Mean 1.900 SD 0.738	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882	Follows class rules consistently	B11	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.952 SD 0.498	Mean 1.700 SD 0.949	Mean 1.111 SD 0.601
B2	Mean 2.100 SD 0.994	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 1.556 SD 1.014	Attention to class activities	B12	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.762 SD 0.423	Mean 1.900 SD 0.876	Mean 1.222 SD 0.677
B3	Mean 1.800 SD 1.135	Mean 1.727 SD 0.767	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 1.333 SD 0.866	Focusing concentration on class work	B13	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882	Mean 1.571 SD 0.676	Mean 1.889 SD 0.928	Mean 1.111 SD 0.614
B4	Mean 2.100 SD 0.994	Mean 2.182 SD 0.664	Mean 1.800 SD 0.919	Mean 1.556 SD 0.882	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	B14	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 2.095 SD 0.539	Mean 1.700 SD 0.949	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882
B5	Mean 2.100 SD 1.287	Mean 2.318 SD 0.534	Mean 1.900 SD 0.738	Mean 1.778 SD 0.972	Participation in class activities	B15	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882	Mean 2.048 SD 0.590	Mean 2.100 SD 0.876	Mean 1.444 SD 0.716
B6	Mean 1.900 SD 1.197	Mean 1.818 SD 0.501	Mean 1.600 SD 0.966	Mean 1.556 SD 0.882	Consistently produces required assignments	B16	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882	Mean 1.714 SD 0.561	Mean 1.600 SD 1.075	Mean 1.111 SD 0.601
B7	Mean 1.900 SD 0.994	Mean 1.919 SD 0.684	Mean 1.900 SD 0.876	Mean 1.444 SD 0.726	Maintains positive interactions with classmates	B17	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.810 SD 0.602	Mean 1.800 SD 0.789	Mean 1.222 SD 0.667
B8	Mean 1.900 SD 0.876	Mean 2.045 SD 0.375	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Maintains positive interactions with me	B18	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Mean 2.143 SD 0.478	Mean 2.100 SD 0.876	Mean 1.778 SD 0.667
B9	Mean 2.000 SD 0.943	Mean 2.045 SD 0.650	Mean 1.600 SD 0.966	Mean 2.000 SD 1.000	Daily school attendance	B19	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Mean 1.857 SD 0.478	Mean 1.900 SD 1.197	Mean 2.111 SD 1.054
B10	Mean 2.000 SD 1.247	Mean 1.955 SD 0.575	Mean 1.900 SD 0.738	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Grades	B20	Mean 1.556 SD 1.014	Mean 1.810 SD 0.402	Mean 1.800 SD 0.789	Mean 1.556 SD 0.726

Table #7: Individual group responses to Part 1C EBD student prompt statements - Means and Standard Deviations

Rsponses C1-C10: 3=Improved, 2=Same, 1= Worse					Prompt Statement	Responses C11-C20: 3=Excellent, 2=Satisfactory, 1=Poor				
ID#	Administrator	Classroom teachers	Voc/Tech teachers	Sp. Ed. Teachers	Indicator	ID#	Administrator	Classroom Teachers	Voc/Tech Teachers	Sp. Ed. Teachers
C1	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Mean 2.111 SD 0.676	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Mean 1.875 SD 0.641	Follows class rules consistently	C11	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744	Mean 1.882 SD 0.485	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Mean 1.375 SD 0.518
C2	Mean 2.111 SD 1.054	Mean 2.000 SD 0.767	Mean 2.111 SD 0.928	Mean 2.000 SD 0.756	Attention to class activities	C12	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744	Mean 1.882 SD 0.697	Mean 1.750 SD 1.035	Mean 1.625 SD 0.518
C3	Mean 1.750 SD 1.165	Mean 1.722 SD 0.958	Mean 1.889 SD 0.928	Mean 1.625 SD 0.518	Focusing concentration on class work	C13	Mean 1.375 SD 0.918	Mean 1.529 SD 0.717	Mean 1.500 SD 0.926	Mean 1.625 SD 0.518
C4	Mean 2.111 SD 1.054	Mean 2.167 SD 0.618	Mean 1.889 SD 0.928	Mean 1.500 SD 0.756	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	C14	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744	Mean 1.882 SD 0.781	Mean 1.667 SD 0.866	Mean 1.500 SD 0.535
C5	Mean 1.889 SD 1.269	Mean 2.222 SD 0.808	Mean 2.111 SD 0.928	Mean 2.125 SD 0.354	Participation in class activities	C15	Mean 1.375 SD 0.916	Mean 1.765 SD 0.562	Mean 1.889 SD 0.782	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000
C6	Mean 1.667 SD 1.000	Mean 1.778 SD 0.647	Mean 1.889 SD 0.782	Mean 1.750 SD 0.463	Consistently produces required assignments	C16	Mean 1.375 SD 0.916	Mean 1.588 SD 0.618	Mean 1.444 SD 0.726	Mean 1.500 SD 0.535
C7	Mean 1.889 SD 0.928	Mean 2.056 SD 0.539	Mean 2.000 SD 0.866	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744	Maintains positive interactions with classmates	C17	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744	Mean 1.765 SD 0.562	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.375 SD 0.518
C8	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Mean 2.167 SD 0.514	Mean 2.000 SD 0.866	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000	Maintains positive interactions with me	C18	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744	Mean 2.118 SD 0.600	Mean 1.889 SD 0.782	Mean 2.125 SD 0.354
C9	Mean 2.000 SD 1.000	Mean 1.833 SD 0.514	Mean 1.556 SD 1.236	Mean 2.125 SD 0.835	Daily school attendance	C19	Mean 1.750 SD 0.866	Mean 1.941 SD 0.429	Mean 1667 SD 1.225	Mean 1.750 SD 0.886
C10	Mean 2.000 SD 1.323	Mean 1.889 SD 0.676	Mean 1.667 SD 1.000	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000	Grades	C20	Mean 1.625 SD 1.188	Mean 1.824 SD 0.529	Mean 1.556 SD 0.882	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000

Table #8: Part 3 Responses by group

Indicator /Prompt Statements		Ratings Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree 4 = Agree 3 = Undecided 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree			
ID #	Indicator	Administrator	Classroom Teachers	Voc/Tech Teachers	Sp. Ed Teachers
E1	Students with ADHD are less likely to be absent from school than in the past.	Mean 3.800 SD 1.033	Mean 2.913 SD 1.276	Mean 3.556 SD 1.236	Mean 3.875 SD 1.246
E2	Students with EBD are less likely to be absent from school than in the past.	Mean 3.667 SD 1.000	Mean 3.091 SD 1.269	Mean 3.556 SD 1.130	Mean 3.375 SD 1.408
E3	Average daily attendance has improved throughout the school population.	Mean 3.800 SD 1.229	Mean 3.522 SD 1.082	Mean 3.444 SD 0.726	Mean 3.250 SD 0.707
E4	Longer class periods allow teachers more time to deal with disciplinary issues in their classes.	Mean 3.400 SD 1.075	Mean 3.550 SD 0.887	Mean 3.222 SD 0.833	Mean 3.125 SD 0.835
E5	Teachers refer ADHD students less often to the office for disciplinary actions.	Mean 3.200 SD 1.033	Mean 3.609 SD 0.839	Mean 4.222 SD .833	Mean 2.750 SD 0.866
E6	Teachers refer EBD student less often to the office for disciplinary actions.	Mean 3.111 SD 1.054	Mean 2.783 SD 0.850	Mean 2.7778 SD 1.563	Mean 2.375 SD 0.744
E7	Within the regular school population, behaviors or situations requiring removal from class have been reduced.	Mean 3.500 SD 1.269	Mean 3.700 SD 0.733	Mean 4.222 SD 0.833	Mean 2.750 SD 0.886
E8	Within the ADHD population, behaviors and situations requiring removal from class have been reduced.	Mean 3.400 SD 0.966	Mean 2.800 SD 0.894	Mean 2.667 SD 1.500	Mean 2.875 SD 0.997
E9	Within the EBD population, behaviors and situations requiring removal from class or school have been reduced.	Mean 3.778 SD 0.667	Mean 4.045 SD 1.214	Mean 4.333 SD 0.707	Mean 2.500 SD 0.756
E10	Parents of students with either ADHD and/or EBD seem to feel that their children's behaviors are better.	Mean 3.111 SD 0.978	Mean 2.780 SD 1.424	Mean 3.300 SD 1. 636	Mean 3.125 SD 0.641

poor range on the current performance level. Vocational/technical teachers were slightly more positive and ranked these groups third lowest. The ranking for Item 3 found agreement only to place all of them in the low to middle range of the same on the level of change/ improvement.

At the high end of the range were Items 8 and 18 (maintains positive interactions with me). The regular education, vocational/technical teachers, and special education teachers see this area as the same for level of change/improvement and satisfactory for the current level of performance. Administrators do not completely share that opinion. They are slightly more negative especially with students with EBD and/or ADHD..

The items mentioned have one thing in common: in each case one of the groups of educators had a slightly different perception (e.g. the vocational/technical teachers on Items 6 and 16, or the administrators for Items 8 and 18.) The data indicate in a number of instances where two groups agree and two disagree. A prime example of this is the response to the students with ADHD B 15 (participation in class activities). The administrators at 70% and special education teachers at 89% placed the students with ADHD current performance level in the poor range. The regular education teachers at 78% and vocational teachers at 90% placed the students' current performance level in the mid satisfactory range. This pattern was only apparent with students with EBD and/or ADHD. Administrators and special education teachers see these students in a more negative manner than the regular education and vocational/technical teachers.

Most interestingly, the special education teachers could almost be singled out as a group of one in numerous instances by their significant number of low responses for the students with EBD and/or ADHD followed by the administrators. Special education teachers rated the performance of students with ADHD as worse on 3 (B1, B3, B7) of the 10 indicators on change/ improvement

and as poor on 7(B11, B12, B13, B14, B15, B16, B17) of the 10 indicators for current level of performance. On 3 Items (B13, B15, and B16), administrators rated these students as worse. The classroom teachers and vocational/technical teachers routinely placed these students in the same range for level of change/ improvement and satisfactory range for current level of performance.

On average, special education teachers were less negative concerning students with EBD than for students with ADHD, but still more negative than other groups of educators. The special education teachers' responses for students with EBD placed two items C11 and C17 in the poor range on current level of performance. These did not match any of the administrators' negative responses. As with the students with ADHD administrators identified C13, C15, and C16 are being in the worse range.

The answer to the question is that there is no clear pattern that the four groups of educators see similarities between the groups throughout the responses. They are close, but there is fluctuation between the groups of educators regarding responses and definitely differences between the groups of students. If any similarities exist, they are seen between the students with EBD and the students with ADHD.

Section 5: What do the 4 groups of educators perceive as the most positive and negative aspects of the block schedule for students with EBD and/or ADHD.

Part 2 of the survey elicited responses from all of the groups of educators using 3 open ended prompt statements. Question 1 asked about their perceptions of the most positive aspects of the block schedule. Question 2 asked about the negative aspects of the block schedule for students

with EBD and/or ADHD. Question 3 asked what, if anything, they felt should be provided for these students in order to improve the schedule for them. An additional question (4)was asked of the special education teachers and administrators concerning what they felt would be helpful or required to assist regular education and vocational/technical teachers in providing a better educational experience for these students.

Administrators felt that the most positive aspect of the block for these students was the longer time available to the students to settle in, refocus, and have more time on task. They specifically mention that fewer transitions during the day seem to help with the refocusing and adjustment to new student grouping. The administrators also cite teachers having time to utilize more hands-on activities in classrooms as being a distinct advantage for these students. They indicate that teachers are taking advantage of the time to really get to know and interact with the students with EBD and/or ADHD.

Regular education teachers identify the time for individual attention as an asset. Time for one-to-one assistance, student conferences, and giving more explicit direction are positive aspects. They point to the use of varied, multiple activities being able to engage these students for longer periods of time. These teachers feel that they have time to get to know their students better. A few of the teachers cite, as do administrators, that fewer transitions per day help the students with EBD and/or ADHD in particular.

Vocational teachers identify the length of class as a positive because it allows more time to work on and complete projects in a timely manner. They feel that longer classes stimulate more requests for individual help as the students become aware of and comfortable with the idea that the teacher really does have the time to respond to their needs. Finally, they point out that

unhurried class periods allow these students the time to process information more effectively and completely.

Special education teachers see classroom teachers as having more time to work with students. The students feel a reduced stress by having to attend fewer classes, make fewer transitions during the day, and spend less time trying to refocus after class changes. These teachers find that they have fewer classes to cover each day so that teacher assistants can provide more adequate coverage. They also find that many regular education and vocational/technical teachers have and take more time to implement specially designed behavior plans within their classrooms. This allows them more time to deal with more positive interventions such as tutoring and skills remediations, or provide more related services.

In negative terms, administrators felt that the length of the blocks can pose problems. They point to teachers who do not use multiple activities or other methods to sustain attention and/or concentration.. One administrator wrote "If a teacher is not innovative, lecturing more than they should or is necessary, then the longer time gets frustrating and boring." This statement was followed up by a colleague adding "longer classes could lead these students into discipline problems." That each of these students come to these classes with possible or probable deficits in attention, concentration, and can become easily frustrated is a critical consideration.

As with administrators, regular education teachers responded that the length of the classes creates a potential issue for students with EBD and/or ADHD. They cite attention span, concentration, being bored, and the ability to retain information as weaknesses which must be accounted for in the way the classes are managed.. A number of teachers reinforced the need to vary activities cautioning that if teachers do not do this then they run the risk of creating a

negative environment. One teacher summed it up this way; "Depending on how the block is taught the sped kids can either be underserved or well served. Lectures, etc. lead to restlessness." Another concern they raise is that of unstructured or dead time in classrooms as various levels of students work to finish lessons while others just languish. One teacher with well above the average number of years' experience summarized it as "The kids are fine, there are problems for the teachers." The undercurrent of the Part 2 responses is that the problems for the students with EBD and/or ADHD in the block stem more from the practices of the teachers than the characteristics of the students. The final concern of these teachers is absences from school being especially difficult for these students to deal with. The schedule leaves very little flexibility for make-up sessions during the course of the school day which requires the students to make up work independently. For students with EBD and/or ADHD this poses a real challenge especially if access to the special education teacher or teacher assistants is unavailable.

Vocational/technical teachers generally feel that the negatives for the block are more teacher oriented than student centered. These teachers straight forwardly state that if the system does not work it is because the teachers do not change their style of teaching. The teacher must vary activities and delivery in order to keep the students' attention. This more critical outlook may come from the fact that vocational/ technical classes have traditionally been longer periods for many years. As with the regular education teachers, these teachers view student absences as a difficult obstacle to overcome for the same reason - lack of time to schedule make-up sessions..

Special education teachers, who were the most negative in the quantitative part of the survey, had the chance to elaborate on their opinions. They leveled a number of negative observations on the classroom structure being used in many situations. They state "90 minute blocks must be

structured or problems develop." This statement was translated by a colleague to say, "some teachers can fake 45 minutes, but 90 is minutes in another story." One teacher wrote that it is difficult for these students to "sustain attention especially with teachers who just lecture, lecture, lecture." Though they were negative about the way many teachers are managing the time, they admit that there are many students who have a hard time with the longer class activities. They realize that some students with EBD and students wtih ADHD just do not have the ability to focus for the 90 minutes even when multiple activities are planned.

To ameliorate the negative aspects and improve the schedule for students with EBD or ADHD, administrators recommend alternatives to study halls, time out space and encouragement of effective self referral, uniform and clearly defined expectations of academic and behavioral performance. The regular education teachers identify the need to design and implement multiple activity classes along with smaller classes, more support personnel, and more counseling as possible solutions. Vocational/technical teachers identify smaller classes, more staff, and information about effective strategies of working with students with EBD and/or ADHD as potentially effective solutions. Special education teachers focus on support for classroom teachers in terms of developing effective classroom techniques, developing behavior plans which the teachers can understand and implement, and promote structured and interesting classes.

Both the special education teachers and administrators identify as crucial to implementing the block effectively that the classroom teachers need training in two forms. The first form is constant upgrading of teaching skills to encourage development of appropriate activities for the block. The second is training in terms of dealing with students with EBD and students with ADHD in the classroom. Teachers stipulate that teaching these students is difficult for them

because they feel that they do not have the level of understanding that they need in order to deal effectively with behaviorally challenged students.

Summary

This research finds that based on the perceptions and experiences of the responding educators, all 3 groups of students are functioning within a similar range of performance change/ improvement and current level of performance, but they are at different ends of that continuum. On average, the regular education students are at the higher end of the "same" and "satisfactory" range, while the students with EBD and/or ADHD are at the lower ends. The educators who responded to the survey perceive these 3 groups more as two throughout the survey. When the whole group of educators was broken down into individual groups the regular education and vocational/technical teachers view the students with EBD and/or ADHD more positively than do the administrators and special education teachers. All four groups are cautionary about the performance of these students within block scheduled classes. They reinforce the notion that the issues which make the block a positive influence and environment for these students can become a negative influence depending on how the time is structured and managed.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

This chapter presents the conclusions of this research. It is organized into four sections. The first section provides an overview of the study. The second section presents a discussion of the answers to the research questions and conclusions for this study. Section 3 addresses the implications for the educational programs offered to the identified students. The final section offers suggestions for future research on this topic.

Section 1: Overview of the Study

In the past 8 to 10 years the philosophy and method of restructuring class time in schools called block scheduling has been gaining momentum. As of 1994, approximately 30 percent of the schools in the United States were either on or planning to adopt the schedule (Cawelti, 1994.) At present, 33% of public high schools in New Hampshire are now using a block schedule. As presented in Chapters 1 and 2, proponents stress the block's broad base of potential educational improvements and benefits for students, teachers, administrators, and the community.

Numerous individuals have provided testimony about the perceived effectiveness of the block and improvements experienced while using the schedules. Research on the actual effects however has lagged far behind the publicity. The limited number of research studies available do support the contentions that students, teachers, and administrators like the block schedule, see some academic improvement, believe discipline improves slightly, and do not want to return to

the old system. Chapter 2 presents two studies, those of Eineder (1995) and Hamdy (1996), which moved beyond the general perceptions of the schedules' impact into areas of behaviors, discipline, dropout rates, and teacher/student relationships. For the most part, they also support the current, widely held, positive opinion of the block schedule. However, within these studies, articles, and literature only a small fraction of the space is devoted to issues of special education students such as those identified as EBD or diagnosed with ADHD in block scheduled classes.

Students identified with EBD and diagnosed with ADHD make up between 5% to 7% (Kauffman, 1995; Barkley, 1991; Silver, 1991) of the student population. The numbers may seem low, but the combination of academic, behavior, and social deficits or issues make them formidable groups of students for whom to effectively plan. Issues with attention, concentration, participation, disruptive behaviors, anti-social behaviors directed towards other students and staff, attendance and indifference to grades are all realities to be considered in planning programs for these students. These students have well documented histories of problems in traditional systems. This study asked: How do they react to a new system which requires attention and concentration sustained for up to 90 minutes, consistent interactions with classmates in cooperative and group learning activities, controlled behaviors for longer periods, and improved attendance to avoid falling behind in the work? The second reality affecting the classrooms is the implementation of inclusion in all of the responding districts. Inclusion inevitably complicates the issue.

Most schools have instituted some form of inclusion ranging from full to partial, of the schools in this research study 7 have full inclusion and 3 have at least partial. The research shows that plans to include the EBD and ADHD populations run substantial risks of failure in the traditional

classroom settings. There is no particular agreement on how to make inclusion work for these students in a traditional school schedule. Models such as responsible inclusion proposed by Cheney and Muscott (1996) exist, but are not widely used. With few generally accepted models to use in traditional school settings there is extremely limited guidance for professionals on how to make it work within a block schedule. The concern of this research is to establish how the block schedule is affecting the academic, behavioral, or social performance of students with EBD or ADHD.

Proponents of block scheduling contend that the schedule inherently addresses many of the educational program needs of these students because of the structure (e.g. fewer classes, fewer transitions, smaller class size), teaching methods used (e.g. multiple activities, hands-on activities, projects, cooperative learning), and student-teacher interactions (e.g. time to get to really know each other, more 1-1 time with the teacher.) Theoretically, most of the preceding changes would seem to parallel what many special education teachers might recommend as classroom strategies for dealing with students with EBD and ADHD. If correctly implemented the environment, methods, and modifications would appear right, but the question remains whether this is happening in reality.

This study was designed to investigate the question: What are the effects of the block schedule on students with EBD and/or ADHD in comparison to the regular education students? This question was researched by collecting data based on the perceptions of the educational professionals who deal with these students on a day to day basis in block scheduled schools. Administrators, regular education, vocational/technical teachers, and special education teachers were surveyed using both limited response and open ended items designed to elicit data on

academic achievement and performance, behavioral performance, and social competence.

Regular education students were included in the research along with students who have formally identified as EBD and those diagnosed with ADHD to allow for comparison. The quantitative data was then statistically analyzed and reviewed to determine whole group and individual group responses and perceptions of the three student groups in terms of change/improvement in performance and current levels of performance in block scheduled schools on academic, behavioral and social performance. Qualitative data were reviewed to determine what the groups of educators viewed as positive and negative aspects of the block schedule along with what might be needed or done to improve the effects of the schedule.

Section 2: Discussion of Research Questions and Conclusions

This section presents the conclusions of the research based on an analysis of the data as it answers the research questions presented in Chapter 1.

1. What are the perceived effects of the block schedule on students identified with EBD and/or ADHD as compared to regular education students?
2. What changes/improvements have occurred in the performance levels of regular education students, and students with EBD and/or ADHD in block scheduled schools?
3. What are the current performance levels for regular education students, and students with EBD and/or ADHD in block scheduled schools?
4. Do the four individual groups of educators see similar effects across all three groups of students?
5. What do the four individual groups of educators see as the positive and negative aspects of the block for the students with EBD and/or ADHD?

Of the 130 potential respondents from 26 schools, 52 educators from 14 different schools responded with completed instruments. After analyzing the data in descriptive and inferential

terms, the following general responses to the research questions were determined.

Based on the data generated by the 4 groups of educators, the conclusion is that the regular education students are performing at the same to improved level of performance on the measured indicators. Concerning the current level of performance, the regular education students are performing at the mid satisfactory to excellent range. These findings are across all items regardless of the academic, behavioral or social impact. This is consistent with the current literature and other studies presented in the literature review of this study. Teachers' remarks would indicate some issues with focusing concentration. The comment was made that "Unless the class is consistently engaging, 90 minutes is a long time." For these students the longer class has led to improved participation level with a current level of performance bordering on the excellent range. The varied activities, interactions with the teacher and classmates, and attention level sustained by the environment of the block classes support the contention that the schedule(s) works well and has a slight, measurable, beneficial effect on these students.

How did the educators see the groups in terms of the change/improvements made while on the block schedule? Again, the regular education students performance was seen as solidly in the same to improved range across all indicators. The second group was the students with ADHD. The responses of many educators viewed these students as functioning in the same level of change/ improvement of performance. The students with EBD were seen as performing slightly lower than the students with ADHD. As a group these educators view the students with EBD and students with ADHD demonstrating little or no improvement in their change/improvement performance levels while in block scheduled classes.

As a group, what did the educators see as the current level of performance for the students

with EBD and/or ADHD in comparison to the regular education students? The regular education students were viewed as performing in the satisfactory to excellent range on all 10 items. The responses ranked the students with EBD second in the low satisfactory range on the current level of performance. Finally, the educators show more disparity in the way they view the students with ADHD as functioning in the satisfactory to poor range on current level of performance. On average, the group of educators views the student groups as in the satisfactory range but in different locations on the continuum of satisfactory. Individually the regular education and vocational/technical teachers see the students with EBD and students with ADHD as more in the middle of the satisfactory range. Administrators were slightly more negative and special educators were very negative in their responses. The specifics of this diversity will be detailed in the following question. The conclusion is that, on average of the whole group responses, there is a slight increase on the current performance of regular education students and no impact on the current level of performance for the students with EBD and/or ADHD.

Do these individual groups of educators (administrators, regular education teachers, vocational technical teachers, and special education teachers) view the three groups of students similarly and similarly affected by the block schedule? The analysis of the data for this question begins to bring out the more specific differences between the groups of educators concerning these students. The data support the finding that there are really two groups in this study, not three. The groups of educators perceive the students with EBD and/or ADHD very similarly in terms of their responses to the block. There are a few significant correlations between the responses concerning regular education students and the EBD and ADHD groups. The vast majority of correlations between the students with EBD and/or ADHD indicate statistical

significance which supports a unified perception that there is a relationship between these two groups. The analysis further supports that, especially on the current level of performance items, the regular education and vocational/ technical teachers tend to be more positive about the students' with EBD and/or ADHD performance than the administrators and substantially more positive than the special education teachers.

The descriptive data show that the regular education and vocational/technical teachers were in virtual agreement about the change/improvement level at the same and current level of performance as satisfactory for these two groups of students. Administrators and special education teachers see their performance in a more negative light. On average, administrators see both the students with EBD and/or ADHD as in the same range for level of change/ improvement and satisfactory range for current performance level. There are three specific exceptions for each group on 3 indicators (concentration on class work, participation in class, and completing class assignments).. On these indicators administrators rated their current performance level as worse. The special education teachers differentiate between the two groups. They see the students with ADHD as being more negatively affected. On the level of change/improvement indicators they rate 3 as worse, 4 as between worse and satisfactory. The current level of performance shows 7 indicators in the poor range with only grades, attendance, and interactions with the teacher as satisfactory. They see the students' with EBD level of change/improvement in the low same range and current level of performance in the low satisfactory range. What explains the divergence of the two groups?

The qualitative data indicates that the responding regular education and vocational/ technical teachers are unified by the daily effort to make the block schedule work. They are

aware of what the block demands in terms of methodologies. They have prepared classes with varied activities and structure in order to keep attention and concentration focused, participation consistent, work being routinely accomplished and on time, and that all students are interacting with each other and the teacher in a satisfactory to excellent level.

These teachers, though they see differences between the groups, see no trend of decreased performance level in any of the groups. When these teachers cite the negative aspects of the block schedule, they routinely mention the length of block, lack of activities, and planning. The only way to reconcile the positive responses to items in Part 1 and 3 with their concerns about the negative effects is to conclude that they are reporting on what they observed or perceive is happening in classrooms around them.

Obviously the students covered in the survey deal with all teachers in their school, not just the responding teachers. If the students with EBD and/or ADHD are having difficulties in classes or with specific teachers and staff the most logical people to deal with the outcomes are either the special education teacher or administrator depending on how the students react to the situations. Special education teachers and administrators are saying that the ways teachers are handling their classes are having a definite effect on the students. Administrators are observing a number of teachers who have not changed their methods to accommodate the block. Special education teachers are dealing with the results of students who are not able to deal well with the way the block is being managed by specific teachers. Going back to a previous statement by a teacher, "The kids are fine; it is a problem for the teachers."

What do the educators see as the most positive and negative aspects of the block? The educators view the length of class, use of multiple activities, fewer transitions, and more time to

get to know the students as positive effects of the block, though these do not seem to translate into change or improvement of their performance or increase their current level of performance for students with EBD and/or ADHD. At least there is no decrease. Conversely, they view the length of class as a potential deficit if not structured properly. Also they identify teachers not using multiple or varied activities, an inability to maintain attention and concentration, and frustration as negative aspects. Given the tenor of the responses by the educators in the survey, this suggests that a number of educators are not making the necessary adaptations to make their block scheduled classes work.

The findings of the survey ultimately must be viewed through the filter of how new the schedule is in most schools. With an average experiential level of 2 to 3 years, not all of the staff members are utilizing the schedule as it was conceived and implemented. For those students who have been identified as EBD or diagnosed with ADHD does the schedule make a difference? The answer is that it definitely can.

Conclusions:

Regarding the effects of the block schedule on students identified with EBD and/or ADHD as compared to regular education students, the data support the conclusion that, if the classes are well structured with teachers using innovative methods to engage the students, then the students will remain at their present levels of change/improvement performance and current level of performance. If the teachers use more traditional methods (e.g. lecturing, seat work) too often or for too long a duration, then the classes can become a negative environment for these students. This may aggravate the academic, behavioral, and social issues which dominate these students'

lives.

This conclusion does not support the hypothesis of block schedule's proponents that the schedule's inherent qualities will necessarily have a positive effect on the students with EBD and/or ADHD. None of the data show statistically significant improvement to support this. The truth is that the effectiveness of the schedule lies in the hands of the teachers. The responding educators have obviously adapted to the new schedule by changing their methods and classroom strategies and they report at best status quo results. Special education teachers and administrators see indications that in certain classrooms there are problems which have created negative effects for these students. These negative views run counter to the more positive quantitative and qualitative responses of the regular education and vocational/ technical teachers.

The conclusion is cautionary. The results of the data analysis do not point to the block having an overriding negative effect which should cause the schools to review its use, but it does raise issues.

1. Teachers need time to adapt; the average school has been on the block only 2 to 3 years which can affect perceptions.
2. Teachers need constant opportunities to learn and implement new teaching strategies.
3. Teachers want and need support to deal with students who have behavioral issues.
4. Administrators, regular education teachers, vocational/technical teachers and special education teachers need to assess the day-to-day effects of the schedule on their students.
5. Have there been honest discussions about how to effectively implement inclusion within the block scheduling framework?
6. What are the best ways of delivering related services for students with special needs within a

block scheduled day?

Under relatively ideal conditions the block seems to work well for the regular education students with neither positive nor negative effects on the students with EBD and/or ADHD. As the block schedule becomes more and more the schedule of choice for districts, educational research needs to focus on numerous issues concerning development of new best practices. Unfortunately research on the best methods for dealing with students with EBD and/or ADHD is mixed in terms of results. There is a philosophical group which questions if these students can ever be successfully included in regular programs with the hoped for success.

Section 3: Implications of the study

This research has implications for all four groups of educators and colleges offering programs for inservice and pre-service to teachers who are teaching or may ultimately teach in a block scheduled school. Both the regular education and vocational/ technical teachers have said that they need to expand their use of new teaching strategies, learn more about the EBD and ADHD student issues, and manage time more effectively. These teachers have provided the basis for the following implications.

1. Administrators must provide ongoing training for teachers to encourage them to strengthen their use of innovative methods. They need to encourage teachers who have not changed their teaching style to do so without embarrassment to them or creating a confrontational situation. This can be done through inservice training, providing time and money to take classes, or encouraging teachers to work together through staff development.

2. Regular education and vocational/technical education teachers must avail themselves of opportunities to learn new methods, try them, and adapt them as necessary. They must keep communications open to the special education staff for needed support. The research is not encouraging in terms of potential improvement on any level with these students, especially the EBD students, and the block increases the potential for problems.

3. Special education teachers must help the classroom teachers to understand the needs of these students, not judge them. The regular education and vocational/technical teachers need help to make these classes work for the EBD and ADHD students. The trained special education teachers can help the teachers learn the necessary strategies to help with delivery of material, promote improved interactions between these students and their peers, and implement behavior plans within a classroom context.

4. Colleges dealing with pre-service teachers need to include sections in their curricula to include teaching methods and strategies applicable to block scheduled classes. Training programs for special educators need to include realistic discussions about appropriate modifications and accommodations needed for the EBD and ADHD students (along with all students with disabilities.) More schools are moving towards adopting the schedule and new teachers need to be prepared for this. Colleges also need to have classes ready for inservice teachers who want or need to learn new, appropriate methods to use in block scheduled classes.

Section 4: Future Research

A one shot survey of block scheduled schools within the first 2 to 3 years of implementation presents a picture which has limitations. Future studies need to be done with the same groups of

educators, but there is a real need to add direct classroom observation by researchers. The evolution of best practices for specific groups of students can be accomplished only by observations and recording students' and teachers' reactions to instructional situations. Interviews with the educators and students would broaden the pool of data. By visiting and becoming directly involved with more of the schools, the number and complexity of responses would inevitably add to the results.

This new study would also allow for the research to study the effects of different forms of the block schedule. This study originally had envisioned comparison on the 4X4, Alternate Day, and rotating block schools. Because of problems with data collection, this could not be accomplished, and quite frankly it needs to be done. The other issue which needs to be clarified is what these terms really mean in their realistic implementation. Discussions with administrators indicate that all of the schools have a different take on how the block is implemented. It cannot be taken for granted a 4X4 or Alternate Day schedule implicitly means four 90 minutes blocks with no variations. Some break various classes down into 45 minute "chunks." Depending on the school addressed, a wide variety of classes such as lower level math, English, music, and physical education are offered this way. At this point the rationale is because the faculty see a range of students needing these options based on ability. These schools may have a better idea, but given the present mindset, no one will ever hear about it because as one administrator put it "everyone is doin' their own thing."

Special education within the block schedule needs to be researched in relation to the effects it is having on the broad spectrum of disabilities. Inclusion is a reality in some form in all schools. How the special education, regular education and vocational/technical teachers are implementing

it is another matter. There have been obstacles in traditionally scheduled schools which have not been settled. Does the block schedule present new issues? The cognitively impaired, learning disabled, and emotionally behaviorally disordered students all present their own set of distinct situations to be dealt with. The educational landscape is being changed and new best practices may need to be considered in relation to the block schedule.

Finally, there is an issue which was very much in the background throughout this research, but must be addressed. That is the issue of course content and how much material is or is not being covered in block scheduled classes. The facts remain that even the block's proponents admit that less material is able to be covered in a given class. One teacher raised this issue in a lengthy written response in that he felt obliged to complete the course content, even though there was not time enough to do so. This required a lot of homework and individual initiative to complete assignments. He cautioned that students may not be up to the challenge.

This also has implications in terms of the criterion based State of New Hampshire assessments currently being administered to tenth graders. Research needs to be initiated which will compare the results of traditionally scheduled schools with those of comparable block scheduled schools. The data will be forthcoming on an annual basis without fail. This will allow a much larger sample, provide data on all types of block schedule formats, provide relatively unbiased data on student performance without requiring extra time on anyone's part.

Research on the block needs to ongoing based on carefully phrased research questions. So far, the questions have been general and the results equally general to the point of vague. To use the question used at the opening "If block scheduling is the answer, what is the question?" The schedule can in fact be a lot of things to all people, but it is not the answer to all of education's

problems. It needs to be analyzed and allowed to take its legitimate place in the educational process, not force fit as the answer to all the questions of what is ailing education in America.

Davis-Wiley, Patricia; Cozart, Angela. (1996). Block scheduling in the secondary arena part II: perceptions from the inside. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 403 644

Dickson, Richard L. (1996). Profiles for success with troubled students. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems, 4(4), 42-46.

Dunlap, Glen, & Childs, Karen E. (1996). Intervention research in emotional and behavioral disorders: an analysis of studies from 1980-1993. Behavioral Disorders, 21(2), 125-36.

Dykman, R. A.,& Akerman, P. T. (1992) . *Attention deficit disorder and specific reading disability: separate but often overlapping disorders.* Journal of Learning Disabilities, 24 (2), 96-103.

Edwards, C. M., Jr. (1995). *Virginia's 4 X 4 high schools: high school, college, and more.* NASSP Bulletin, 79(571), 23-41.

Eineder, D. V. (1996). *The effects of block scheduling in a high school.* Doctoral Dissertation. University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Eineder, D. V. & Bishop, H. L.(1997). Block scheduling the high school: The effects on achievement, behavior, and student teacher relationships. NASSP

Embriano, Anthony J.; Ryan, Mark J. (1995) *Using interdisciplinary block programing for underachieving pupils.* NASSP Bulletin, 79(569), 38-45.

Epstein, M. H., Polloway, E. A., Foley, R. M., and Patton, J. R., (1993) *Homewowrk: A comparison of teachers' and parents' perceptions of the problems experienced by students identified as having behavioral disorders, learning disabilities, and no disabilities.* Remedial and Special Education, 14(5), 40-49.

Fallon, K. (1995). *Intensive education.* San Francisco, CA. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 083 262.

Federal Register 55069 (1997). Proposed Rules . §300.7.

Fletcher, J. M., Morris, R. D., & Francis, D. J. (1991). *Methodological issues in the classification of attention related disorders.* Journal of Learning Disabilities, 24 (2), 72-78.

Fletcher, Richard,K., Jr. (1997). *A study of the block scheduling movement in six high schools in the upper Cumberland region of Tennessee.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 403 647.

Faigel, H.C., & Heligenstein, E. (1996). *Medication for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: commentary and response.* Journal of College Health, 45, 40-52.

Gunter, Philip L., and Others. (1994). *The effects of challenging behaviors of students with EBD on teacher instructional beahvior.* Preventing School Failure, 38(3), 35-39.

Guskey, Thomas R.; Kifer, Edward. (1995) *Evaluation of a high school block schedule restructuring program.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 384 652

Greenbaum, Paul E. and Others. (1996). *National adolescent and child treatment study (nacts): outcomes for children with serious emotional and behavioral disturbance.* Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 4(4) 130-46

Hallenbeck, Betty, A., and Kauffman, James M.. (1995). *How does observational learning affect students with emotional and behavioral disorders.* Journal of Special Education, 29, 45-59

Hamdy, Mona. (1996). *Block scheduling: its impact on academic, and perceptions of students, teachers, and administrators.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic

University.

Harvey, Virginia Smith, (1996). *Educators' perceptions of effectiveness of programs for students with emotional and behavioral disorders.* Behavioral Disorders, 21(3), 205-215.

Hinmon, E. B. (1992). *Reducing discipline referral and improving student satisfaction through implementation of middle school practices at Ramey School.* Ramey, Puerto Rico. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 360 726.

Huff, L. A. (1995). *Flexible block scheduling: It works for Us!* NASSP Bulletin, 79(571), 19-22.

Irmsher, Karen. (1996). *Block scheduling,* ERIC Digest, Number 104. ERIC Document Reproduction Service. No. ED 393 156.

Kangas, J. A. *Success and retention rates for Gateway U. classes, spring 1992.* San Jose, CA. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 349 049

Kauffman, James M. (1989). Characteristics of behavior disorders of children and youth, fourth edition. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.

Kauffman, James M, & Wong, Kathleen L.H. (1991). *Effective teachers of students with behavioral disorders: are generic teaching skills enough?* Behavioral Disorders, 16(3), 225-237

Kauffman, James, M., and Others. (1991). *What puts pupils at risk? an analysis of classroom teachers' judgments of pupils' behavior.* Remedial and Special Education, 12(5), 7-16.

Kauffman, James M. and Others. (1995). *Inclusion of all students with emotional or behavioral disorders? let's think again.* Phi Delta Kappan, 76(7), 542-46.

Kruse, C. A., & Kruse, G. D. (1995). *The master schedule and learning: improving the*

quality of education. NASSP Bulletin 79(571), 1-8.

Lee, V. E. & Smith, J. B. (1994). *High school restructuring and student achievement: a new study finds strong links.* Center on Organization and Restructing School, Madison, Wi. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 376-565.

Lewis, T. J., Chard, D. and Scott, T. M., (1994). *Full inclusion and the education of children and youth with emotional and behvioral disorders.* Behavioral Disorders, 19(4), 277-293.

Martin, Kerri F., and Others. (1995). *Teacher's perceptions of educational placement decisions for pupils with emotional or behavioral disorders.* Behavior Disorders, 20(2), 106-117.

Malloy, William. (1997). Responsible inclusion: celebrating diversity and academic excellence. NASSP Bulletin,

McBurnett, K., Lahey, B., & Pfiffner, L. (1993). *Diagnosis of attention deficit disorders in DSM-IV: Scientific basis and implications for education .* Exceptional Children, 60 (2), 108-117.

Meadows, Nancy B., Neel, R. S., Scott, C. M., and Parker, G. (1994). *Academic performance, social competence, and mainstream accomodations: A look at mainstreamed and nonmainstreamed students with serious behavioral disorders.* Behavioral Disorders, 18(3), 170-180.

Meadows, Nancy B. (1996). *Meeting the challenges of Responsible Inclusion.* Preventing School Failure, 40(3), 139-142

Meadows, Nancy B. and Melloy, Kristine J., et al. (1996). *Behavior management as a*

curriculum for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Preventing School Failure, 40(3), 124-130.

Mell, Kathy. *Caution advised on block scheduling.* Online: http://www.execpc.com/~presswis

Mistretta, G. M. and Polansky, H. B. (1997). Prisoners of time: implementing a block schedule in the high school. NASSP Bulletin, 81 (593), 23-31

Munroe, M. J. (1989). *Block successful alternative format addressing learner needs.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 311 003.

Nelson, J. R. (1996). *Designing schools to meet the needs of students who exhibit disruptive behaviors.* Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 4(3), 147-61

Prisoners of Time. (1984). Report of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning. (On-Line). Available http//www.ed.gov/pubs/PrisonersOfTime/index.html.

Raphael, D., Wahlstrom, M. W., & McLean, L. D. (1986). *Debunking the semestering myth.* Canadian Journal of Education, 11(1), 36-52.

Reid, L. (1995). *Percieved effects of block scheduling on the teaching of english.* (Colorado State University). Fort Collins, CO. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 382 950.

Rettig, M. D.& Canady, R. L. (1996). *All around the block: the benefits and challenges of a non-traditional school schedule.* The School Administator, 53(8), 8-16.

Sailor, Wayne. (1991). *Special education in the restructured school.* Remedial and Special Education, 12(6), 8-22.

Schneider, B. H., and Leroux, J. (1994). *Educational environments for the pupil with*

behavior disorders: a "best evidence" synthesis. Behavioral Disorders, 19(3), 192-204.

Shortt, T. L., & Thayer, Y. (1995). *What can we expect to see in the next generation of block scheduling?* NASSP Bulletin, 79(571), 53-63.

Shortt, T. L., & Thayer, Y. (1997). *A vision for block scheduling: where are we now? where are we going?* NASSP Bulletin, 81 (593), 1-15.

Silver, L. B. (1990). *Attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder: is it a learning disability or a related disorder?* Journal of Learning Disabilities, 23 (7), 394-397.

Staunton, J. (1997). *A study of teaching beliefs on the efficacy of block scheduling. NASSP Bulletin, 81* (593), 73-80.

West, Mike. (1996). *Block schedule: breaking the barriers.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 440 607.

Wilson, C. (1995). *The 4:4 block system: a workable alternative.* NASSP Bulletin, 79(571), 63-65.

Zentall, S. S. (1993). Research on the educational implications of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Exceptional Children, 60 (2), 143-153.

Zentall, S. S., Harper, G. H., & Stormont-Spurgin, M. (1993). *Children with hyperactivity and their organizational abilities.* Journal of Educational Research, 87(8), 112-117.

Zentall, S. S., Smith, Y.N., Lee, Y. B., Wieczorek, C. (1994). *Mathematical outcomes of attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder.* Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27 (8), 510-519

Zionts, Paul. (1996). Teaching disturbed and disturbing students. Austin, Texas: Pro-Ed.

Appendix A

Diagnostic Criteria for Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

A. Either (1) or (2)

(1) Six (or more) of the following symptoms of inattention have persisted for at least six months to a degree that is maladaptive and inconsistent with developmental level:

Inattention

(a) often ails to give close attention to details or makes careless mistakes in schoolwork, work, or other activities.
(b) often has difficulty sustaining attention in tasks or play acclivities
(c) often does not seem to listen when spoken to directly
(d) often does not follow through on instructions and fails to finish schoolwork, chores, or duties in the workplace (not due to oppositional behavior or failure to understand instructions.)
(e) often has difficulty organizing tasks and activities.
(f) often avoids, dislikes, or is reluctant to engage in tasks that require sustained mental effort (such as schoolwork or homework).
(g) often loses things necessary for tasks and activities (e.g. toys, school assignments, pencils, books, or tools).
(h) is often easily distracted by extraneous stimuli
(i) is often forgetful in daily activities.

(2) Six (or more) of the following symptoms of hyperactivity-impulsivity have persisted for at least 6 months to a degree that is maladaptive and inconsistent with developmental level:

(a) often fidgets with hands or feet or squirms in seat.
(b) often leaves seat in classroom or in other situations in which remaining in seat is expected.
(c) often runs about or climbs excessively in situation which it is inappropriate (adolescents or adults, may be limited to subjective feeling or restlessness.
(d) often has difficulty playing or engaging in leisure activities quietly.
(e) is often "on the go" or often acts as if "driven by a motor"
(f) often talks excessively

Impulsivity

(g) often blurts out answers before the questions have been completed
(h) often has difficulty awaiting turn

Appendix A

(i) often interrupts or intrudes on others (e.g. butts into conversations or games

B. Some hyperactive-impulsive or inattentive symptoms that caused the impairment were present before the age 7 years.

C. Some impairment form the symptoms is present in two or more settings (e.g. at home, at work, or at school).

D. There must be clear evidence of clinically significant impairment in social, academic, or occupational functioning.

E. The symptoms do not occur exclusively during the course of a pervasive developmental disorder, schizophrenia, or other psychotic disorder and are not better accounted for by another mental disorder (e.g. Mood Disorder, Anxiety Disorder, Dissociative Disorder, or a Personality Disorder).

Code based on type:

314.01 Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, Combined Type: if both criteria A1 and A2 are met for the past 6 months

314.00 Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, Predominantly Inattentive Type: if Criterion A1 is met but Criterion A2 is not met for the last 6 months

314.01 Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, Predominantly Hyperactive-Impulsive Type: if Criterion A2 is met but Criterion A1 is not met for the last 6 months.

Appendix B

State of New Hampshire, Department of Education List of Block Scheduled Schools

Conway Kennett

SCHOOLS WITH BLOCK SCHEDULING

~~1996~~ 1997 – 98

Belmont High with 2/45 24 yrs.	267-6525	046	Shaker Regional (460) 9-12	4 X 4 Block
Berlin Senior High 2yr.	752-4122	003	Berlin 600 (9-12)	Block
Coe-Brown Northwood Academy 34 yrs	942-5531	044	(Northwood) 565 (9-12) I	7 Period Modified Block
Concord Senior High	225-0800	008	Concord	4 X 4 Block
ConVal Regional High	924-3869	001	Contoocook Valley 24 yrs. 900-	4 X 4 Block
~~Groveton High~~	~~636-1619~~	~~058~~	~~Northumberland~~	~~Modified Block~~
Hopkinton High	746-4167	066	Hopkinton	4 X 4 Block QB Day 1 2 1 2
Inter-lakes High will call back	279-6162	002	Inter-Lakes	4 X 4 Block
John Stark Regional High 94 yrs.	428-3546	024	John Stark Regional (94 yrs.)	Modified Block
Kearsarge Regional High 34 yrs. 9-540	927-4261	065	Kearsarge Regional (9-12)	Modified Block alternate day A&CF
Kingswood Regional High will call back	569-2055	049	Governor Wentworth Reg. 830	Modified 4X4 Block
Lisbon Regional High moving	838-5506	035	Lisbon Regional	4 X 4 Block
Merrimack Valley High 23 yr.	753-4311	046	Merrimack Valley 800 Students 3	4 X 4 Block straight
Newport Senior High	863-2414	043	Newport	Modified 4X4 Block
Pelham High	635-2115	028	Pelham	4 X 4 Block
Portsmouth High	436-7100	052	Portsmouth	4 X 4 Block
Profile Senior High	823-7411	035	Profile	Modified Block
Sanborn Regional High	642-3341	017	Sanborn Regional	7-8 Per. & Mod Block
Souhegan Coop High	673-9940	039	Souhegan Cooperative	Modified Block
Stratford Public	922-3387	058	Stratford	4 X 4 Block
White Mountain Regional High	837-2528	036	White Mountain Regional	4 X 4 Block
Winnacunnet High School	926-3395	021	Winnacunnet	Modified 4 X 4 Block

Fall Mountain 220 835-6318 060 Langdon 4x4 Block

230 538-6996 007 Piermont Modified 4x4 Block

Plymouth Regional 240 536-1444 048 Plymouth Modified Block

Hillsboro 250 Kennett 760

Appendix C

Initial Contact Phone Log

Phone LOG:

School: _____ **Size** _____

_____

_____

Block Format: _____

_____

Years on the Block: _____

Have they changed the format during that time: ____**yes** ___**no**
How: _____

_____

Future Contact Person: _____

Information Supplied by: _____

Notes:

Appendix D

School Reponse Log

School Reponse Log

NO.	School Name	ADM	RET	RET		SPED	Total
10	Belmont High						
20	Berlin Senior High						
30	Coe-Brown Northwood						
40	Concord Senior High						
50	Conval Regional High School						
60	Hopkinton High School						
70	Inter-lakes High School						
80	John Stark Regional High School						
90	Kearsarge Regional High School						
100	Kingswood Regional High School						
110	Lisbon Regional High School						
120	Merrimack Valley High School						
130	Newport Middle High School						
140	Pelham High School						
150	Portsmouth High School						
160	Profile Senior High School						
170	Sanborn Regional High School						
180	Souhegan Regional High School						
190	Stratford Public School						
200	White Mountain Regional High School						
210	Winnacxunnet High School						
220	Fall Mountain Regional High School						
230	Pittsburg High School						
240	Plymouth Regional High School						
250	Hillsboro-Deering Cooperative						
260	Kennett (Conway)						
	TOTALS						

Appendix E

Introductory Letter for Survey Packets

Notre Dame College
Manchester, NH

Dear So and so

Thank you for agreeing to help with my research study. As you may recall, my name is Mark Tenney. I am currently completing a Master's Degree in Education at Notre Dame College specializing in emotional behavioral disabilities. I am surveying 26 high schools in New Hampshire that are using a block schedule to research "The Perceived Effects of Block Scheduling on Students with Emotional Behavioral Disabilities and/or ADHD." During the past two months I have endeavored to speak personally with as many of you as possible concerning the focus of this research while gathering basic information about your individual schools.

I would like to thank each of you who gave generously of you time to discuss your schools, the basic block schedules used, and other anecdotal information which has helped in preparing these questionnaires. Please find the complete packets enclosed. You should find 3 types of questionnaires (one has two different colors), self-addressed stamped envelopes to return the surveys. I would ask that the surveys be given out in the following fashion.

1. (1) Administrator (Blue Form). Please give this form to the administrator you feel most comfortable with responding to the questions. There is some specific information requested which one person might have immediate access to thereby requiring less time to complete the questions.

2. (2) Classroom Teachers (Pink Form) Please give one form to an English teacher and the second from a different academic curriculum (e.g. math, Science, Social Studies).

3. (1) Classroom Teacher (Green Form) Please give this form to a member of your technology program (e.g. Tech. Ed., Agriculture, Business, Computer).

4. (1) Special Education Teacher (Yellow Form) Please give this form to the teacher who is directly responsible for highest number of EBD/ADHD students in your school.

I have included specific instructions with the surveys. Each survey has an attached, self-addressed, stamped envelope for the respondents to use. They just complete them, insert in the envelope and mail them back to me. Your only responsibility is to choose the people and hand out the surveys. The rest is up to the respondents. I would like all responses back to me by June 5.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation for your willingness to participate in this research. If you have any questions concerning this research please feel free to contact me or my advisor at

Mark Tenney
28 Depot Street
Antrim, NH 03440
Phone: Work: 547-3311 ext 225
Home: 588-2608
E-mail: t_tenney@conknet.com

Or

Dr. Nancy Cook
Notre Dame College
2321 Elm Street
Manchester, NH 03104
Phone: 669-4298 Ext 145
E-mail: nrc@nanc.mv.com

Appendix F

Questionnaire: Administrative Version

The Effects of Block Scheduling on Students with Emotional Behavioral Disabilities and/or ADHD

Research Questionnaire: Administrative Version

This questionnaire is divided into 4 parts. Each is designed to elicit your personal and professional observations and opinions concerning the effects that block scheduling have had on the classroom behaviors of student groups, those with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities(EBD) and/or ADHD as compared with the regular education students who are not coded or receiving assistance.

Part 1 asks you about how you view these subgroups' performance in classroom situations.

Part 2 asks you to respond to the positive and negative impacts of the "block" with these students and what might be advantageous in the future to provide for programs.

Part 3 asks you to use your specific areas of expertise to rate ten categories of behavior indicators which are not exclusively classroom based.

Part 4 is a survey asking for personal information about your educational background, areas of responsibility, and professional opinions about specific programming. This information will allow for better correlation between groups.

Please Remember

1. Answers need to be as candid and honest as possible.

2. If you do not have an opinion or enough information to answer a particular question, please use the No Opinion (N/O) or undecided categories which have been included.

3. Space has been provided with each part or section for a written response. If there is not enough room, add extra paper to the form taking care to make sure it is securely attached.

4. A self addressed, stamped envelope has been provided for you. Just complete the form, insert, and drop it in the mail.

5. All information provided is ethically considered confidential. Space for your signature has been provided should you wish to sign the form.

Directions for Part 1, Sections A-C: Complete the following sets of behavior ratings using the scales provided by circling the appropriate number response. There is a (N/O) No Opinion category available for those instances when you do not have enough information to draw a conclusion. There is space provided for you to elaborate on any of your answers below each set of ratings. For example, in Part 1A, the first item asks if you think that regular education students have improved in following class rules since being in block scheduled classes, then circle 3 in the first column.

Part 1A: Ratings for regular education students

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor N/O = No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently producing required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of regular education students in our school is ____.
Our school has a total of _____ coded students.
Notes:

Part 1B: Ratings for students with ADHD

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor N/O= No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently produces required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates.	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of students with ADHD in our school is ___.

Notes

Part 1 C: Ratings for students with EBD

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor N/O = No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently producing required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of EBD students in all my classes is _____?

Comments:

Part 2: Answer the following questions concerning you opinions about the relationships between block scheduling and students with ADHD and EBD.

1. What are the most positive aspects of block scheduling for students with either ADHD and/or EBD?

2. What are the most negative aspects of block scheduling for students with either ADHD and/or EBD?

3. In order to improve the system, what would be the one thing you could or should provide for students with ADHD and/or EBD ?

4. In order to improve the system, what would be the one thing you could or should provide for the teachers of students with ADHD and/or EBD ?

Part 3: Based on your disciplinary and supervisory experiences in a block scheduled school containing ADHD and Emotionally Behaviorally Disabled students, rate the following indicators.

Indicators	Ratings: 5= Strongly Agree 4= Agree 3= Undecided 2= Disagree 1= Strongly Disagree
1. Students with ADHD are less likely to be absent from school than in the past.	5 4 3 2 1
2. Students with EBD are less likely to be absent from school than in the past.	5 4 3 2 1
3. Average daily attendance has improved throughout the entire school population.	5 4 3 2 1
4. Longer class periods allow teachers more time to deal with disciplinary issues in their classes.	5 4 3 2 1
5. Teachers refer ADHD students less often to the office for disciplinary action.	5 4 3 2 1
6. Teachers refer EBD students less often to the office for disciplinary action.	5 4 3 2 1
7. Within the regular school population, behaviors or situation requiring removal from class or school have been reduced.	5 4 3 2 1
8. Within the ADHD population, behaviors or situations requiring removal from class or school have been reduced.	5 4 3 2 1
9. Within the EDB population, behaviors or situations requiring removal from class or school have been reduced.	5 4 3 2 1
10. Parents of students with either ADHD and/or EBD seem to feel that their children's behaviors are better.	5 4 3 2 1

Part 4: The following information will help to correlate your observations with similar professionals. Fill in as completely as possible.

1. Educational Background: Degrees: Bachelor's___ Master's ___
___ Advanced Garduate Study
2. Active Years in: Teaching ____ Administration ____
3. Present position: _____ Years in that position _____
4. At present my school's operative special education philosophy is best described as:
   - ___A. Full Inclusion: No special classes, services within the regular education setting, some time set aside with student to manage issues.
   - ___B. Modified Inclusion: Roughly 50% or more of the education happens with regular education settings.
   - ___C. Modified Self Contained: 50% or less of the educational process happens within a self contained setting.
   - __D. Self Contained: Only limited participation in regular education programming.
5. Our school uses an full inclusionary model for ADHD and/or EBD students: yes __ No ___
6. Our school uses an alternative (school or class) plan for some or all ADHD and/or EBD students. Explain _____
_____
_____
_____
7. How has block scheduling effected your drop out rate?
   A. Total School: Up__ Down ___ Same___ %____
   B. Regular Education: Up__ Down ___ Same___ %____
   C. EBD Students: Up__ Down ___ Same___ %____
   D. ADHD Students: Up__ Down ___ Same___ %____
   E. Other Coded Students: Up__ Down ___ Same___ %____
   (LD, MR, Physically Disabled)

(Optional) Signature _____

Appendix G

Questionnaire: Regular Education Teachers

The Effects of Block Scheduling on Students with Emotional Behavioral Disabilities and/or ADHD

Research Questionnaire: Regular Education Teacher Version

This questionnaire is divided into 4 parts. Each is designed to elicit your personal and professional observations and opinions concerning the effects that block scheduling have had on the classroom behaviors of student groups, those with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities(EBD) and/or ADHD as compared with the regular education students who are not coded or receiving assistance.

Part 1 asks you about how you view these subgroups' performance in classroom situations.

Part 2 asks you to respond to the positive and negative impacts of the "block" with these students and what might be advantageous in the future to provide for programs.

Part 3.asks you to use your specific areas of expertise to rate ten categories of behavior indicators which are not exclusively classroom based.

Part 4 is a survey asking for personal information about your educational background, areas of responsibility, and professional opinions about specific programming. This information will allow for better correlation between groups.

Please Remember

1. Answers need to be as candid and honest as possible.

2. If you do not have an opinion or enough information to answer a particular question, please use the No Opinion (N/O) or undecided categories which have been included.

3. Space has been provided with each part or section for a written response. If there is not enough room, add extra paper to the form taking care to make sure it is securely attached.

4. A self addressed, stamped envelope has been provided for you. Just complete the form, insert, and drop it in the mail.

5. All information provided is ethically considered confidential. Space for your signature has been provided should you wish to sign the form.

Directions for Part 1, Sections A-C: Complete the following sets of behavior ratings using the scales provided by circling the appropriate number response. There is a (N/O) No Opinion category available for those instances when you do not have enough information to draw a conclusion. There is space provided for you to elaborate on any of your answers below each set of ratings. For example, in Part 1A, the first item asks if you think that regular education students have improved in following class rules since being in block scheduled classes, then circle 3 in the first column.

Part 1A: Ratings for regular education students

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor N/O = No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently producing required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of regular education students in all my classes is ___.

Notes:

Part 1B: Ratings for students with ADHD

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor n/o= No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently produces required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of students with ADHD in my classes is ___.

Notes

Part 1C: Ratings for students with EBD

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor N/O= No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently producing required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of EBD students in all my classes is _____.

Comments:

Part 2: Answer the following questions concerning you opinions about the relationships between block scheduling and students with ADHD and EBD.

1. What are the most positive aspects of block scheduling for students with either ADHD and/or EBD?

2. What are the most negative aspects of block scheduling for students with either ADHD and/or EBD?

3. In order to improve the system, what would be the one thing you could or should provide for students with ADHD and/or EBD ?

Part 3: Based on your classroom, content area, and disciplinary experiences in a block scheduled school with ADHD and EBD students, rate the following indicators.

Indicators	Ratings: 5= Strongly Agree 4= Agree 3= Undecided 2= Disagree 1= Strongly Disagree
1. I am more aware of the ADHD students in my class than under the traditional schedule.	5 4 3 2 1
2. I am more aware of the EBD students in my classes than under the traditional schedule.	5 4 3 2 1
3. I consciously plan lessons to include appropriate methods and strategies for ADHD students.	5 4 3 2 1
4. I consciously plan lessons to include appropriate methods and strategies for EBD students.	5 4 3 2 1
5. ADHD students can work more effectively in small group (2 or 3 students) situations than in traditional classes.	5 4 3 2 1
6. ADHD students can work more effectively in large group (4 or more students) situations than in traditional classes.	5 4 3 2 1
7. EBD students can work more effectively in small group (2 or 3 students) situations than in traditional.	5 4 3 2 1
8. EBD student can work more effectively in large group (4 or more students) situations than in traditional classes.	5 4 3 2 1
9. I am more apt to handle disciplinary issues within the classroom than remove them or have them removed.	5 4 3 2 1
10. I really need more teacher assistants (aides) in the classes to instruct effectively and meet these students educational needs	5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

Part 4: The following information will help to correlate your observations with similar professionals. Fill in as completely as possible.

1. I have been teaching for ____ years.
2. I have been at my present school for ____ years.
3. At present, I teach _____ (Content Area)
4. I teach grade(s) 9___ 10___11___ 12___
5. How many classes do you teach per day? _____
6. How many of these classes have special education students? ____
6. How many of your classes have extra staff (aides) available who are expressly there to help with the ADHD and/or EBD students? ____
7. My educational background is
   A. Area(s) of certification:_____
   B. Educational level ____ Bachelor's. ____ Master's
      ____ Advanced Graduate Studies

Please use the remaining space, or use other paper, to make any extra comments you might have concerning this subject.

Thank you for participating

Signature (Optional)_____

Appendix H

Questionnaire: Vocational/Technical Teachers

The Effects of Block Scheduling on Students with Emotional Behavioral Disabilities and/or ADHD

Research Questionnaire: Vocational/Technical Teacher Version

This questionnaire is divided into 4 parts. Each is designed to elicit your personal and professional observations and opinions concerning the effects that block scheduling have had on the classroom behaviors of student groups, those with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities(EBD) and/or ADHD as compared with the regular education students who are not coded or receiving assistance.

Part 1 asks you about how you view these subgroups' performance in classroom situations.

Part 2 asks you to respond to the positive and negative impacts of the "block" with these students and what might be advantageous in the future to provide for programs.

Part 3.asks you to use your specific areas of expertise to rate ten categories of behavior indicators which are not exclusively classroom based.

Part 4 is a survey asking for personal information about your educational background, areas of responsibility, and professional opinions about specific programming. This information will allow for better correlation between groups.

Please Remember

1. Answers need to be as candid and honest as possible.

2. If you do not have an opinion or enough information to answer a particular question, please use the No Opinion (N/O) or undecided categories which have been included.

3. Space has been provided with each part or section for a written response. If there is not enough room, add extra paper to the form taking care to make sure it is securely attached.

4. A self addressed, stamped envelope has been provided for you. Just complete the form, insert, and drop it in the mail.

5. All information provided is ethically considered confidential. Space for your signature has been provided should you wish to sign the form.

Directions for Part 1, Sections A-C: Complete the following sets of behavior ratings using the scales provided by circling the appropriate number response. There is a (N/O) No Opinion category available for those instances when you do not have enough information to draw a conclusion. There is space provided for you to elaborate on any of your answers below each set of ratings. For example, in Part 1A, the first item asks if you think that regular education students have improved in following class rules since being in block scheduled classes, then circle 3 in the first column.

Part 1A: Ratings for regular education students

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor N/O = No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently producing required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of regular education students in all my classes is ___.

Notes:

Part 1B: Ratings for students with ADHD

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor n/o= No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently produces required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of students with ADHD in my classes is ___.

Notes

Part 1C: Ratings for students with EBD

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor N/O= No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently producing required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of EBD students in all my classes is _____.

Comments:

Part 2: Answer the following questions concerning you opinions about the relationships between block scheduling and students with ADHD and EBD.

1. What are the most positive aspects of block scheduling for students with either ADHD and/or EBD?

2. What are the most negative aspects of block scheduling for students with either ADHD and/or EBD?

3. In order to improve the system, what would be the one thing you could or should provide for students with ADHD and/or EBD ?

Part 3: Based on your classroom, content area, and disciplinary experiences in a block scheduled school with ADHD and EBD students, rate the following indicators.

Indicators	Ratings: 5= Strongly Agree 4= Agree 3= Undecided 2= Disagree 1= Strongly Disagree
1. I am more aware of the ADHD students in my class than under the traditional schedule.	5 4 3 2 1
2. I am more aware of the EBD students in my classes than under the traditional schedule.	5 4 3 2 1
3. I consciously plan lessons to include appropriate methods and strategies for ADHD students.	5 4 3 2 1
4. I consciously plan lessons to include appropriate methods and strategies for EBD students.	5 4 3 2 1
5. ADHD students can work more effectively in small group (2 or 3 students) situations than in traditional classes.	5 4 3 2 1
6. ADHD students can work more effectively in large group (4 or more students) situations than in traditional classes.	5 4 3 2 1
7. EBD students can work more effectively in small group (2 or 3 students) situations than in traditional.	5 4 3 2 1
8. EBD student can work more effectively in large group (4 or more students) situations than in traditional classes.	5 4 3 2 1
9. I am more apt to handle disciplinary issues within the classroom than remove them or have them removed.	5 4 3 2 1
10. I really need more teacher assistants (aides) in the classes to instruct effectively and meet these students educational needs	5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

Part 4: The following information will help to correlate your observations with similar professionals. Fill in as completely as possible.

1. I have been teaching for ____ years.
2. I have been at my present school for ____ years.
3. At present, I teach _____ (Content Area)
4. I teach grade(s) 9___ 10___ 11___ 12___
5. How many classes do you teach per day? _____
6. How many of these classes have special education students? ____
6. How many of your classes have extra staff (aides) available who are expressly there to help with the ADHD and/or EBD students? ____
7. My educational background is
   A. Area(s) of certification:_____
   B. Educational level ____ Bachelor's. ____ Master's
      ____ Advanced Graduate Studies

Please use the remaining space, or use other paper, to make any extra comments you might have concerning this subject.

Thank you for participating

Signature (Optional)_____

Appendix I

Questionnaire: Special Education Teachers

The Effects of Block Scheduling on Students with Emotional Behavioral Disabilities and/or ADHD

Research Questionnaire: Special Education Teacher Version

This questionnaire is divided into 4 parts. Each is designed to elicit your personal and professional observations and opinions concerning the effects that block scheduling have had on the classroom behaviors of student groups, those with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities(EBD) and/or ADHD as compared with the regular education students who are not coded or receiving assistance.

Part 1 asks you about how you view these subgroups' performance in classroom situations.

Part 2 asks you to respond to the positive and negative impacts of the "block" with these students and what might be advantageous in the future to provide for programs.

Part 3.asks you to use your specific areas of expertise to rate ten categories of behavior indicators which are not exclusively classroom based.

Part 4 is a survey asking for personal information about your educational background, areas of responsibility, and professional opinions about specific programming. This information will allow for better correlation between groups.

Please Remember

1. Answers need to be as candid and honest as possible.

2. If you do not have an opinion or enough information to answer a particular question, please use the No Opinion (N/O) or undecided categories which have been included.

3. Space has been provided with each part or section for a written response. If there is not enough room, add extra paper to the form taking care to make sure it is securely attached.

4. A self addressed, stamped envelope has been provided for you. Just complete the form, insert, and drop it in the mail.

5. All information provided is ethically considered confidential. Space for your signature has been provided should you wish to sign the form.

Directions for Part 1, Sections A-C: Complete the following sets of behavior ratings using the scales provided by circling the appropriate number response. There is a (N/O) No Opinion category available for those instances when you do not have enough information to draw a conclusion. There is space provided for you to elaborate on any of your answers below each set of ratings. For example, in Part 1A, the first item asks if you think that regular education students have improved in following class rules since being in block scheduled classes, then circle 3 in the first column.

Part 1A: Ratings for regular education students

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor N/O = No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently producing required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of regular education students in all my classes is ___.

Notes:

Part 1B: Ratings for students with ADHD

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor n/o= No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently produces required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of students with ADHD in my classes is ___.

Notes

Part 1C: Ratings for students with EDB

Since the block was instituted: 3= Improved 2= Same 1= Worse N/O= No Opinion	Identified Behavior	Now: 3= Excellent 2= Satisfactory 1= Poor N/O= No Opinion
3 2 1 N/O	Followed class rules consistently	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Attention to class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Focusing concentration on class work	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Disruptive behaviors that require removal from class	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Participation in class activities	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Consistently producing required assignments	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Maintaining positive interactions with me	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Daily school attendance	3 2 1 N/O
3 2 1 N/O	Grades	3 2 1 N/O

The total number of students with EBD in our school is ____.

Notes:

Part 2: Answer the following questions concerning you opinions about the relationships between block scheduling and students with ADHD and EBD.

1. What are the most positive aspects of block scheduling for students with either ADHD and/or EBD?

2. What are the most negative aspects of block scheduling for students with either ADHD and/or EBD?

3. In order to improve the system, what would be the one thing you could or should provide for students with ADHD and/or EBD ?

4. In order to improve the system, what would be the one thing you could or should provide for your teachers who deal with ADHD and/or EBD students?

Part 3: Based on your teaching, resource room, and supervisory experiences in a block scheduled school with ADHD and EBD students, rate the following indicators.

Indicators	Ratings: 5= Strongly Agree 4= Agree 3= Undecided 2= Disagree 1= Strongly Disagree
1. Students with ADHD are less likely to be absent from school than in the past.	5 4 3 2 1
2. Students with EBD are less likely to be absent from school than in the past.	5 4 3 2 1
3. I spend less time talking students into going to class.	5 4 3 2 1
4. Longer class periods allow teachers more time to deal with disciplinary issues in their classes.	5 4 3 2 1
5. Teachers less often refer ADHD students to the office for disciplinary action.	5 4 3 2 1
6. Teachers less often refer EBD students to the office for disciplinary action.	5 4 3 2 1
7. My students with ADHD or EBD seem to be genuinely less frustrated academically than in the past	5 4 3 2 1
8. Within the ADHD population, behaviors or situations requiring removal from class or school have been reduced.	5 4 3 2 1
9. Within the EDB population, behaviors or situations requiring removal from class or school have been reduced.	5 4 3 2 1
10. Parents of students with either ADHD and/or EBD seem to feel that their children's behaviors are better.	5 4 3 2 1

Part 4: The following information will help to correlate your observations with similar professionals. Fill in as completely as possible.

1. I have been in special education for _____ years.
2. My current areas of certifications or endorsements are
   Certifications: _____
   Endorsements: _____
3. Current Degree: ___ Bachelor's ____Masters ___ Advanced Graduate Study
4. I have been in my present position for _____ year(s).
5. My primary responsibility is to EBD___ LD____ MR___ students with a caseload of____ students
6. My present program is best described by the following model:
   ___A. Full Inclusion: (no special classes, services within the regular education setting, some time set aside with student to manage issues)
   ___B. Modified Inclusion: Roughly 50% or more of the education happens with regular education settings.
   ___C. Modified Self Contained: 50% or less of the educational process happens within a self contained setting.
   ___D. Self Contained: Essentially the entire day is spent in a self contained class with only very limited exposure to regular education classes.
7. How many support staff does your program have?
   ___Instructional Assistants/Teacher Aides/Instructional Associates
   ___Psychologists
   ___Volunteers
   ___Others: Please identify _____
8. What do you consider to be the ratio of "staff to students" in your program. _____

Any extra comments or observations you would like to make? Write them here.

There may be a need to do a follow up interview with some SpEd teachers. If you would be willing to participate please sign, add a phone number and a best time to call.

Signature (Optional) _____
Phone _____ Times _____

Appendix J

Individual Group Responses to Part 1A, 1B, and 1C

Table # : Administrators responses to prompts

Responses: 3= Improved, 2 = Same, 1= Worse				Indicator/ Prompt Statements	Responses: 3 = Excellent, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Poor			
ID #	Reg. Ed Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students	Indicators	ID#	Regular Ed Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students
1	Mean 2.400 SD 0.699	Mean 2.100 SD 0.944	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Followed class rules consistently	11	Mean 2.111 SD 0.610	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744
2	Mean 2.400 SD 0.699	Mean 2.100 SD 0.944	Mean 2.111 SD 1.054	Attention to class activities	12	Mean 2.000 SD 0.500	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744
3	Mean 2.500 SD 0.707	Mean 1.800 SD 1.135	Mean 1.750 SD 1.165	Focusing concentration on class work	13	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882	Mean 1.375 SD 0.918
4	Mean 2.600 SD 0.690	Mean 2.100 SD 0.944	Mean 2.111 SD 1.054	Disruptive behaviors requiring removal from class	14	Mean 1.900 SD 0.568	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744
5	Mean 2.600 SD 0.966	Mean 2.100 SD 1.287	Mean 1.889 SD 1.269	Participation in class activities	15	Mean 2.111 SD 1.054	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882	Mean 1.375 SD 0.916
6	Mean 2.200 SD 0.919	Mean 1.900 SD 1.197	Mean 1.667 SD 1.000	Consistently producing required assignments	16	Mean 1.778 SD 0.677	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882	Mean 1.375 SD 0.916
7	Mean 2.400 SD 0.699	Mean 1.900 SD 0.944	Mean 1.889 SD 0.928	Maintaining positive interaction with classmates	17	Mean 1.889 SD 0.333	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744
8	Mean 2.600 SD 0.516	Mean 1.900 SD 0.876	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Maintaining positive interaction with me	18	Mean 2.000 SD 0.500	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744
9	Mean 2.200 SD 0.632	Mean 2.000 SD 0.943	Mean 2.000 SD 1.000	Daily attendance	19	Mean 2.000 SD 0.500	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Mean 1.750 SD 0.866
10	Mean 2.500 SD 0.972	Mean 2.000 SD 1.247	Mean 2.000 SD 1.323	Grades	20	Mean 2.000 SD 0.866	Mean 1.556 SD 1.014	Mean 1.625 SD 1.188

Table # : Regular Education teachers response to prompts.

Responses: 3= Improved, 2 = Same, 1= Worse				Indicator/ Prompt Statements	Responses: 3 = Excellent, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Poor			
ID #	Reg. Ed Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students	Indicators	ID#	Regular Ed Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students
1	Mean 2.318 SD 0.568	Mean 2.000 SD 0.617	Mean 2.111 SD 0.617	Followed class rules consistently	11	Mean 2.286 SD 0.561	Mean 1.952 SD 0.498	Mean 1.882 SD 0.485
2	Mean 2.364 SD 0.790	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 2.000 SD 0.767	Attention to class activities	12	Mean 2.143 SD 0.655	Mean 1.762 SD 0.423	Mean 1.882 SD 0.697
3	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 1.727 SD 0.767	Mean 1.722 SD 0.958	Focusing concentration on class work	13	Mean 1.762 SD 0.539	Mean 1.571 SD 0.676	Mean 1.529 SD 0.717
4	Mean 2.364 SD 0.492	Mean 2.182 SD 0.664	Mean 2.167 SD 0.618	Disruptive behaviors requiring removal from class	14	Mean 2.238 SD 0.625	Mean 2.095 SD 0.539	Mean 1.882 SD 0.781
5	Mean 2.591 SD 0.590	Mean 2.318 SD 0.534	Mean 2.222 SD 0.808	Participation in class activities	15	Mean 2.381 SD 0.590	Mean 2.048 SD 0.590	Mean 1.765 SD 0.562
6	Mean 1.909 SD 0.526	Mean 1.818 SD 0.501	Mean 1.778 SD 0.647	Consistently producing required assignments	16	Mean 1.857 SD 0.478	Mean 1.714 SD 0.561	Mean 1588 SD 0. 618
7	Mean 2.273 SD 0.550	Mean 1.919 SD 0.684	Mean 2.056 SD 0.539	Maintaining positive interaction with classmates	17	Mean 2.143 SD 0.655	Mean 1.810 SD 0.602	Mean 1.765 SD 0.562
8	Mean 2.455 SD 0.596	Mean 2.045 SD 0.375	Mean 2.167 SD 0.514	Maintaining positive interaction with me	18	Mean 2.333 SD 0.658	Mean 2.143 SD 0.478	Mean 2.118 SD 0.600
9	Mean 2.364 SD 0.658	Mean 2.045 SD 0.650	Mean 1.833 SD 0.514	Daily attendance	19	Mean 1.952 SD 0.590	Mean 1.857 SD 0.478	Mean 1.941 SD 0.429
10	Mean 2.273 SD 0.550	Mean 1.955 SD 0.575	Mean 1.889 SD 0.676	Grades	20	Mean 2.000 SD 0.459	Mean 1.810 SD 0.402	Mean 1.824 SD 0.529

table # : Vocational Technical Teachers Responses

Responses: 3= Improved, 2 = Same, 1= Worse				Indicator/ Prompt Statements	Responses: 3 = Excellent, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Poor			
ID #	Reg. Ed Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students	Indicators	ID#	Regular Ed Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students
1	Mean 2.300 SD 0.483	Mean 1.900 SD 0.738	Mean.1.778 SD 0.833	Followed class rules consistently	11	Mean 2.000 SD 0.471	Mean 1.700 SD 0.949	Mean 1.375 SD 0.518
2	Mean 2.200 SD 0.527	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 2.111 SD 0.928	Attention to class activities	12	Mean 2.200 SD 0.422	Mean 1.900 SD 0.876	Mean 1.625 SD 0.518
3	Mean 2.300 SD 0.483	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 1.889 SD 0.928	Focusing concentration on class work	13	Mean 2.200 SD 0.422	Mean 1.889 SD 0.928	Mean 1.625 SD 0.518
4	Mean 2.400 SD 0.516	Mean 1.800 SD 0.919	Mean 1.889 SD 0.928	Disruptive behaviors requiring removal from class	14	Mean 2.300 SD 0.483	Mean 1.700 SD 0.949	Mean 1.500 SD 0.535
5	Mean 2.500 SD 0.527	Mean 1.900 SD 0.738	Mean 2.111 SD 0.928	Participation in class activities	15	Mean 2.400 SD 0.516	Mean 2.100 SD 0.875	Mean 1.500 SD 0.535
6	Mean 2.100 SD 0.568	Mean 1.600 SD 0.966	Mean 1.889 SD 0.782	Consistently producing required assignments	16	Mean 2.100 SD 0.738	Mean 1.600 SD 1.075	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000
7	Mean 2.100 SD 0.568	Mean 1.900 SD 0.876	Mean 2.000 SD 0.866	Maintaining positive interaction with classmates	17	Mean 2.200 SD 0.632	Mean 1.800 SD 0.789	Mean 1.375 SD 0.518
8	Mean 2.400 SD 0.516	Mean 2.000 SD 0.816	Mean 2.000 SD 0.866	Maintaining positive interaction with me	18	Mean 2.200 SD 0.422	Mean 2.100 SD 0.876	Mean 2.125 SD 0.354
9	Mean 2.200 SD 0.919	Mean 1.600 SD 0.966	Mean 1.556 SD 1.236	Daily attendance	19	Mean 1.900 SD 0.876	Mean 1.900 SD 1.197	Mean 1.750 SD 0.886
10	Mean 2.500 SD 0.527	Mean 1.900 SD 0.738	Mean. 1.667 SD 1.000	Grades	20	Mean 2.000 SD 0.422	Mean 1.800 SD. 0.789	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000

Table # : Special Education Teachers' responses to indicators

Responses: 3= Improved, 2 = Same, 1= Worse				Indicator/ Prompt Statements	Responses: 3 = Excellent, 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Poor			
ID #	Reg. Ed. Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students	Indicators	ID#	Regular Ed Students	ADHD Students	EBD Students
1	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882	Mean 1.875 SD 0.410	Followed class rules consistently	11	Mean 2.296 SD 0.756	Mean 1.111 SD 0.601	Mean 1.375 SD 0.518
2	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Mean 1.556 SD 1.014	Mean 2.000 SD 0.756	Attention to class activities	12	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Mean 1.222 SD 0.677	Mean 1.625 SD 0.518
3	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Mean 1.333 SD 0.866	Mean 1.625 SD 0.518	Focusing concentration on class work	13	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488	Mean 1.111 SD 0.614	Mean 1.625 SD 0.518
4	Mean 2.143 SD 1.069	Mean 1.556 SD 0.882	Mean 1.500 SD 0.756	Disruptive behaviors requiring removal from class	14	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488	Mean 1.444 SD 0.882	Mean 1.500 SD 0.535
5	Mean 2.714 SD 0.488	Mean 1.778 SD 0.972	Mean 2.125 SD 0.354	Participation in class activities	15	Mean 2.571 SD 0.535	Mean 1.444 SD 0.716	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000
6	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Mean 1.556 SD 0.882	Mean 1.750 SD 0.463	Consistently producing required assignments	16	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488	Mean 1.111 SD 0.601	Mean 1.500 SD 0.535
7	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488	Mean 1.444 SD 0.726	Mean 1.625 SD 0.744	Maintaining positive interactions with classmates	17	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488	Mean 1.222 SD 0.667	Mean 1.375 SD 0.518
8	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Mean 1.778 SD 0.833	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000	Mantaining positive interactions with me	18	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488	Mean 1.778 SD 0.667	Mean 2.125 SD 0.354
9	Mean 2.429 SD 0.535	Mean 2.000 SD 1.000	Mean 2.125 SD 0.835	Daily attendance	19	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488	Mean 2.111 SD 1.504	Mean 1.750 SD 0.886
10	Mean 2.143 SD 1.069	Mean 1.667 SD 0.707	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000	Grades	20	Mean 2.286 SD 0.488	Mean 1.556 SD 0.726	Mean 2.000 SD 0.000

Appendix K

Individual Group Frequencies for Part 1A, 1B, and 1C.

```
page screen=scroll
 >tabulate
TABLE OF VALUES FOR    IDNUM
FREQUENCIES
```

1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	6.000
1	1	1	1	1	1

7.000	8.000	9.000	10.000	21.000	22.000
1	1	1	1	1	1

23.000	24.000	25.000	26.000	27.000	28.000
1	1	1	1	1	1

29.000	41.000	42.000	43.000	44.000	45.000
1	1	1	1	1	1

46.000	47.000	48.000	49.000	50.000	51.000
1	1	1	1	1	1

52.000	53.000	54.000	55.000	56.000	57.000
1	1	1	1	1	1

58.000	59.000	60.000	61.000	62.000	63.000
1	1	1	1	1	1

64.000	65.000	66.000	67.000	68.000	69.000
1	1	1	1	1	1

70.000	71.000	72.000	73.000	TOTAL
1	1	1	1	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(1)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	2	28	19	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(2)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	5	19	25	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(3)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	1	5	25	18	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(4)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	1	1	27	20	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(5)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	1	1	15	32	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(6)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	1	5	32	11	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(7)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	3	30	16	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(8)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	1	24	24	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(9)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	1	3	25	20	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(10)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	2	1	24	22	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(11)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
5	4	30	13	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(12)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
5	4	31	12	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(13)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
5	2	4	37	4	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(14)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
4	4	31	13	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(15)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
5	1	2	23	21	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(16)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
5	1	6	34	6	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(17)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
5	5	31	11	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(18)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
5	3	30	14	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(19)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
5	1	6	32	8	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR A(20)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
6	1	2	35	8	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(1)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	3	9	29	10	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(2)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	3	12	21	15	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(3)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	5	13	24	9	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(4)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	3	9	25	14	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(5)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	4	4	26	17	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(6)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	5	10	29	7	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(7)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	4	9	30	8	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(8)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	3	3	38	7	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(9)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	5	4	31	11	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(10)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
1	4	6	32	9	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(11)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	3	13	29	4	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(12)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
3	3	12	32	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(13)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
4	6	13	27	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(14)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	3	3	10	29	7	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(15)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	3	4	7	31	7	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(16)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	3	5	16	25	3	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(17)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	3	4	10	33	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(18)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	3	3	2	36	8	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(19)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	3	4	7	28	10	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR B(20)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	3	4	8	35	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(1)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	8	2	7	27	8	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(2)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	8	2	8	20	14	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(3)
FREQUENCIES

	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	9	4	12	18	9	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(4)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	8	2	9	21	12	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(5)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	8	3	5	20	16	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(6)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	8	3	8	29	4	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(7)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	8	2	7	27	8	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(8)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	8	2	2	33	7	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(9)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	8	5	4	27	8	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(10)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	8	4	6	25	9	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(11)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	10	2	10	28	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(12)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	11	2	11	23	5	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(13)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
	11	4	14	21	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(14)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
10	3	10	25	4	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(15)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
10	3	6	31	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(16)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
10	3	16	22	1	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(17)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
10	2	12	27	1	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(18)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
10	2	3	31	6	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(19)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
10	3	9	23	7	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR C(20)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	TOTAL
10	4	5	30	3	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(1)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	TOTAL
2	3	13	8	15	11	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(2)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	TOTAL
4	3	11	10	15	9	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(3)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	TOTAL
2	2	6	12	24	6	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(4)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	TOTAL
5	1	8	12	24	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(5)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	TOTAL
2	1	7	15	20	7	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(6)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	TOTAL
3	4	18	14	11	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(7)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	TOTAL
5	1	6	12	20	8	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(8)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	TOTAL
5	4	14	13	14	2	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(9)
FREQUENCIES

.	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	5.000	TOTAL
4	1	7	9	15	16	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR E(10)
FREQUENCIES

.	0.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000
2	1	6	9	14	14

5.000	TOTAL
6	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR GROUP
FREQUENCIES

1.000	2.000	3.000	4.000	TOTAL
10	23	10	9	52

TABLE OF VALUES FOR ASUM1
FREQUENCIES

.	14.000	15.000	18.000	19.000	20.000
3	2	1	3	3	3

21.000	22.000	23.000	24.000	25.000	26.000
7	3	2	2	7	4

27.000	28.000	29.000	30.000	TOTAL
1	4	3	4	52

>

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Effects of Block Scheduling on Students with Emotional Behavioral Disorders and/or ADHD

Author(s): Mark G. Tenney

Corporate Source: Notre Dame College (thesis)

Publication Date: November 11, 1998

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please **CHECK ONE** of the following options and sign the release below.

Check Here, Please

__X__ Check here for Level 1 Release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

or

_____ Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

or

_____ Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Mark G Tenney Position: Teacher
Printed Name: Mark G Tenney Organization:
Address: 28 Depot Street Telephone Number: hm (603) 588 - 2608
Antrim, NH wk (603) 547 - 3311 ext 225
03440 Date: 4/5/99

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: N/A

Address:

Price Per Copy:

Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant a reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:

Name: N/A

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

You can send this form and your document to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education. They will forward your materials to the appropriate ERIC Clearinghouse.

ERIC Acquisitions
ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 20191-1589
(800) 328-0272
ericec@cec.sped.org
http://ericec.org