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ABSTRACT

In this program evaluation, I examined the effectiveness of in school suspension (ISS) program at one high school. The literature reviewed argues although ISS is a necessity in the current climate of education, ineffective ISS programs can interrupt academic progress. Often used in isolation and as a holding area for code of conduct violations, ISS can yield results such as increased recidivism, increased hostility and decreased academic progress. The methods used within this study included surveys and interviews from key stakeholders. The results revealed some things were working well, and some things were not. In conclusion, Eminence High should incorporate specific actions and strategies to ensure that ISS is effective for all participants.
In my five short years as an educator at Eminence High School, I have seen hundreds of students each year participate in the in school suspension program. Some students are scared straight from the embarrassment and exclusion of the experience, while others are frequent visitors repeating the same offences repeatedly. As an educational leader and professional, I began to contemplate if the status quo was actually a benefit for our student population.

When the time arose to select a dissertation topic, I felt this was the perfect time to evaluate the effectiveness of the current ISS program at Eminence High. My goal was to utilize the finding from the evaluation along with research to provide administration at the school and district level with strategies, action steps, and policies that would allow the current program to become effective for all participants. This aspect of the evaluation made this project significant not only to me, but also to all the stakeholders at Eminence High and Millbrook School District.

The leadership lessons that I have learned throughout this program evaluation have been applicable, appropriate and apt. I have learned that as an educational leader affecting the lives of students every day, it is our responsibility to teach the whole child. Academic education is why students come to school, however the social and character development is the hidden curriculum that school leaders impart on every student who enters the building. This curriculum is woven into school code of conduct and classroom norms and rules.

The development of an innovative school culture is another leadership lesson that I garnered from this program evaluation. From this study, it is now my belief that the
hidden curriculum has to be just as important as the core academic subject areas. As leaders in school buildings across the district, we hold an obligation to assess each student, by what unique prescription is needed for their overall success, not just academic success.

I am committed to further enhancing and developing in school suspension at Eminence High school. I understand the challenges that both teachers and students face when students are assigned ISS as a consequence. As a school leader, I now consider the ramifications of assigning ISS to a student. I take the time to speak with the student about the offence and help them to process next steps as they return to their classroom environment. In addition, I visit the ISS classroom more often, and provide support and resources to the facilitator in an effort to support the hidden curriculum that exists within the ISS classroom and the school culture. ISS participants are still our students and just because they made a mistake does not mean that we stop educating them. Actually, this is the time to pour more love, attention, and affirmation into this exceptional population of students.
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SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In school suspension (ISS) is a discipline method used across many school districts around the country. The premise surrounding ISS is that students can be disciplined for minor code of conduct infractions, alleviating the need for frequent outside of school suspensions. Supporters of ISS as a discipline method feel that ISS provides a method for students to continue to receive their education while being disciplined for the code of conduct infraction that they violated. Antagonists feel that this method of discipline is not effective, arguing that students will miss direct instruction from their teachers. They believe that, for most of the time, in school suspension does not have any significant reduction in recidivism rates among students.

Many schools within the Millbrook (pseudonym) school district do not operate with an in school suspension program. They simply rely specifically on out of school suspension as their method of discipline. Due to the enormous attendance issues, along with the constant discipline referrals received within our school, we retained ISS as a viable option as one of our methods of discipline. District policy within the student code of conduct states that on the first occurrence of out of school suspension (OSS), the student is allowed to make up the missing work. However, for any subsequent infractions that leads to out of school suspension, the teacher is not obligated to allow the student to make up the work. However, with the ISS program, regardless of how many times a student is given ISS as a consequence, the student is allowed to make up the missing work for credit for each class missed.
According to the accountability report published by the Florida Department of Education, Eminence High School (pseudonym) received a school grade of C for the 2014-2015 school year. Eminence has a population that is approximately 46% minority students and 38% economically disadvantaged students. By March of the 2015-2016 school year, Eminence High’s ISS program had served two hundred and ninety students in ISS. Without the use of ISS in our school, hundreds of students who do not necessarily have the academic fortitude would be destined to fail their courses by the second infraction that resulted in out of school suspension.

**Purpose of the Evaluation**

As I explained previously, not all schools within the district operate with an ISS program. In my opinion, this may be attributed to the amount of teacher staff allocations provided to schools each year. The problem context and the reason I chose to evaluate in school suspension was because of the program’s necessity on our campus, but I feel the impact of the program has yet to be revealed. With each passing school year, instructional teacher allocation positions become fewer and fewer, and the demand to ensure student safety continues to increase. I believe that ISS worked for our school because of the array of discipline issues that arose within our school in a given year. Eminence High School followed a strict procedure with every ISS incident. Once a student was deemed to be in violation of a code of conduct rule (i.e., dress code, skipping, excessive tardiness, etc.), a referral is generated and an administrator or dean meets with the student regarding the infraction. From there, the student was told how many days he or she would serve in ISS, a parent was contacted to inform them of the in school suspension, and the student was provided with paperwork documenting the
consequence. The paperwork was duplicated, the student received a copy, and a copy was placed in the student’s discipline file. The school discipline secretary alerted all of the students’ teachers of the days he or she will serve in ISS. The expectation is that the teachers would provide work to the student in ISS by the following school day. The work was sent directly to the ISS facilitator, who then disbursed the work to the student. The facilitator collected the completed work and returned it to the teacher of record. If for some reason the student did not receive anything from any teacher, the ISS facilitator ensured assignments were given from the Leaps Lessons program, which focused on character building and behavior modification lessons. This is in an effort to ensure that the students would always have something to work on with the intent of not having to return to the classroom with various missing assignments.

From a statistical standpoint, at Eminence High in the 2015-16 school year, 240 ninth and tenth graders received out of school suspension as a consequence. In that same school year, 232 in school suspension offences occurred. In the 2016-17 school year, there were reportedly 266 out of school suspension offences and 268 in school suspension offenses among ninth and tenth grade students. In the 2017-2018 school year, I acquired data for all four grade levels. There were 672 out of school offenses and 894 in school offenses. Without in school suspension, there is absolutely no way the students of Eminence High who participated in ISS would have been able to remain connected to their classroom materials and make academic progress.

By the end of each school year, building administrators were waiting to hear about how many allocations they would be provided for the upcoming school year. Because of this, each year there was a discussion as to whether or not the ISS program
was necessary, considering the demands of instructional personnel needed in the classroom superseded the need for a certified teacher in the ISS classroom. Although not required, teacher certification is definitely a strong preference in an ISS facilitator.

Students assigned in school suspensions were required to complete missing classwork in an effort to remain connected to the content material and not fall behind their peers. To make this experience advantageous to students, it would be beneficial if the ISS facilitator possessed teacher certifications in either English or math. These two areas are critical to the success of at risk students and are typically the area in which most students struggle.

Decreased instructional allocations means an increase in the probability of hiring personnel not qualified enough to facilitate ISS. Since most of the students who participate in the ISS program are there because of behavioral infractions, it is imperative that the facilitator have training and experience in classroom management, exceptional student education skills, and behavior modification skills. Therefore, decreasing instructional personnel allocations made it more likely that the ISS facilitator would lack experience working with exceptional students, which is vital to any ISS program.

ISS within our school was modified several times since the 2012-13 school year to fit the needs of the program. Since its most recent modification, the program appeared to be running smoothly. The ISS program relocated this past year from its original location in building three, due to the room not being big enough to accommodate more than twelve students at a time. In the 2014-2015 school year, students were scheduled a week in advance for their ISS consequence due to the lack of space in the ISS classroom. During the 2015-2016 school year, the ISS program moved to a larger classroom that
could hold 25-30 students comfortably without having students sitting on top of one another.

However, the constant “packed house” of rule breakers led to the notion that ISS may not be as effective as intended in deterring students from making offenses against student code of conduct rules. “Although ISS programs are a desirable alternative to OSSs, poorly conceived ISS programs are little more than “holding tanks” and may function as brief stops on the way to OSS” (Dupper, Theriot, & Craun, 2009, p. 10). Of the two hundred and ninety students who served in ISS from August to March of 2015-2016, one hundred and three of them served more than once in ISS. This rate of recidivism indicated that the program may not have had the intended impact on deterring inappropriate and unwanted behaviors, which is the purpose of ISS. Similarly, in comparing OSS for ninth and tenth graders only, their statistics continued to rise even with the implementation of ISS. In the 2015-16 school year, there were 35 ninth and tenth grade students participating in OSS. In the 2016-17 school year, there were 55 ninth and tenth grade students participating in OSS. In addition, in the 2017-18 school year, there were 67 ninth and tenth grade students participating in OSS. Therefore, even with the recidivism rate of ISS participants increasing, so are the rate of OSS participants.

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the ISS program at Eminence High School in terms of fidelity to its original goal, which was to provide a consequence while maintaining the academic experience. “In School Suspension is a disciplinary measure that costs time, money, and student seat time,” as it relates to students missing direct instruction from instructors (Rahynes, 2015 p. 5). With this research, my goal was that the data would reveal the true effectiveness of the ISS
program and whether or not the program was meeting the goals, expectations, and intent of the program. It is important to note that the current in school suspension program was not a listed item on the current school year’s school improvement plan. More significantly to note was that in my five years of employment at Eminence High, I do not recall ever seeing a goal item addressing in school suspension. Furthermore, many of the school improvement plan goals created either a cause or effect on our in school suspension program, directly or indirectly.

Although ISS was not a goal that we would want to encourage students to participate in, components of ISS were addressed in the School Improvement Plan through section two, which addressed the needs assessment and analysis. The number of student infractions per student was assessed in this area. The data from this section was a great place to generate a goal to monitor students and record how the intervention was working in relation to academic achievement. One example of a goal for ISS was by using the early warning systems data in place, students at Eminence High would increase engaged behaviors in order to maintain a safe and supportive culture for all students. “Rather than isolating and punishing students, it has been suggested that ISS programs emphasize modifying students’ misbehavior by including counseling components and conflict resolution strategies” (Ingersoll & LeBoeuf, 1997, p. 6). The strategies to accomplish this goal would be the consistent use of Leaps Lessons for all students and restorative practices within the ISS classroom to assist students with identifying acceptable classroom and school behavior, while teaching critical problem solving and conflict resolution skills.
Rationale

In school suspension is a program utilized within many schools around the country. When an ISS program is structured and organized properly, it could be a huge benefit for all stakeholders involved. The Consistency Management and Cooperative Discipline (CMCD) program, utilized primarily in Texas, has shown significant strides with helping to reduce behavior problems with African American and Latino students. CMCD focuses on “creating classrooms where teachers and students work collaboratively to set rules for classroom management and transforms teacher-centered classrooms into person-centered classrooms” (Dupper, Theriot, & Craun, 2009, p. 10).

Today, teachers are evaluated by the academic gains that students assigned to their classes make throughout the year. Since the shift in teacher evaluations emerged, many lawsuits have also arisen. Plaintiffs in these lawsuits “have argued that Value Added Models (VAM) often fall far short of their intention to create fair, apples-to-apples comparisons of teachers’ effectiveness because their statistical models cannot account for the subtle ways in which groups of students differ from one year to the next” (Close & Amrein-Beardsley, 2018 p. 16). If a teacher has a large population of students who are suspended throughout the year and those students are never afforded the opportunity to learn the course content material and make up the work, then this not only impacts the student’s grade but also the teacher’s evaluation rating. Ultimately, over time, if this cycle continues it can impact the school grade as well. When administrators have large numbers of students who are continuously suspended and missing classroom instruction and testing requirements, eventually this will cause serious ramifications for
administration as school grade and testing requirements also offer pressure on school leaders and cause district leaders to intervene.

Out of school suspensions impact all stakeholders, but most notably it affects the individual student suspended from school. Students who spend significant amounts of time away from direct instruction and classroom interactions with teachers and students within a learning environment tend to lose necessary academic skills learned in school. This can lead to academic, and often social, regression. Kearney (2008) explained how “the prevalence of unexcused absences from school exceeds that of major childhood behavior disorders and is a key risk factor for violence, injury, substance use, psychiatric disorders, and economic deprivation” (p. 451). A crucial aspect of schooling is the development of character traits and value systems that are woven into the curriculum through interactions and experiences between students, peers, and teachers. These experiences are important to the social development of all students. In addition, students’ critical thinking and problem-solving skills can be impaired by a lack of stimulus and application when they are always written up and suspended. In the end, out of school suspensions impact the entire academic community, but more importantly, the individual student missing the opportunity to be in school and progress fully.

The impact of student absenteeism and being unsuccessful in school affects various stakeholders such as school districts and administrators, police departments, juvenile court system, probation officers, and the community. “Research has demonstrated that youth who are not in school and not in the labor force are at high risk of delinquency and crime” (Ingersoll, & LeBoeuf, 1997, p. 2). Conversely, “children who are not educated will more than likely lack adequate skills to secure employment and
become self-sufficient adults” (Ingersoll, & LeBoeuf, 1997, p. 1). This scenario quickly becomes an epidemic and a vicious never-ending cycle, which begins with a student’s inability to assimilate and matriculate successfully in the school setting. When the connection is severed, the community, the school district, and the student face permanent effects that are extremely hard to reverse.

An effective ISS program offers a solution to a problem that has multilevel systemic ramifications. In school suspension affords the opportunity for the students to reconnect with course material missed while serving their punishment for the infraction committed. Additionally, it allows the classroom teacher the ability to connect to students in a different way outside of the classroom. Often the individualized attention received out of the classroom while in ISS makes a world of difference between the student and classroom teacher when the student is allowed to return to the classroom. While in ISS, students are usually exposed to Leaps Lessons. “Leaps is a comprehensive, online program and resource for educators who are creating learning environments built upon resources that provide both evidence of benefit and content for delivery” (SEL For Schools, n.d.). Leaps is a behavior modification curriculum typically used in conjunction with positive behavior modification programs (like PBIS) within the school. Leaps is scenario based and allows students to work through life situations while building their conflict resolution and problem solving skills. In school suspension affords the teacher time to reflect, regroup, and implement new strategies and interventions in the classroom once the student returns.

I was especially intrigued by the effectiveness of in school suspension because, from a counselor’s perspective, I understand the need for in school suspension but often
wonder about the social stigma and possible segregation that may be covertly occur by using in school suspension as a means to remove students from the classroom environment. Hancock, Lawrence, Shepherd, Mitrou, and Zubrick (2017) suggested that “policies aiming to extend the time spent at school, either through reducing absences or extending the school calendar, would have a larger impact on low-achieving students and therefore help to reduce achievement inequality” (p. 416). If this suggestion is true, then by utilizing ISS more often than OSS, the students at Eminence high should perform academically and behaviorally just as well as their non-suspended counterparts. However, it takes more than just simply being present in school. The recidivism rate in which some students return to ISS is alarming. I often wondered what else was being used to avoid the in school and/or out of school suspension from occurring in the first place. Systems such as Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is a “school-wide proactive, data driven set of problem solving strategies designed to minimize or prevent problematic student behaviors and use suspension as a last resort” (Dupper, et. al., 2009, p. 11) were used in most schools within the Millbrook school district. However, the recidivism rates continued to increase. Either way, in school or out, the student was the one not in class and not receiving direct instruction from the content area teacher.

**Goals of the Program Evaluation**

The goal of this evaluation was to assess the effectiveness of the ISS program at Eminence High School in terms of fidelity to its original goal of keeping students connected to their instructional content from the classroom, while providing consequences for code of conduct violations. Ingersoll and LeBoeuf (1997) determined that the goal of an in school suspension program was to redirect students from exhibiting
inappropriate and disruptive behavior, which caused them to receive ISS as a consequence. “In school suspension programs provide an interpersonal training program to develop coping and communication skills; and conflict resolution and law-related education programs” (Ingersoll, & LeBoeuf, 1997, p. 6). In school suspension, if used appropriately, can also reinforce character and citizenship behaviors appropriate for school. By addressing the goal of ISS and evaluating the effectiveness of the ISS program, I evaluated student learning of interpersonal skills that should prevent repeat visits to in school suspension. The rate of recidivism, as found in ISS suspension data, was evidence of whether or not ISS made the impact intended. As I identified how ISS affected student behavior, I recognized its impact on the student body as a whole and on the perception of stakeholders. Additionally, it was interesting to notice how (ISS) participants also affected student learning in the classrooms they were absent from. With teacher surveys, I asked teachers to elaborate on how the classroom environment and dynamic was impacted when ISS participants were absent or present in class.

**Exploratory Questions**

I had several questions that I explored within my study. My primary questions were:

1. What do the participants (Teachers, ISS Facilitators, and school-based Administrators) perceive as working well in with the current in school suspension program at Eminence High School?

2. What do the participants (Teachers, ISS Facilitators, and school-based Administrators) perceive as not working well with the current in school suspension program at Eminence High School?
3. What do the participants (Teachers, ISS Facilitators, and school-based Administrators) perceive as the biggest challenge with the current ISS Program at Eminence High School?

4. What do the participants (Teachers, ISS Facilitators, and school-based Administrators) suggest as ways to improve the ISS program at Eminence High School?

5. According to the participants (Teachers, ISS Facilitators, and school-based Administrators), how effective is ISS at deterring code of conduct violations?

6. According to the participants (Teachers, ISS Facilitators, and school-based Administrators), what benefit, if any, do students who have been ISS participants seem to gain from ISS?

My secondary exploratory questions included:

1. What perceptions do the participants (Teachers, ISS Facilitators, and school-based Administrators) have regarding any impact the ISS program has had on school wide behavior among students?

2. What perceptions do the participants (Teachers, ISS Facilitators, and school-based Administrators) have regarding any impact the ISS program has had on the behavior of student participants of the ISS program?

3. What perceptions do the participants (Teachers, ISS Facilitators, and school-based Administrators) have regarding student participants of ISS being given the opportunity to receive missing work from the teacher of record?

4. What do stakeholders report as the influence of ISS on the student body?

5. What do stakeholders report as the influence of ISS on students who participate in ISS?
Through surveying and interviewing participants, I revealed perceptions and hidden beliefs about the in school suspension program. My objective was to also assist in identifying some of the systematic flaws that may be affecting the program from becoming as effective as it could be.

Conclusion

My expectation of this program evaluation was to determine if the current program was viable and to provide an effective behavior modification intervention for the student body as evidenced through the collected surveys, interviews, and the suspension data. The survey and interview data will provided evidence of benefit or non-benefit to the student population and to faculty and staff. It was my desire, through this program evaluation to gather evidence that would assist school administrators as well as district personnel to consider, use, and develop district wide standard operating procedures for in school suspension, making the program practicable and relevant as a viable behavior intervention strategy and not an isolation chamber for at risk students.

By using survey and face-to-face interview questions to collect data on student suspensions over the years, I showed school administration and district personnel whether ISS was a viable intervention resource and strategy. The results from the interview and survey data addressed what was working well and not working well with the current in school suspension program. My data also revealed what participants acknowledged as the biggest challenge, ways improvements could be made to the program to make a more effective experience for individuals who work the system daily. Lastly, the results garnered from data identified whether or not the current in
school suspension program was a deterrent for the student body and identified if benefits for its participants existed.
SECTION TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In today’s classroom setting, student behavior disrupts the learning environment at an alarming rate. Many students who are not proficient and lack the necessary academic skills within the classroom resort to inappropriate and unwanted behaviors during instructional time, in an attempt to disrupt and distract from actual learning.

“Discipline in America’s schools has been characterized as a major concern of the general public for the last three decades” (Garibaldi, Blanchard, & Brooks, 1996, p. 408). The behaviors often become divergent from what is actually occurring with the student. The embarrassment of either unprepared, unequipped, or unmotivated learners causes distractions that can turn any classroom into disarray. Many teachers avoid confronting these students and correcting the classroom environment, which causes continuous discipline issues that take over the instructional time deemed for learning and collaborating. Therefore, their classrooms become chaotic and problematic and, in turn, learning cannot occur as it should.

This has become so much of a problem that it consumes an enormous amount of teachers’ and administrators’ daily functions. Vanderslice (1999) expounded on the enormous task that administrators and teachers face daily in attempting to manage inappropriate behaviors that interrupt and distract from direct instruction. This persistent interference prevents building administrators from effectively being instructional leaders and providing needed support to teachers.

To that end, many students find themselves sitting in a principal’s or assistant principal’s office facing the inevitable: suspension. Garibaldi, Blanchard, and Brooks
(1996) explained how the practice of suspending students from school originally was meant to allow a cooling off period for students, while simultaneously allowing the teacher to dismiss inappropriate behaviors from the learning environment for a period of time. However, times have changed. Payne and Welch (2013) made reference to the zero tolerance initiatives that impacted school discipline methods across the country. This article highlighted how punishment within schools has increased and schools have incorporated “juvenile justice and criminal justice systems” (Payne & Welch, 2013, p. 542) into their policy and procedures regarding issuing out discipline consequences.

Wadhwa explained it even further in her body of work, highlighting how zero tolerance initiatives in schools are “designed to mimic that of the drug enforcement policies derived in the 1980’s, back when the goal was to prevent drug cartels from expanding by punishing harshly” for all offences regardless of severity (Wadhwa, 2015, p. 5). Today, zero tolerance within schools means students are no longer given opportunities to mess up. There is not any corrective or rehabilitative action occurring to assist students with new behavior modification skills. Rather, there are strict guidelines as to how and when you will be punished for conduct infractions.

In school suspension emerged as an alternative, eliminating the need for the student to be out of school while simultaneously allowing the student to serve a consequence for the infraction committed. The use of in school suspension is typically issued prior to any out of school suspension. In school suspension should serve as an intervention and or deterrent for additional unwanted classroom behaviors. The purpose of using ISS instead of OSS is to afford students the opportunity to correct and adjust inappropriate behaviors from re-occurring, while continuity of educational services
continues. The hope is that the student will learn why the behavior is inappropriate in a classroom and or school setting, while being allowed to make up missing work.

The continuity of educational services is where some may feel the confusion can develop. School is supposed to be the place where learning occurs. School is supposed to be a place where shared knowledge and the love of learning come together and is nurtured. However, there are some minds of thought that presume that in school suspension is nothing more than an isolation chamber that does not deter unwanted behavior. Many believe that learning is not and cannot occur within the confines of in school suspension merely because of the fact that direct instruction is not occurring. Some critics of the program feel that the instruction needed can only come from the teacher of record.

**Developing a Teacher–Student Relationship**

McDermott (1997) explained how the relationship between student and teacher impacts student learning and behavior. He expounded on the social interaction that occurs within the classroom setting, causing a teacher and a student to develop a common language and a communication regimen that, if done properly, can be beautifully orchestrated. However, McDermott also pointed out that when personal biases and covert racism exist; the opposite can and will occur. Many students can become very aware of the dislike and antipathy that their teachers may feel for them. When teachers demonstrate abhorrence toward student misbehavior, the result is usually an increase in discipline referrals sent to the administrator in charge of discipline. Fabelo, Thompson, Plotkin, Carmichael, Marchbanks, and Booth (2011), described how students with one or more discipline referral were 10% more likely to have criminal offenses proceed the
discipline referral in school within one year. When teachers continuously relied on discipline referrals and administration to correct classroom behavior, the message of odium became clear to the student. It is a message that says: because of your actions, you are now unwanted and unwelcomed in this class. This belief system among teachers can cause resentment and animosity between the teacher and the student, further disrupting the learning environment and the student’s ability to learn.

Another barrier to academic learning within the confines of ISS that I have personally noted is that teachers will not provide the work to the student who is absent from the classroom. Often, teachers are reluctant to let their classroom assignments and lessons leave their grasp. Teachers reported that students assigned to ISS often times never return to class with the assigned work completed. Teachers may feel that students blatantly refuse to do the work. Some stated that students in ISS aren’t held accountable for work completion while in ISS. If the teacher refuses to send work to the student in ISS, this may lead to the student feeling as if the teacher does not want them to succeed, and the animosity and bitterness between student and teacher continues to grow.

When the relationship between student and teacher is broken, it is hard to repair without significant effort by both parties. Educators who recognize this divide can implement intercessions quickly in an attempt to save the working relationship. This can lead educators to search for alternative methods of discipline, such as Restorative Practices, to increase academic and social connections. Aboluwodi referred to a “disciplined student environment” (2015, p. 134) in which the learning environment was controlled and both the teacher and the students circulated knowledge. Aboluwodi expounded on how a learning environment that is disruptive in nature typically resulted
in punitive sanctions for the disruptive student. However, Aboluwodi’s argument was that, aside from the punishment, the student still does not learn any new skills to prevent future misbehavior. Rather, this study highlighted the benefits of retributive discipline, which can either be used as a preventative measure or included as a part of the ISS program to further increase academic connectedness and decrease recidivism.

As a stakeholder, be it parent, teacher, facilitator, administrator, or district personnel, we have to determine whether or not the learning environment of ISS is conducive for learning and if students within ISS are being afforded the needed assistance to learn, along with being held accountable for work completion while in ISS.

**Being Male in School Today**

Research showed that male students, specifically African American males, seem to have a higher attendance rate in ISS compared to their female counterpart who may also attend ISS. “In virtually, every study presenting school disciplinary data by gender, boys are referred to the office and receive a range of disciplinary consequence at a significantly greater rate than girls” (Skiba, Michael, & Nardo, 2000, p. 8). A study by Townsend (2000) revealed that “African American males composed 43% of the school age population, but received 65% of the school districts suspensions” (p. 382). At Eminence High School, in the 2017-2018 school year, African American students made up 29.2% of the school’s population; however, African American students made up 48.8% of total suspensions. During this same school year, 301 total students participated in in school suspension. Among those students, seventy-eight students (26%) involved were African American males, with African American females following closely behind their male counterparts with sixty-seven students, or 22%.
This increase in male attendance in ISS was so prevalent across school districts throughout the country that it poses the question that this may be part of a larger, more complex issue. “One gender difference that refuses to go away: boys are languishing academically while girls are soaring” (Sommers, 2013, p. 2). As a whole, school aged males are struggling in school. As a school counselor for over five years, each year I was astonished as I searched for the top African American male in the respective senior class. This search typically left me searching through at least thirty to forty students from the top of the class, usually passing two or more African American girls, before reaching an African American male.

Parallel to their female counterparts, African American males, specifically from a lower socioeconomic status, are experiencing far more distress in school socially and academically. Compared to the behavior and academic advancement of school-aged females, boys have definitely fallen behind. In a Louisiana urban school system where “87% of the 86,000 students were African American, it was found that African American males accounted for 58% of the non-promotions, 65% of the suspensions, 80% of the expulsions, and 45% of the dropouts - even though these young men represented only 43% of the school population. It was also very discomforting to find that more than 800 of the 1,470 non-promotions in the first grade and more than 1,600 of the almost 2,800 non-promotions in the sixth through eighth grades were African American males” (Garibaldi, 1992, p. 5). There is a serious unease as to why African American males are doing so poorly in school when compared to their all other students.

Varlas (2005) expressed concern that American male student receive a significantly higher rate of disciplinary suspensions and expulsions than their female
counterparts. The article further outlined how African American males spend more time in special education programs and spend less time in honors and college prep courses while in K-12 schools. Special education classes, also referred to as ESE classes, are packed with males, specifically African American and Hispanic males (Kunjufu, 1990). “Taylor and Foster (1986) reported a consistent ordering in the likelihood of suspension from most to least: black males, white males, black females, white females” (Skiba, Michael, & Nardo, 2000, p. 8). This may explain why minority males are more susceptible to receive punitive discipline. This also reflects the significant increase in the number of suspensions and expulsions for African American males.

**Exceptional Student Education and Discipline**

In a 2015 executive summary of California’s growing discipline gap, Losen, Hodson, Keith, Morrison, and Belway revealed how gender and racial disparities among students with disabilities were pivotal in increasing the discipline gap. In this study, it is documented that males with disabilities have the highest rate of suspension compared to their female counterparts. Specifically, African American males with disabilities had the highest percentage of suspensions, and Hispanic males with disabilities followed closely behind. What was also interesting to note in this study was that African American females with disabilities exhibited higher percentage rates of suspension than that of white males with disabilities.

In school suspension has become essential to the discipline and correction of students within the Exceptional Student Education program (ESE). ISS is often used as an alternative to out of school suspension for special education students, otherwise known as ESE students. Federal law states that a student enrolled in the Exceptional
Student Education program is entitled to a free and appropriate public education. The law further explains that a student enrolled in an ESE program within a public school is limited to ten suspension days per school year. Since these students are limited to the amount of out of school days they can receive within a school year, the use of in school suspension as a measure of consequence becomes vital. If the building administrator consistently uses OSS as a consequence for ESE students, then the ten-day maximum will likely be depleted before the midyear mark and discipline for that student for the remainder of the year becomes more difficult. I found that many administrators make deals with ESE students and become very creative with using OSS and ISS in combination for one discipline infraction. For example, student A curses at the teacher and slams a book on the floor. When the general education student would have received 3-5 days of OSS for this inappropriate behavior, plausible punishment for an ESE student may be one day OSS followed by 3 days ISS to allow a significant amount of cooling down time for both the student and the classroom teacher. This reality of the consequence disparity may leave the classroom teacher feeling helpless, since this student will not have to experience the level of consequence that a general education student would. Understandably, this is why within the confines of ISS, rehabilitative and corrective action skills are necessary and crucial to behavior modification. My hope is that the qualitative survey data will demonstrate this need.

**Parental and Community Involvement**

For many parents, school and academia are a daunting task. In my current school experience, I discovered that many parents were not model students themselves and have personal reservations in response to school and school policies. This discord between
school, parents, and community can affect student behavior and the respect that students exhibit toward school authorities and school rules. Discord that can further invite inappropriate and disruptive behaviors to occur within the learning environment, when allowed to propagate and develop into feelings of resentment and lack of trust.

Sheldon and Epstein (2002) emphasized how important home environment and neighborhood environment directly affect student behavior in school. Students who are repeat offenders of code of conduct infractions and receive in school suspension as well as out of school suspension usually do not have consistent parental support and guidance as it relates to school. Sheldon and Epstein also focus on how schools can use the community and the parent connection to positively impact classroom behavior. They suggest formulating mentoring groups and community safety patrols and allowing neighborhood businesses to have direct access to students and their academic environments.

Thorbahn (1995) discussed how essential parental and community involvement are to the success of a school. Additionally, his body of work illustrated how involvement and support from parents, community, and businesses directly influenced the success and commitment of students who attend the school. When students know that they have the support of home and external partners, they tend to rise to the expectation of success imposed onto the student by their external support system.

Today, the school rules and policies are not necessarily a shared vision with parents. In my experience, I revealed that parents often disagree with the rules that are currently in schools today. School rules are intentionally created to keep students safe. Across the country, there has been a strict initiative to increase student safety, commonly
referred to as “zero tolerance.” Zero tolerance refers to a list of infractions that, if broken, will result in immediate out of school or in school suspension as a method of discipline. Mendez and Knoff (2003) revealed that “most out of school suspensions across the country are for minor infractions of school rules rather than for dangerous or violent acts” (p. 32). Depending upon whether or not the student is ESE also makes a huge determination in whether or not the student receives ISS versus OSS. It is because of these nuances that parents have a hard time supporting school authorities when discipline methods are enforced. Parents who have a hard time supporting the discipline measures used and proposed within schools often have a hard time encouraging their students to follow the rules while they are in school.

**Conclusion**

In concluding the review of literature addressing in school suspension, I found that what originated as a time out or cooling off period for inappropriate behavior in the classroom has transformed to a zero tolerance culture that often lacks humanity and does not allow children to mess up and learn from their mistakes. The policies and procedures in place within schools today do not purportedly protect the well-behaved students. “Students no longer see school officials making the learning environment safe and orderly. They see school officials acting punitively toward their friends, family, and peers” (Black, 2018 p. 15). The school discipline matrix provides an anticipation that students will behave inappropriately, and there is a long list of consequences for said behaviors should they arise. Conversely, interventions and rehabilitative services are not mentioned in the discipline matrix. The students are only expected to serve a consequence for the infraction, never to learn any behavior modification or coping skills
to correct the inappropriate behavior, that the institution put in place to assist them. M. Griffin-Gay (personal communication, July 9, 2018) asserted that “school is supposed to be a place where shared knowledge and the love of learning come together”. Section three of this study will address my research design and the steps I took to gather data to support my research.
SECTION THREE: METHODOLOGY

Research Design Overview

The evaluation of any program is the practice of analytically examining said program. It involves gathering and studying information about a program's activities, characteristics, and outcomes. “Its purpose is to make judgments about a program, to improve its effectiveness, and/or to inform programming decisions” (Patton, 1987). It is my goal in evaluating the in-school suspension program at Eminence High School to use the findings to make recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the program and/or apprise programming decisions.

While providing a comprehensive overview of Eminence High School’s ISS program evaluation, my intention in gathering data for this study was to investigate the relationship between student discipline data and student participation in the in school suspension program. Ultimately, my goal was to see how the data impacted student learning. I collected and analyzed student discipline records for Eminence High School. I retrieved a list of students who had been active participants in the in school suspension program for the 2015-2016 and the 2016-2017 school years. The data was obtained from the school’s electronic information and data warehouse and through the former ISS facilitator and dean of student discipline. I collected the data and formulated a list of survey and interview questions for further data collection. Face to face interview questions were asked of a former ISS facilitator still working at the school in an alternate capacity. I was able to interview current teachers at Eminence High as well.

I attempted to administer surveys to all faculty and staff members present on the day of the survey data collection. I distributed surveys concealed in colored envelopes to
teachers, administrators, the dean and campus monitor. Included with each envelope was
a release of information, study participation form, and purpose of study for all
participants to ensure full disclosure was apparent.

I created a list of questions for each of the parties interviewed: administrators,
dean, past and present ISS facilitators, campus monitor, and teachers. I provided faculty,
administration, dean, and campus monitor with a release of information and study
participant form. This allowed the information collected and gathered to be included in
this study.

I collected student discipline records, student behavior data, and student
achievement data. Simultaneously along with the previous data, I interviewed a former
ISS facilitator, the current building administrators, current dean, and current teachers.
The information I gathered was revealed through written explanation within the study.

Patton (2008) highlights the argument of Scriven (2006), where he argued that the
purpose of program evaluation is to determine the effects of the program, if any, and
judge the program’s merit, worth, or significance. The text also stated that it is not the
task of the evaluator to explain these effects, other than to show that there are effects of
the program. It was my goal in conducting this research to reveal through comprehensive
description how my research methodology answers my primary research questions. I
garnered the perceptions and thoughts of those individuals who work daily with the
program and have firsthand experience of its benefit or ramification influencing their
day-to-day operations, to explain and answer both primary and secondary questions.
Participants

I engaged participation from the following participants in this study: the school’s current building administrators, which includes one principal and four assistant principals. The administration ranged between the ages of 25 and 70, both male and female. I also engaged participation from 31 teachers between the ages of 18 and 70, both male and female. Lastly, I engaged participation from the school’s dean and campus monitor, and these individuals were between the ages of 18 and 70, and both are male. All participants chosen had an affiliation and connection to the school and were between the ages of 18 and 70, both male and female. These participants were encouraged to participate in the voluntary anonymous survey as well as the face-to-face interview portion. These individuals were chosen because they have direct access to the students who may have participated in in school suspension for the school years reviewed. Some of these individuals may have also initiated or processed discipline referrals on the in school suspension participants as well.

Data Gathering Techniques

To begin the process of gathering my data, I first scheduled a meeting with the principal of Eminence High School. During this meeting, I presented the principal with an informed consent form titled Adult Participant Survey (Appendix A). This form explained the purpose of the study and the role any participants would play in the study. The form also informed participants that their participation is voluntary and that they can rescind consent at any time. During this meeting, I also notified the principal that I would be collecting data and evaluating the in school suspension program currently in place at Eminence High for a program evaluation project I am completing towards my doctoral
degree. Next, I orchestrated the best time to address and explain the purpose of the survey to the entire faculty. It was determined during that meeting with the principal that the best time to obtain informed consent and distribute the surveys would be during a faculty meeting, as this would be the time that I would have the majority of the faculty and staff present. I gathered the data from voluntary surveys and voluntary interview sessions with willing participants who agreed at the time of explanation that they wished to participate. I chose to use this method to protect the anonymity of the participants and to preserve their confidentiality.

**Surveys**

In an effort to maximize participation and collect data efficiently, I chose to administer paper surveys to my participants. I asked 24 questions on the voluntary survey for teachers (Appendix B) and administrators (Appendix C), with questions surrounded around teacher opinion and experience with the current in school suspension program. During a fall 2017 faculty meeting, I explained the purpose of the survey and explained the informed consent process. I handed each person in the faculty meeting two envelopes. I explained that the manila envelope contained two copies of the informed consent form. I asked that if a participant chose to participate that they remove the informed consent forms, and sign one of them and return it to the manila envelope and seal it. I also explained that in the white envelope is a copy of the actual survey. Those individuals present were encouraged to participate in the survey and return the forms to the while envelope and seal it. Lastly, I explained that whether participating or not, upon exiting the faculty meeting, I asked that all individuals place their envelopes in the two respective bins located at the rear of the room. I continuously communicated that
participation was voluntary and that confidentiality will be maintained throughout this process. I collected and analyzed the data from the distributed surveys to identify and reveal relationship patterns among participants to answer my primary and secondary exploratory questions outlined in this study. I used the voluntary participant responses to generate answers to my primary and secondary exploratory questions. Additionally, I used the data to determine what procedural strategies, interventions, and modification recommendations should be made to make in school suspension at Eminence High more effective.

**Individual Interviews**

In an effort to delve deeper into the survey responses and get more experience and perception data from the survey participants I chose to administer face-to-face interviews. I asked twelve interview questions of the voluntary participants who took the survey and later agreed to an additional interview. The participants indicated on the survey that they would like to participate in a face-to-face interview after submitting the survey. I later contacted the participants by the email address they provided on the completed survey. I scheduled a time and date to conduct the interview outside of their contract hours. The data I collected from the interviews was transcribed and evaluated for themes, patterns, and trends. I used this information to identify and reveal relationship patterns among participants to answer my primary and secondary exploratory questions outlined in this study.

**Student Data**

I also collected discipline data for the students who participated in ISS from the 2015-2016 school year through the 2017-2018 school years. I obtained data through
Millbrook School District’s student information database, Edu Info. I used data to determine how many students were participants in ISS within a given school year. I also used the data to make predictions and suggest strategies and interventions based on student demographics (i.e., gender, ethnicity, and academic labels). In Table 1 I refer to the most recent student in school suspension data from the 2017-2018 school year. There were 260 students serviced in the in school suspension program in the 2017-2018 school year. I used data to identify and reveal program deficits and opportunities for improvement with the current in school suspension program.

**Data Analysis Techniques**

After gathering the data for evaluating the in school suspension program at Eminence High, I used surveys, interviews of school personnel, and discipline data from ISS participants to draw conclusions about my exploratory questions. I completed data gathering between December 2017 and March of 2018 and have explained the results of the data information gathered during this time period. I collected the data during this study to evaluate the effectiveness of the in school suspension program at Eminence High.

Patton (2008) expounded on how accurate and believable data with limitations clearly stated upfront is essential in the data gathering process. It is essential because “decision makers want highly accurate and trustworthy data. This means they want data that are valid and reliable” (Patton, 2008, p. 396). By explicitly sharing my data gathering techniques, I am able to establish credibility with decision makers who can use the interpretations, judgements, and recommendations presented from this study.
Surveys

Once participants were done with the surveys, I instructed them to place them into the respective bins as they exited the faculty meeting. I went through each of the white envelopes to place the surveys in one pile together. Then I went through the manila folders and placed the consent forms in alphabetical order for storage. I began the process of reviewing and analyzing the information listed on the voluntary surveys. I used this technique to generate frequency and patterns of the responses. I generated descriptive statistical data from the information collected from each survey. I transformed the response codes and statistics into written explanation formulated to express the results received within this study.

Individual Interviews

I collected first hand responses from interviews of faculty of their perceptions and feelings about the current in school suspension program at Eminence High school. I completed face-to-face interviews with survey participants who indicated at the bottom of their voluntary surveys that they wished to participate further with a face-to-face interview within a week of the survey completion. I emailed each of the participants and offered dates and times from which they could choose to participate in the interview. The dates and times I provided were specific enough as to not interfere with their normal duty at school. The data I collected assisted in the development of recommendations to enhance the current in school suspension program.

I conducted one face-to-face interview with each of the eight survey participants who agreed to participate in the interview for approximately 30 minutes using set interview protocols (Appendix E). I explored the experiences each participant has had
with the current in school suspension program. To assist with recollection of each interview, I obtained taped recorded responses from the eight interview participants during their interview time slot. I transcribed the responses and analyzed the responses looking for patterns, themes, and similar responses to create response categories. I then wrote them out as explanations to the exploratory questions previously mentioned in my study. I used the interview data collected to enhance the effectiveness of the current in school suspension program at Eminence High School.

**Ethical Considerations**

In conducting the research for this program evaluation, I ensured that ethical considerations were taken into account throughout this entire program evaluation process. I received approval to conduct research from National Louis University and the Millbrook School District. I obtained informed and signed consent from all participants prior to participation in the survey or interview process. I notified all participants that their participation was voluntary and could be discontinued at any point throughout the process. Privacy and confidentiality of all participants was maintained throughout the entire process. I used pseudonyms in lieu of participant, school and district names to ensure privacy. No minors were involved in the study.

After I secured permission from the principal of Eminence High to conduct this research within the school, I prepared packets with informed consent notices that included the statement regarding my promise to keep their confidentiality and privacy. I presented two copies of titled Informed Consent Notice Adult Participant Survey to voluntary participants. I asked participants to sign one copy and return it to the manila envelope, and retain the other copy for their records.
I provided another envelope with the actual survey to be completed titled Teacher Survey. Administration and discipline deans received envelopes with the informed consent and administrator survey in the same manner. If survey takers voluntarily wanted to participate in the survey, I asked that they sign the Informed Consent Notice Adult Participant Survey first and then proceed to take the survey. I asked that participants return both forms to their respective white and manila envelope provided and then drop the envelopes in the designated labeled bins located at the back of the room prior to their exit.

When I conducted the individual interview sessions, participants were provided with an additional informed consent form titled Informed Consent Adult Participant Interview (Appendix D), to sign again for the participation in the voluntary face-to-face interview. I explained that any participation in the study is voluntary and they could withdraw their consent at any time during the interview process. I ensured that the privacy of all survey participants was protected by requiring both participants and non-participants to return their envelopes in the same locked box. I did not divulge the interview participants’ names in the study at all. All results that would reveal identity, I gave a pseudonym. I also gave the name of the high school and the district a pseudonym to protect the identity of anyone involved. I did not interview nor survey any minors in the course of my research. This study provided minimal risk of harm or benefit, as all the information I gathered and obtained was through survey, interviews and historical discipline data already collected.
Conclusion

This research study focused on the efficacy of the in school suspension program at Eminence High school. The study focused on the opinions and experiences of those stakeholders involved with policy, procedure and practice of the program. It was my hope that the data reveal answers to all of my exploratory questions. I wanted to know from the stakeholders what is working well and what is not working well, in their opinions. I also wanted the stakeholders to acknowledge what is perceived as the biggest challenges and provide ways to improve the program from their perspective. The outcomes of the study results provided building administration and district administration a blueprint to follow if and when in school suspension becomes a district wide program within middle and high schools. Through this study, by obtaining research and asking questions and gathering recommendations from those individuals who work with the program daily, a deeper understanding of the day-to-day operations and needs of students, teachers, and school administration became evident.
SECTION FOUR: RESULTS

Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the current in school suspension program at Eminence High school. The information collected throughout this evaluation can be used to increase the effectiveness of the current in school suspension program. For this study, I gathered both quantitative and qualitative data using surveys and interviews of administrators and faculty seeking their perspectives based on their experience with the current in school suspension program. The quantitative and qualitative data gave me a descriptive sense of what participants felt were components of the program that work well and components that needed improvement.

When collecting my quantitative and qualitative data, I conducted surveys and interviews in order to gain a perspective on the current in school suspension program at Eminence High School. The survey and interview responses were used to answer my study’s primary and secondary exploratory questions. The findings from the survey and interviews provided a clear picture regarding the perception of effectiveness of the current in school suspension program, as well as provided me with some of the recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the current in school suspension program. The survey and interview data I collected from the participants provided me insight regarding the current in school suspension program and can be used to guide future actions to enhance the effectiveness of the program.
Teacher Surveys

I handed out 120 surveys during a faculty meeting. Thirty-one completed surveys were returned to me. This was a response rate of 26%. This response rate was disheartening since many of the teachers at Eminence have been so vocal in the past about the discipline matrix and the need to address behavioral issues and conflict early on.

Teacher survey question number one asked, “When you write a discipline referral on a student, does the consequence result in the student usually receiving ISS as the consequence?” Only twenty-eight of the thirty-one participants answered this question. Fifteen (53.57%) of those who participated indicated that when they write a referral the consequence (SOMETIMES) given is typically ISS. Eleven (39.39%) of those who participated indicated that when they write a referral the consequence (MOST TIMES) given is typically ISS. These data support the stance that referrals received by the discipline dean sometimes receive in school suspension as the consequence.

Figure 1. Do discipline referrals result in the student receiving ISS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 When you write a discipline referral on a student, does the consequence result in the student usually receiving ISS as the consequence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests that in other instances other measures of punishment (such as OSS) may be the consequence provided for those students. Either way, the discipline dean
receives and processes the referral written by the teacher or other school personnel. He refers to the discipline matrix and the code of conduct to determine appropriate consequence.

Teacher survey question number two asked, “Is there communication to notify you when your students are assigned ISS as a consequence?” Twenty (64.52%) of those who participated, indicated that there is (ALWAYS) communication to notify the teacher of when students are assigned ISS as a consequence. Similarly, 10 (32.36%) of those who participated, indicated that there is communication (MOST TIMES) to notify the teacher when students are assigned ISS as a consequence.

Figure 2. Is there communication to notify when students are assigned ISS?

The data support that the majority of faculty and staff feel that communication occurs regarding students assigned to ISS, and that the communication appears to be consistent and occurring regularly. Since the majority of participants indicate communication is occurring, this indicates a portion of the process and procedure that is working well. Consistent communication to teachers is a vital part of the process. As it stands currently at Eminence High, the disciplinary dean at the time of processing a
referral then sends an email to all of the student’s teachers, his or her direct discipline administrator and the grade level counselor. The policy and procedure manuals that may derive from this study for districtwide initiative for ISS should include this aspect as a viable process. An automatic notification feature as a way to assist with communication and notification should also be considered when implementing a district wide policy.

Teacher survey question number three asked, “As the teacher of record for a student assigned to ISS, do you visit the ISS room to meet with your student and provide instruction?” Nineteen (61.29%) of those that participated indicated that they (NEVER) visit the ISS room to meet with students and provide instruction. Eight (25.81%) of those who participated indicated that they (SOMETIMES) visit the ISS room to meet with student and provide instruction.

*Figure 3. As the teacher of record, do you visit ISS to provide instruction to your student?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST TIMES</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question three relates to an implied expectation that the teacher would visit the student in ISS to provide instruction. As commonly known, most ISS facilitators are not always certified teachers. Some ISS facilitators are certified and in fact, at Eminence
High, our past four ISS facilitators have been certified teachers. However, even with holding a teaching certificate, rarely will you find an individual dual or multiple certified, with the ability to assist a student in multiple subjects. Hence, this is why it was important to pose question #3 regarding whether or not teachers attempted visiting a student who was absent from their classroom and missing direct instruction for days at a time. The data revealed that this visit rarely existed and many have never even thought about it until asked this question on this survey.

Teacher survey question number four asked, “When students are assigned ISS, are the missing assignments and materials provided to the student while they are in ISS?” Twelve (38.71%) of those who participated indicated that when students are assigned ISS, the missing assignments and materials are (SOMETIMES) provided to the student. Nine (29.03%) of those who participated indicated that when students are assigned ISS, the missing assignments and materials are (MOST TIMES & ALWAYS) provided to the student.

**Figure 4.** Are missing assignments and materials provided to students while in ISS?
The data supported another major component to include in the policy and procedure manuals that may derive from this study for districtwide initiative. Ensuring that those students who are assigned ISS have access to the previous missing assignments, as well as the assignments the student will miss while in ISS, are vital to the success of the student’s transition back into the classroom.

Teacher survey question number five asked, “When students are assigned ISS, are teachers aware of what the rules are for makeup work and students getting caught up after being assigned to ISS?” Fourteen (45.16%) of those who participated indicated that they are (SOMETIMES) aware of the rules for students being able to get caught up in their classroom following a return from ISS. Eight (25.81%) of those who participated indicated that they are (ALWAYS) aware of the rules for students being able to get caught up in their classroom following a return from ISS. I think it is important to note that six participants indicated that they are (MOST TIMES) aware of the rules for students being able to get caught up in their classroom following a return from ISS.

*Figure 5.* Are teachers aware of rules for makeup work and getting caught up for students assigned to ISS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most Times</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
These data indicate that training and communication regarding the procedures for students being allowed to make up their work following a return from ISS is essential. Of the 31 participants, the fact that the teachers were unclear as to the procedure for students being allowed to make up missing work is alarming. It poses questions as to how these students have fared in the past with respects to missing assignments and how many of them have taken zeros because of the teachers lack of clarity surrounding their return from ISS.

Teacher survey question number six asked, “Are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the student?” Fifteen (48.39%) of those who participated indicated that (SOMETIMES) the procedures outlined for ISS is beneficial to the student. Twelve (38.71%) of those who participated indicated that (MOST TIMES) the procedures outlined for ISS is beneficial to the student. Notably, four (12.90%) of those who participated indicated that the procedures outline for ISS was beneficial to the student (ALWAYS).

Figure 6. Are procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the student?
Making meaning of the data revealed that the personal perception by faculty and staff is that the procedures outlined for ISS may not be of benefit to the student. The question allowed for interpretation as to what “benefit” refers to, as to some it may mean correction of inappropriate behavior, to others it may mean experiencing a smooth transition back into the classroom setting, and to others it may refer to the amount of work completed and returned to the teacher post ISS consequence. Nonetheless, the overall assumption of “benefit of the student,” which is supposed to be the charge and goal of every educational initiative and reform does not appear to have met that standard with this particular practice of the ISS process.

Teacher survey question number seven asked, “Are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial for the teacher?” Eighteen (58.06%) of those who participated felt that (SOMETIMES) the procedures outlined for ISS was beneficial to the teacher. Seven (22.58%) of those who participated felt that (MOST TIMES) the procedures outlined for ISS was beneficial to the teacher. Notably, three (9.68%) of those who participated felt that either (NEVER or ALWAYS) the procedures outlined for ISS was beneficial to the teacher. Here again, the perception among faculty and staff was that the procedures were not necessarily a benefit to the teacher. Yet again, the phrase “benefit to the teacher” allows for interpretation as to what is truly meant by “benefit,” but the consensus is that teachers did not feel the procedures benefitted them entirely. In the results from question 6, I made mention about the charge and goal of every educational initiative and reform being in the benefit of the student, yet in question 7, teachers still did not feel the procedures benefitted them either. This suggested that the procedures should be examined to determine whose interest is being served with these procedures and protocols.
In response to teacher survey question number eight asked, “Do your students who have been assigned ISS in the past typically get re-assigned to ISS within 30 days of being dismissed?” Only 30 of the 31 participants answered this question. Twenty-two (73.33%) of those who participated indicated that students assigned to ISS typically were re-assigned to ISS (SOMETIMES) within 30 days of being dismissed. Six (20%) of those who participated indicated that students assigned to ISS typically are re-assigned to ISS (MOST TIMES) within 30 days of being dismissed. Only two (6.67%) indicated that students assigned to ISS typically are re-assigned to ISS (ALWAYS) within 30 days of being dismissed. The data suggested that the goal and intention of ISS being a deterrent for inappropriate behaviors may be working. The majority of the teachers indicated that recidivism is occurring sometimes, which is better than most times and always. This provided hope that the procedures outlined in ISS are such that students do not want to return.
Teacher survey question number nine asked, “Do students who return from ISS typically have all of the missing work completed?” Nineteen participants (63.33%) stated that students who returned to class (SOMETIMES) had their missing work completed. Six participants (20%) indicated that students who returned to class (NEVER) had their missing work completed. Five participants (16.67%) indicated that students who returned to class (MOST TIMES) had their missing work completed. These data reveal that most of the instances where students are assigned to ISS, there is a higher probability that the student may not complete the missing work assigned by the time he or she returns to the classroom. These data suggest the need for further investigation into why students are able to sit in ISS and not complete work. It also opens questions about why the student did not complete the work. Additional questions that arise from the results from question 9 include was instruction given for the missing assignment? Can the work be completed independently? Was the
facilitator aware the student did not complete the assignment? All responses would allow more clarity regarding the results from question 9.

*Figure 9.* Do students who return from ISS have all missing work completed?

| Q9 Do students who return from ISS typically have all of the missing work completed? |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| NEVER                           | 0%                            |
| SOMETIMES                       | 60%                           |
| MOST TIMES                      | 10%                           |
| ALWAYS                          | 5%                            |

Teacher survey question number ten asked, “The use of ISS for student discipline consequences allows students to remain connected to the content material learned in the classroom.” All thirty-one participants answered this question, with fourteen (45.16%) answering in the affirmative. Twelve participants (38.71%) answered in the negative; disagreeing that the use of ISS for discipline allows students to remain connected to the classroom materials. Four participants (12.90%) agreed that the use of discipline does not allow the student to remain connected to the classroom materials. These data reveal that the majority of the participants felt that the use of ISS does not allow the student to remain connected to the instruction received in the classroom. These data suggest the need to investigate further into the way students in ISS receive instruction on the coursework they receive while in ISS. Suggestions to combat this issue surround having students participate in class virtually, while in ISS, or having content area teachers on a
rotation visit the ISS classroom and provide instruction and academic reinforcement while students serve out their consequence.

*Figure 10.* The use of ISS for student discipline allows students to remain connected to the content material learned in the classroom.

In response to teacher survey question number 11, asked, “Although student behavior violations are assigned ISS as a consequence, inappropriate student behavior has not decreased”. Thirty of the thirty-one participants responded to this question. Of the thirty participants, twenty participants (66.67%) agreed that inappropriate student behavior has not decreased with the use of ISS as a consequence. Only eight participants (26.67%) disagreed and felt that the behaviors decreased. Two participants (6.67%) agreed with the majority, that the discipline has not changed. These data reveal that there is still the perception or belief that although ISS is utilized in the school as a consequence, the majority of the faculty feel that the behaviors in the school have not been diminished. These data warrant the need for administration to revise and re-structure what occurs in ISS when a student is assigned. It also suggests the need to evaluate the
facilitator and his/her ability to maintain order and correct behavior with those students assigned.

*Figure 11.* Although student behavior violations are assigned ISS, inappropriate student behavior has not decreased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Although student behavior violations are assigned ISS as a consequence, inappropriate student behavior has not decreased.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to teacher survey question number 12 asked “Teachers within my school perceive ISS as an effective behavioral intervention.” Only twenty-nine participants answered this question. Fifteen participants (51.73%) disagreed that ISS is an effective behavioral intervention. On the contrary, fourteen participants (48.28%) agreed that our school’s use of ISS is an effective behavioral intervention. These data have a very small marginal difference between agreement and disagreement about the effectiveness of ISS. It appears that the majority of the faculty felt that this was not an effective tool for our students; however, just 3% fewer felt the use of ISS was an effective tool. These data represent the clear divide among teachers about whether or not the program is effective and therefore highlight the division and value some may place on the program. In addition, the meaning of the word effective could also be interpreted differently by different individuals.
Survey question number 13 asked, “I feel students who misbehave should serve out of school suspension (OSS) rather than in school suspension (ISS).” No one skipped this question. Twenty-one participants (67.74%) disagreed with this question. Ten participants (32.26%) agreed with the survey question. These data are significant in that the large majority of faculty agreed that students do not need to be suspended out of school, yet based on the previous survey, the majority also felt that ISS is not an effective behavior intervention. It is apparent that educators wanted students in school. The data support the need for an enhancement or alternative for ISS that would allow students to remain in school continuing to learn.
Figure 13. Students should serve out of school suspension rather than in school suspension.

Survey question number 14 asked, “I feel repeat offenders/participants of ISS program is the greatest challenge of this program.” The majority of the participants, (83.87%), agreed with survey question number 14, with five participants (16.13%) disagreeing with the question. These data reveal that the majority of faculty agreed that repeat offenders were a great challenge for the ISS program. These data support survey question number twelve and backs the idea that the program was an ineffective behavioral intervention tool. When the majority of the participants acknowledged that the greatest challenge of the program is the repeat offenders, it amplified the notion that students do not mind participating in ISS. Therefore, its deterrent status and discipline consequence loses its merit and weight. Students continuously participating also indicates that the behavior modification that should occur during this time is either not occurring or is ineffective.
Figure 14. Repeat offenders/participants of the ISS program are the greatest challenge of the program.

Survey question number 15, asked, “Classroom teachers and the ISS facilitation teacher collaborate in an effort to benefit the students in the ISS program?” Nineteen participants (61.29%) answered in disagreement with survey question number 15. Twelve participants (38.71%) agreed with the survey question.

Figure 15. Classroom teachers and the ISS facilitation teacher collaborate in an effort to benefit the students in the ISS program.
The data disclosed another weakness in the ISS program. The majority of faculty report that the ISS facilitator did not collaborate with the classroom teacher to assist the students in the ISS classroom. Here again is another example that supports the notion that the program may be in fact ineffective. The classroom teacher and ISS facilitator collaboration is vital to the success of the student while in ISS and when he or she returns to class. Teacher-facilitator collaboration could occur electronically, in which the two teachers communicate about the work the student has to complete. This informs the facilitator about what the student should be doing and lets the classroom teacher know that the facilitator is aware work should be completed and returned.

Survey question number 16 asked, “In your opinion, the use of the ISS program has improved school behavior school wide?” Fifteen participants (53.57%) agreed that the ISS program has improved school wide behavior. Conversely, thirteen participants (46.43%) disagreed with this survey question.

Figure 16. The use of the ISS program has improved school behavior school wide.

These data conflict with the previous data from interview question number 11, in which participant responses revealed that the participants’ perception was that
inappropriate behavior had not decreased with the use of ISS. In question number sixteen, the same participants are acknowledging that ISS has improved school wide behavior on campus. This conflict may reveal that participants may not share the same interpretational meaning for improved school wide behavior and effective intervention tool. It is possible that in question 11 the respondents were only thinking in regards to those students who have been to ISS, whereas here in question 16 the focus is on students who have not been to ISS.

Survey question number 17 asked, “I feel that the current ISS program at my school should be discontinued.” Please note that two participants did not answer this question. Only twenty-nine participants answered the question and of those that did, twenty-six (89.65%) disagreed with the notion of discontinuing the ISS program at our school. Three participants (10.35%) agreed that the program should be discontinued. Again, shocking results from participants who deemed the program ineffective and having little impact on inappropriate behavior in school. However, the need and the want of the program is still great.

*Figure 17. The current ISS program at my school should be discontinued.*
Survey question number 18 asked, “I am able to notice an immediate positive behavior change from students who return to my class from ISS. Please note that five participants did not answer this question.” Of those that did answer the question, sixteen (61.45%) disagreed that an immediate positive behavior change was noticeable upon return from ISS. Ten participants (38.47%) agreed that they were able to notice a difference in the student’s behavior upon return from ISS. These data reveal that some pockets of effectiveness exist in the program with approximately 40% of teachers noticing a positive difference in the students when they return.

*Figure 18.* I notice an immediate positive behavior change from students who return to class from ISS.

These data also align with both arguments of whether or not the program is effective. Whenever asked about the effectiveness of our ISS program, the answer always seemed uncertain and dependent upon the level of experience of the stakeholder. According to the data collected, a majority disagreed on the positive impact, whereas the minority agreed to the positive impact. However, the number of participants who did not answer this question was about 16%, which is a significant number of participants who
were either undecided or reluctant to make a decision about their perceptions. I feel as though a program that has been in place at Eminence High for such a lengthy time should by now have a clear and definitive impact or effect that is known by all.

Survey question number 19 asked, ‘What is working well with the ISS program in your school?’ Twenty-nine participants answered this open-ended question. The top three responses to this question were consequence, deterrent, and staying in school. The largest responses referenced ISS as a consequence with nine participants (31.03%) acknowledging that consequence was working well. Eight participants (27.59%) felt that ISS used as a deterrent was also working well. Lastly, six participants (20.69%) felt that the ability for the student to remain in school was the third most important thing that was working well with the current ISS program. Also important to note, four participants (13.79%) reported that nothing was working well.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>9 of 29</td>
<td>31.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrent</td>
<td>8 of 29</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay in school</td>
<td>6 of 29</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>4 of 29</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 29 participants answered this question. Two participants skipped this question.

This all indicates that, among the faculty at Eminence High, having a consequence and providing a deterrent is an area where the ISS program was flourishing. The information garnered from this question explained that the survey participants from Eminence High felt that students being able to stay in school and serve a consequence for their inappropriate infraction are components that the current programing are getting right. The responses from this question also suggested that the current reputation and expectation of the program provided a deterrent among the student body.
Teacher survey question number 20 asked, “What is NOT working well with the ISS program in your school?” This survey question was an open-ended question. Nine (31%) of the respondents felt that assignment completion while in ISS was the biggest issue not working well with the current program. Eight (28%) of the respondents stated that the structure of the ISS program did not appear to be working well either. Six (21%) of the participants responded that ISS as a deterrent does not appear to be working well. This is contrary to the responses received from question nineteen where respondents felt that the use of ISS as a deterrent was working well. Five respondents felt that the loss of instructional time for participants in ISS was not working well with the current program. Lastly, four respondents highlighted that communication, along with continued student behavior issues, as items not working well with the current ISS program. These six separate issues were valid and outnumbered the three issue items that were reported as working well. It is evident that work completion and the structure of how ISS operates daily are areas that need special attention from school administration immediately.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment completion</td>
<td>9 of 28</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>9 of 28</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of ISS</td>
<td>8 or 28</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrent</td>
<td>6 or 28</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional time</td>
<td>5 or 28</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4 or 28</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behavior</td>
<td>4 or 28</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 28 participants answered this question and three skipped this question.

Teacher survey question number 21 asked, “What are the challenges with the current ISS program in your school?” This was an open-ended survey question. It is important to note that five participants (19.23%) skipped this question and did not
provide a response. Of the twenty-six respondents who did answer, five (19.23%) participants rated work completion was the number one challenge with the current ISS program. Four respondents (15.38%) indicated that student’s perception and fear of ISS was a challenge with the current program. Three respondents (11.54%) indicated that repeat offenders and that the current program was not a deterrent, were challenges with the current ISS program. Two respondents (7.69%) highlighted the loss of instructional time when students were in ISS as a challenge. Lastly, one (3.85%) respondent stated that a challenge with the current program was that it became a holding tank for ESE students who consistently repeat the same behaviors. Although only one respondent provided this response, I think it was an important one. It was interesting to see that the majority of the challenges the participants reported focused on the students and their perceived perceptions about the program in general.

Table 3

Q21: What are the challenges with the current ISS program in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Completion</td>
<td>5 of 26</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student perception</td>
<td>4 of 26</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Offenders</td>
<td>3 of 26</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a deterrent</td>
<td>3 of 26</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional time lost</td>
<td>2 of 26</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Tank for ESE</td>
<td>1 of 26</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 26 participants answered this question and five participants skipped this question.

Teacher survey question number 22 asked, “How can we address these challenges? Please be specific.” This was an open-ended survey question. It is important to note that six participants (24%) did not answer this question. Six participants (24%) stated that the challenges could be addressed by re-structuring the current ISS program. Five respondents (20%) stated that finding an alternative to ISS could assist with the challenges. Four respondents (16%) stated that students should obtain their missing work
afterschool and address behavior modification during ISS to influence the challenges.

Lastly, three participants (12%) stated that to address the challenges, the principal has to make ISS a priority and there needs to be more communication between the ISS facilitator and the classroom teacher. These findings all surround the school personnel working together to alleviate the challenges that surround student perception and practice with regards to in school suspension.

Table 4

**Q22: How can we address these challenges?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-structure of ISS</td>
<td>6 of 25</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to ISS</td>
<td>5 of 25</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student get work afterschool</td>
<td>4 of 25</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Facilitator Communication</td>
<td>4 of 25</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority of Principal</td>
<td>3 of 25</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 25 participants answered this question and six participants skipped this question.

Teacher survey question number 23 asked, “Please provide three things that you would like to see change about the current ISS program.” This was an open-ended survey question. Eight respondents (27.59%) stated that the way assignments were being completed and returned to the classroom teacher was the first and foremost issue that they would like to see change. Six respondents (20.69%) reported that the current level of communication between the ISS facilitator and the student’s classroom teacher needs to increase. Additionally, five respondents (17.24%) highlighted facilitator accountability for the students and the work completed while in ISS, and along with behavior modification, restorative justice or rehabilitation would be things they would like to see change with the current ISS program. Lastly, four respondents (13.79%) highlighted student accountability as something that they would like to see change in the future. This
information is essential to me as I seek to streamline and implement procedural safeguards for the in school suspension program at Eminence High.

Table 5

Q23: Please provide three things that you would like to see change about the current ISS program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment completion</td>
<td>8 of 29</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6 of 29</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Accountability</td>
<td>5 of 29</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Accountability</td>
<td>4 of 29</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 29 participants answered this question and two participants skipped this question.

Teacher survey question number 24 asked, “What are your views regarding students being able to complete their missing work while in ISS?” This was an open-ended survey question. It should be noted that five participants (19.23%) skipped this question and did not provide a response. Of those who did participate, nine (34.62%) respondents were in agreement with students being able to complete their missing work while in ISS and felt it was in the best interest of the students to do it this way. Six respondents (23.08%) felt that it should be a requirement that the students in ISS complete their missing work. Six respondents (23.08%) stated that this does not happen currently. Three respondents (11.54%) felt missing classwork should be done outside of ISS and should come second to behavior modification lessons. Lastly, two respondents (7.69%) felt that students were missing instruction needed to complete the work and, therefore, should not complete work during ISS time. These data suggest that the majority of teachers want students to complete the work they may miss during ISS. The data did not address the concern that the student was missing direct instruction and may not have had the ability to complete the work provided by the classroom teacher. The majority of the teachers who participated in the survey were more concerned with what
behavior modification lessons were being provided to students while in ISS. Most of the teachers felt the missing classwork could be addressed in class when students returned. The teachers felt that the time away in an alternative setting is best used working on behavior correction techniques. Administration could use the data to develop character development lessons for ISS facilitators to use, while encouraging classroom teachers to collaborate and plan with ISS teacher to be able to provide instruction.

Table 6

Q24: What are your views regarding students being able to complete their missing work while in ISS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Student</td>
<td>9 of 26</td>
<td>34.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not happen</td>
<td>6 of 26</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>6 of 26</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete outside of ISS</td>
<td>3 of 26</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing instruction time</td>
<td>2 of 26</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Instruction to complete work</td>
<td>2 of 26</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 26 participants answered this question and five participants skipped this question.

Administrator Surveys

I asked all five of the Eminence High school administrators to complete a survey and received five responses, which was a 100% response rate. The administrators’ questions focused on the effectiveness of the in school suspension program from the perspective of the administration. Two of the administrators were brand new to the school with less than six months experience with the current in school suspension program. Another administrator was at Eminence for two years, and the last two administrators were a part of the Eminence staff over four years and had multiple years of experience with the in school suspension program at Eminence. I thought the difference in years of experience at Eminence High from each school based administrator would add value to my study.
Administrator survey question number one asked, “Would you say that communication to notify teachers of when their students are assigned to ISS as a consequence is consistent?” All of the participants answered this question. Four (57.14%) of those who participated indicated that when students were assigned ISS, notification to teachers occurred and was consistent (ALWAYS). Two (28.57%) of those who participated indicated that notification occurred (MOST TIMES). One (14.29%) participant indicated that the communication notification occurred (SOMETIMES). These data support the stance that when students receive ISS, communication notification of some kind was being provided to the classroom teacher. The fact that all participants were not in agreement could suggest that this area should be evaluated to create a regular and reliable protocol that guarantees notification is provided to the classroom teacher.

Figure 19. Is communication to notify teachers of when students are assigned to ISS is consistent?

Administrator survey question number two asked, “Do you as the administrator on campus visit the ISS room to see the students assigned?” All of the participants answered this question. Four (57.14%) of those who participated indicated that they
(SOMETIMES) visited the ISS classroom. Two (28.57%) of those who participated indicated that they visited the ISS classroom (MOST TIMES). Leaving 1 (14.29%) participant who indicated that they (ALWAYS) visited the ISS classroom.

*Figure 20. Do you as the administrator visit the ISS room to see the students?*

These data suggest that consistent administrative presence was not felt in the one place where it was needed most. Of the administrative team, which for this study included the discipline dean and the campus monitor, only one person visited the ISS room frequently. The data supported the need for administration to possibly create a schedule and routine of visiting the ISS room to encourage and motivate the behavior modification that should be occurring within this classroom.

Administrator survey question number three asked, “Have students who have been assigned ISS in the past typically get re-assigned to ISS within 30 days of being dismissed?” One hundred percent of participants answered this question. Six (85.71%) of those who participated indicated that students who have been assigned ISS (SOMETIMES) get re-assigned to ISS within 30 days. One (14.29%) participant indicated that the re-assignment happens (MOST TIMES). These data suggest that the
consequence of ISS was not serving as a deterrent. Recidivism was evident, and administration needed to explore additional interventions and or procedures once students were re-assigned ISS.

Figure 21. Do students who are assigned ISS in the past get re-assigned to ISS within 30 days of being dismissed?

Administrator survey question number four asked, “I am able to notice an immediate positive behavior change from students who return to class from ISS. All seven participants answered this question.” Four (57.14%) of the participants indicated that they were able to notice an immediate positive behavior change from students who returned from ISS (SOMETIMES). Three (42.86%) of the participants indicated that they were able to notice an immediate positive behavior change from students (MOST TIMES). These data support the data from administrator survey question three and teacher survey question eleven. All three questions asked about the behaviors of ISS participants, and in all three questions, the respondents indicated that behaviors were not improving after ISS had been assigned. These data reveal the need for clarity of the program goals and evaluation of whether the current practices are meeting the goals.
Administrator survey question number five asked, “Students who return from ISS typically have all of the missing work completed.” All of the participants responded to this question. Five (71.43%) participants indicated that students who returned from ISS (SOMETIMES) had all of the missing work completed. One (14.29%) participant stated that (MOST TIMES) students had all of the missing work completed. Lastly, one (14.29%) participant stated that students (NEVER) had all of the missing work completed. These data are alarming and supports administration survey question four and the need for evaluation of what actually occurs in ISS if students are able to remain in there for days and not complete the work. These data also support the notion that it is plausible that most students do not complete the work because they have not received direct instruction and struggle with the content and cannot teach themselves.
Administrator survey question number six asked, “The use of ISS for student discipline consequences allows students to remain connected to the material learned in the classroom.” All of the participants answered this question. Five (71.43%) participants (AGREED) that the use of ISS allowed students to remain connected to the material learned in the classroom. Two (28.57%) participants (DISAGREED) that the use of ISS allowed students to remain connected to the material learned in the classroom.

Figure 24. The use of ISS for student discipline allows student to remain connected to the material learned in the classroom.
I believe these data suggest a disconnect between what administration thinks was occurring and what actually was occurring. The data previously revealed that the students in ISS did not have the work completed once they left the ISS classroom. Thus, they were not remaining connected to the material learned in the classroom.

Administrator survey question number seven asked, “Although student behavior violations are assigned ISS as a consequence, inappropriate student behavior has not decreased.” All survey participants answered this question. Four (57.14%) participants (AGREE) that inappropriate student behavior had not decreased. Three (42.38%) participants (DISAGREE) that inappropriate student behavior had not decreased. These data highlight a clear divide among the administrative team, with the majority acknowledging that they did not feel the behaviors that warrant ISS as a consequence were declining. This suggests and compels administration to review goals, purpose and strategies occurring in ISS to change behavior.

*Figure 25. Although student behavior violations are assigned ISS, inappropriate student behavior has not decreased.*
In response to administrator survey question number eight, which stated, “Teachers within my school perceive ISS as an effective behavioral intervention. All survey participants answered this question.” Six (85.71%) participants (AGREE) that the teachers perceived ISS as an effective behavioral intervention. One (14.29%) participant (DISAGREE) that the teachers at Eminence High perceived ISS as an effective behavioral intervention. These data are in direct conflict with the responses from the teachers. On the teacher survey, (51.73%) indicated that ISS was not an effective behavioral intervention. These data further reveal a disconnect between what teachers and administration were thinking.

*Figure 26. Teachers perceive ISS as an effective behavioral intervention.*

Administrator survey question number nine asked, “I feel students who misbehave should serve out of school suspension (OSS) rather than in school suspension (ISS).” All of the survey participants answered this question. Six (85.71%) participants (DISAGREE) that students who misbehaved should serve out of school suspension (OSS) rather than in school suspension (ISS). One (14.29%) participant acknowledged (STRONGLY DISAGREE) to students serving OSS instead of ISS. These data
acknowledge the need for students to remain in school, even after they commit code of conduct violations. These data reveal that the administrative team acknowledged the need and shared the sentiment that students should be in school as much as possible.

*Figure 27.* Students who misbehave should serve out of school suspension rather than in school suspension.
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Administrator survey question number ten asked, “I feel repeat offenders/participants of ISS program is the greatest challenge of this program.” All of the survey participants answered this question. Four (57.14%) participants (AGREE) that repeat offenders were the greatest challenge of the program. Two (28.57%) participants (STRONGLY AGREE) that repeat offenders were the greatest challenge of the program. One (14.29%) participant (DISAGREE) that repeat offenders were the greatest challenge of the program. These data highlight that the perception among administration is that students, or the offenders, were the biggest challenge that the program faced. These data conflict with what the teachers felt was the biggest challenge. Those challenges outlined by the teachers were student work completion, changing student behavior, and communication between classroom teacher and ISS facilitator. These data again further
reveal a disconnect between the two most influential forces in the school who should be working together to teach the student.

Figure 28. Repeat offenders/participants of ISS program are the greatest challenge of this program.

Administrator survey question number 11 asked, “Classroom teachers and the ISS facilitation teacher collaborate, in an effort to benefit the students in the ISS program.” All of the participants in this survey answered this question. Five (71.43%) participants (DISAGREE) that classroom teachers and the ISS facilitator collaborated. Two (28.57%) participants (AGREE) those classroom teachers and the ISS facilitators collaborated. These data support why so many students did not have work completed when they exited ISS. The data here can be used by administration to substantiate the need for collaboration, PLC, and common planning to include the ISS facilitator.
Administrator survey question number 12 asked, “Have you ever assigned a student to ISS at your current school?” All survey participants answered this question. All seven (100%) of the participants acknowledged (STRONGLY AGREE) to assigning a student to ISS at Eminence. These data highlight the need that everyone has to pitch in and help process the discipline of students at Eminence. This responsibility does not exclusively belong to the dean over discipline.

Figure 30. Have you ever assigned a student to ISS at your current school?
Administrator survey question number 13 asked, “Is there an expectation that the missing assignments and materials will be provided to the student while they are in ISS?” All participants answered this question. Four (57.14%) participants (AGREE) that there was an expectation that missing work and materials would be provided to the student while in ISS. Two (28.57%) participants (STRONGLY AGREE) that among faculty there was an expectation that missing work and materials would be provided to students while in ISS. One (14.29%) participant (DISAGREE) that there was an expectation that missing assignments and materials would be provided to students while they were in ISS. These data imply that the teachers and students were aware that work should be sent to the ISS room once notification was received that a student was assigned. However, the data from teacher surveys lists work completion as the biggest issue. Thus, administration expected the work to be delivered, yet teachers knew that they would not obtain the work back once sent.

*Figure 31.* Is there an expectation that missing assignments and materials will be provided to the student while in ISS?
Administrator survey question number 14 asked, “Would you say that the teachers of the students assigned to ISS understand the procedure for make-up and missing assignments from the students assigned to ISS?” All of the survey participants answered this question. Six (85.71%) participants (AGREE) that the teachers of the students assigned to ISS understood the procedure for make-up and missing assignments from the students assigned to ISS. One (14.29%) participant (DISAGREE) that the teachers of the students assigned to ISS understood the procedure for make-up and missing assignments from the students assigned to ISS. Making meaning of these data reveal that administration was confident in the classroom teachers understanding the need and obligation to ensure any student assigned from his/her class has classwork/assignments to work on while in ISS. Conversely, there did not seem to be an expectation that the teachers visit the ISS classroom or collaborate/plan with the ISS facilitator to provide instruction on the work sent.

Figure 32. Would you say that the teachers of the students assigned to ISS understand the procedure for make-up and missing assignments from students in ISS?
Administrator survey question number 15 asked, “Are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the student?” All of the survey participants answered this question. Five (71.43%) participants (AGREE) that the procedures outlined for ISS were beneficial to the student. Two (28.57%) participants (STRONGLY AGREE) that the procedures outlined for ISS were beneficial to the student. Making meaning of the data, it was evident that administration felt that the procedures as they are benefitted the students.

This same question was posed to teachers, and the majority of the teachers at Eminence high felt that (SOMETIMES) the procedures for ISS benefitted the student. Here is another category where teachers and leadership team have completely different answers for the same group of students. It is evident that the two groups need to meet and have candid conversations about the procedures outlined for the ISS program.

*Figure 33. Are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the student?*
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Administrator survey question number 16 asked, “Which stated, are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the teacher?” All of the survey participants answered this question. Six (85.71%) of those who participated in this survey acknowledged they (AGREE) that the procedures outlined for ISS were beneficial to the
teacher. One (14.29%) participant (DISAGREE) that the procedures outlined for ISS were beneficial to the teacher. These data depict the perception that the procedures of ISS was beneficial not only to the student but also to the teachers. In the teacher survey, the majority of teachers felt the procedures of ISS was (SOMETIMES) beneficial to them. These data encourage the need for dialogue to occur between administration and faculty to determine what the procedures of ISS should be to ensure benefit for all parties involved.

*Figure 34. Are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the teacher?*

Administrator survey question number 17 asked, “In your opinion, the use of the ISS program has improved school behavior school wide.” All of the survey participants answered this question. Five (71.43%) of those who participated in the survey (AGREE) that the use of the ISS program improved school behavior school wide. Two (28.57%) of those that participated in the survey (DISAGREE) that the use of the ISS program improved school behavior school wide. Administration seemed to be in consensus that ISS improved school behavior school wide. The teacher responses to this survey question were divided, with a small marginal difference. I think the data contribute to the belief
that teacher and administration believe ISS has improved school wide behavior. However, those who disagree may not share the same interpretational meaning about improved school wide behavior. Additionally, with the rise of repeat offenders being sent to ISS it also, brings into question the validity of this perception.

*Figure 35. The use of the ISS program has improved school behavior school wide.*

Q17 In your opinion the use of the ISS program has improved school behavior school wide.

Administrator survey question number 18 asked, “I feel that the current ISS program at my school should be discontinued.” All survey participants answered this question. Five (71.43%) of those who participated in this survey (STRONGLY DISAGREE) that the current ISS program should be discontinued. One (14.29%) participant (DISAGREE) that the current ISS program should be discontinued. One (14.29%) participant (AGREE) that the current ISS program should be discontinued. These data are similar to that from the teacher survey responses. According to the data, administration was in favor and appreciated the need for an ISS program at Eminence High. They understood that the school could not function in the benefit of the students without it.
Figure 36. The current ISS program should be discontinued.

Administrator survey question number 19 asked, “What is working well with the ISS program in your school?” This was an open-ended survey question. It should be noted that only six participants answered this question and one skipped it. Each respondent offered various lists of things that were working well with the current ISS program. I separated the list into themes with the following emerging. Four respondents (66.67%) acknowledged that ISS was an alternative to OSS. Two respondents (33.33%) stated that ISS as a behavior modification tool was working well. Lastly, one respondent (16.67%) reported that ISS worked well at providing a consistent routine for its participants.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19: What is working well with the ISS program in your school?</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative to OSS</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Modification</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Routine</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Six participants answered this question and one participant skipped this question.

These data compared to the data from the teacher responses to the same question is very interesting. Although administration named several categories, all the major
categories acknowledged by the teachers were also noted by administration in their survey responses. These data suggest that the two groups are in alignment about things working well with the current program. This foundational common ground can be groundwork for further alignment and revitalization of the ISS program.

Administrator survey question number 20 asked, “What is not working well with the ISS program in your school?” This was an open-ended survey question. Only six of those who participated in this survey answered this question. Four (66.67%) of those who answered this question recorded teachers providing the work as the top item not working well with the ISS program. One (16.67%) respondent stated behavior modification curriculum was not working well. One (16.67%) respondent stated the discipline matrix was not working well. Lastly, one (16.67%) respondent stated location of the classroom was not working well.

Table 8

Q20: What is not working well with the ISS program in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers providing work</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Modification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline matrix prohibition</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of classroom</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Six participants answered this question and one participant skipped this question.

These data differ slightly from the teacher response data. The teachers felt that work completion was the issue, not working well. These data suggest that administration was faulting teachers for not sending work to their students and teachers were faulting students for not completing the work provided during ISS. The data encourage a hard look at the ISS facilitator to determine procedures that are succinct and allow little room for error regarding the student work completed in the ISS classroom and returned to the teacher.
Administrator survey question number 21 asked, “What are the challenges with the current ISS program in your school?” This was an open-ended survey question. Only six of those who participated in this survey answered this question. Four (66.67%) of those who answered this question indicated teachers providing the work was the major challenge with the current ISS program. One respondent (16.67%) reported ISS being open during faculty shortages was a challenge. In addition, one respondent (16.67%) reported ISS facilitator efficacy was another challenge with the current in school suspension system.

Here again, the data reveal a discrepancy between administration and teachers specifically related to what the challenges of the program appeared to be. Administration will need an in depth discussion with faculty to come to a consensus of what challenges the program actually faces, which will hopefully lead to a re-evaluation of the program.

Table 9

| Q21: What are the challenges with the current ISS program in your school? |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Response Category | Number of Respondents | % of participants |
| Teacher providing work | 4 of 6 | 66.67% |
| ISS open during shortages | 1 of 6 | 16.67% |
| ISS Teacher efficacy | 1 of 6 | 16.67% |

Note: Six participants answered this question and one participant skipped this question

Administrator survey question number 22 asked, “How can we address these challenges?” This was an open-ended survey question. It should be noted that only six participants answered this question and one participant skipped it. Three (50%) respondents felt student accountability was needed to combat the challenges. Two respondents (33.34%) reported ISS facilitator accountability was needed to address the challenges that existed in the ISS program. One respondent (16.67%) stated that we could address the challenges by teaching behavior modification in ISS.
Table 10

Q22: How can we address these challenges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Accountability</td>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Accountability</td>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>33.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Modification Taught</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Six participants answered this question and one participant skipped this question.

Behavior modification and communication were items shared between both administrators and teachers. It is my assumption from the data that both sides had valid feelings and positions about how to combat the current challenges. Administration has to be open enough to listen to the feedback and data from teachers.

Administrator survey question number 23 asked, “Please provide three things that you would like to see change about the current ISS program.” This was an open-ended survey question. Four of the seven survey participants answered this question. The top two suggestions to change the ISS program were teachers providing work consistently and using Leaps program consistently as a behavior modification curriculum. A change of the location of ISS was also proposed as a suggestion. The suggestions made by these four survey participants aligned with what teachers had proposed and suggests that the two groups of participants (administration and teachers) may be on the same page as it relates to improving the overall ISS program.

Table 11

Q23: Please provide three things that you would like to see change about the current ISS program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers provide work consistently</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Leaps program consist</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Location</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Four participants answered this question and three participant skipped this question.
Administrator survey question number 24 asked, “What are your views regarding students being able to complete their missing work while in ISS?” This was an open-ended survey question. Six of the survey participants answered this question. Five of the six participants agreed that students being able to complete their missing work while in ISS allowed students to maintain their academic pace. These data conflict with data received from teacher surveys, which highlighted that students are not completing the course work while in ISS, thus falling further behind in their academic pacing. The data reveal the need for conversations about why the students do not complete the work while in ISS. One participant acknowledged that students not being allowed to complete their work while in ISS was like double jeopardy for the same offence. Explaining that not being allowed to complete the work is another consequence and is unfair.

Table 12

Q24: What are your views regarding students being able to complete their missing work while in ISS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students maintain academic pace</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Jeopardy for offense</td>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Six participants answered this question and one participant skipped this question

Face to Face Interviews

Out of the total 38 survey participants surveyed, eight participants agreed to proceed with a face-to-face interview. I personally contacted each voluntary participant to schedule a date and time conduct the interview. Scheduled interviews did not interfere with participant’s job responsibilities. All of the questions asked were open-ended questions. The range in length of minutes for the interviews ranged from 10 minutes to 25 minutes. The average length of minutes of the interviews was 15 minutes.
Interview question number one asked, “What is your job role at this school?” All of the face-to-face interview participants answered this question. All eight (100%) of the participants answered as faculty. The interview participants varied in ages from 25 to 60 and in the level of teaching experience at Eminence High school. The data are consistent with the survey data, as more faculty members completed the voluntary survey.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: What is your job role at this school: Faculty, Staff, or Administrator?</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview question number two asked, “What do you perceive as working well with the current in school suspension program at your high school?” All face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Four participants (50%) indicated that ISS as an alternative setting was working well. Three participants (37.5%) indicated that the processing of the discipline referrals received was also working well. Two participants each (25%) indicated that the use of ISS as a makeup work area or as an option to minimize classroom disruptions was working well. Only one person (12.5%) felt that ISS as a deterrent was working well.

These data somewhat correlate with question 19 from the teacher surveys. In question 19, the top items cited as working well surrounded having ISS as a consequence and students being able to remain in school. Similar in the face-to-face interview response, having an alternative setting was set as the top item working well. Contrary to question 19, ISS as a deterrent ranked high on the list of items working well. Here in the face-to-face interview, ISS as a deterrent fared poorly. I previously noted this discrepancy in various other questions as well. As stated before, the opinions regarding the program
here at Eminence waived immensely. Therefore making it difficult to pinpoint all the things that are working well with the ISS program.

Table 14

Q2: What do you perceive as working well with the current in school suspension program at your high school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative setting</td>
<td>4 of 8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing discipline referrals</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make up work area</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option to minimize disruptions</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrent</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview question number three asked, “What do you perceive as not working well with the current in school suspension program at your high school?” All face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Three participants (37.5%) indicated that both lack of discipline in ISS and ISS not being enough of a deterrent are items that were not working well with the current ISS program. Two (25%) participants revealed that a lack of communication between the ISS facilitator and the student’s classroom teacher was the third highest item not working well. Lastly, the time between the offence and the consequence, along with the lack of work being completed while in ISS, were both items that one (12.50%) participant provided respectively, as the fourth and fifth items of what was not working well.

These data are in direct alignment with the teacher survey responses from question number 20. In question 20, I asked survey participants a similar question, and the responses were lack of assignment completion, consequences time lag, lack of deterrent, and the structure of ISS. Similarly, the face-to-face interview responses mirrored those same responses. This would suggest that the teachers seem to be on the same page regarding what was not working well and have a solid argument as to why
these specific items need revision. This response data outlines a starting point for school administration and even district supporting personnel can work with Eminence to revamp the program.

Table 15

Q3: What do you perceive as not working well with the current in school suspension program at your high school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of discipline</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough of a deterrent</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time between offense and consequence</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Completion</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview question number four asked, “What do you perceive as the biggest challenge with the current in school suspension program at your high school?” All face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Three items emerged as the top three biggest challenges: changing behavior of students assigned to ISS, communication between ISS classroom teacher and students’ assigned classroom teacher, and work completion while in ISS. Each of these received responses from two participants (25%). The remaining items were one respondent (12.5%) answers, which included extended removal from classroom environment, wandering students, assignments given during ISS, and continuous administration changes.

The response data reveal the biggest challenge is at least three fold. This means that the challenge has layers. Changing behaviors requires adaptive changes made through teaching desirable behaviors and skills to faculty, staff, and students. Communication between classroom teacher and ISS facilitator will take an adaptive and technical change in that faculty members will have to change their perception about ISS and their feelings about what occurs in ISS. The technical change may need to be in a
formal communication document that must be produced to create an ongoing record and formality for the process. Lastly, work completion will require adaptive changes on the part of the student and ISS facilitator. The facilitator should ensure students continue to work and make progress on the work provided. Students have to know that the expectation is to complete the work provided prior to leaving ISS. The resolution will not be solely a technical challenge solution. The challenges outlined through the data have revealed the collaboration of both adaptive and technical challenge solutions. This means that the progress toward change will take some time and new learned behavior modification for students and teachers where all parties will be responsible for the outcome.

Table 16

Q4: What do you perceive as the biggest challenge with the current in school suspension program at your high school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing behavior</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between teachers</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work completion</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended removal from class</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandering students</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments given</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant administration changes</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview question number five asked, “What would you suggest a way to improve the in school suspension program currently at your high school?” All face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Two (25%) participants acknowledged the need for a specified behavior modification program within ISS in order to improve the current program. One participant (12.5%) provided the following suggestions: behavior modification class added to the students’ schedules, make ISS more of a
deterrent, a consistent ISS facilitator, empower the ISS facilitator, and stricter monitoring of student work completion while in ISS.

These data expound on those challenges expressed earlier. The respondents provided tangible improvements that they feel will advance the program. A behavior modification curriculum would be an example of a level two adaptive and technical solution, in which multiple parties are vested in the outcome and equally responsible for the outcome. Currently, Eminence relies on a behavior modification program that is popular in middle school and many of the students have already been through the lessons, further highlighting the need to change and utilize a different behavior modification program.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Behavior Mod Program in ISS</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Mod class on schedule</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make ISS more of a deterrent</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent ISS Facilitator</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empower the ISS Facilitator</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments given to facilitator to return</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stricter monitoring of student work completion</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview question number six asked, “Has in school suspension improved school wide behavior in your opinion?” All interview participants answered this question. Four participants (50%) answered in the negative, stating NO, ISS has not improved school wide behavior. Three participants (37.5%) answered in the affirmative, stating YES, ISS has improved student wide behavior. One participant (12.5%) indicated uncertainty by answering, “I don’t know.”
Had the one person who was uncertain agreed with those participants in the affirmative, then it would have been an even 50/50 split on whether or not the current ISS program at Eminence High has improved school wide behavior. These data are significant because for the five years I have been at Eminence, the in school suspension program has been in place. It was my understanding that the program was in existence at least two to three years prior to me coming to this school. This means that for the past seven years, this program has been in existence on campus and stakeholders still debate between whether or not the program positively affects school wide behavior. In my opinion, the fact that the debate exists warrants a program revision.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4 of 8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don’t Know</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview question number seven asked, “What procedures are in place to ensure students who receive ISS are given the missing work from your understanding?” All face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Eight participants (100%) revealed that email notification was provided to inform teachers that students assigned to ISS were in need of work. Six participants (75%) stated that the teachers were supposed to send the missing work to the ISS room, either in hard copy or electronically. Four participants (50%) indicated that the missing work was rarely returned to the classroom teacher. One participant (12.5%) felt that students assigned to ISS should not be allowed to make up missing work.

These data outlined a procedural task that, for the most part, appeared to serve as an effective communication tool. Maintaining or enhancing this task during the program
revision is essential. Although two of the response categories did not address the question, I felt the responses were valid and worthy of explanation as they paint the picture of the perception that the interviewees have about the students assigned to ISS. It is as if, because the student participated in a code of conduct violation, he or she should be punished, inconvenienced, neglected, and deprived of an education. In my opinion, these responses further explained the reason zero tolerance laws in schools are ineffective. Students are no longer afforded the privilege or opportunity to make mistakes and learn corrective behavior.

Table 19

Q7: What procedures are in place to ensure students who receive ISS are given the missing work from your understanding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email notification to teachers</td>
<td>8 of 8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing work sent to ISS</td>
<td>6 of 8</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing work is not sent back to teacher</td>
<td>4 of 8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students not allowed to makeup work</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview question number eight asked, “In your opinion what is the goal of ISS?” All face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Four participants (50%) stated that the goal of ISS was to change student behavior. Three participants (37.5%) responded that the goal of ISS was punitive and used as a teaching tool. Two participants (25%) responded that the goal of ISS was to deter students from misbehaving. One participant (12.5%) responded that the goal of ISS adds a layer of support and was an alternative to out of school suspension.

These data mean that Eminence High stakeholders felt that the number one goal of the current in school suspension program was to change or modify behavior. However, as reported in previous questions regarding the biggest challenge and needed improvements to the program, the number one item was behavior modification or
changing students’ behavior. The common undertone that was garnered from these data suggest that in order for the current ISS program to become truly effective, a behavior modification component has to be incorporated with fidelity.

Table 20

Q8: In your opinion what is the goal of ISS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Student Behavior</td>
<td>4 of 8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching tool</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter students from misbehaving</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added layer of support</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative to OSS</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview question number nine asked, “In your opinion, how does the use of ISS directly impact its participants?” All face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Three participants (37.5%) responded that the use of ISS did not directly impact the participants at this time. Two participants (25%) responded that the use of ISS had a positive impact on its participants. One participant (12.5%) provided the following responses: allowed students reflection time, made students angry, and took students out of the classroom environment.

Table 21

Q9: In your opinion, how does the use of ISS directly impact its participants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not impacted at this time</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows reflection time</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes them angry</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes students out of the class environment</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These responses acknowledge the need for an effective behavior modification program within ISS. The top response from this interview question dictates that the perception among stakeholders is that the student participants of ISS were not impacted
by the consequence of ISS. This response illuminates the necessity for a more effective behavior modification program that will make an impact on the student population.

Interview question number 10 asked, “In your opinion, how does ISS directly impact the student body as a whole?” All face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Four participants (50%) indicated that ISS served as a deterrent for the student body as a whole. Three participants (37.5%) indicated that ISS did not have an impact on the student body as a whole. One participant (12.5%) indicated the following two responses: ISS had a positive impact on the student body and ISS instilled fear among the student body.

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10: In your opinion, how does ISS directly impact the student body as a whole?</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deterrent</td>
<td>4 of 8</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an impact</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages fear</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data reveal that, from the perception of the stakeholders, ISS may or may not be a deterrent for the majority of the student body. The data also suggested that seven of the eight participants were divided on whether ISS was making an impact on the collective student body. Interesting enough, one stakeholder pointed out that the use of ISS fostered and encouraged fear among the student body but did not necessarily classify the fear fostered as a deterrent. Once again, the impact of this nearly permanent program is still unclear.

Interview question number 11 asked, “How effective has our ISS program been in achieving its goal?” All face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Three participants (37.5%) provided the top three distinct responses: effective in achieving its
goal, not effective, and consistent facilitator needed. One participant (12.50%) admitted that they were unsure what the goal of ISS actually was. In adding up the responses outside of effective, although stated slightly different, they were all stating that ISS had not been effective in achieving its goal.

Table 23

**Q11: How effective has our ISS program been in achieving its goal?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent facilitator needed</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure what the goal is</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data are vital in providing the needs assessment for programmatic revitalization based on stakeholder perception. Programmatic revitalization such as streamlined processes for communication between ISS facilitator and classroom teachers and for streamlining the processes for students being able to access not only the course work but also instruction. The data suggest that ISS needs a programming overhaul to become more effective.

Interview question number 12 asked, “How can ISS become more effective in your opinion?” All of the face-to-face interview participants answered this question. Three participants (37.5%) suggested that the use of a behavior modification program along with a more disciplined ISS environment would make ISS more effective. Two participants (25%) suggested that therapy for the students along with increased communication between ISS facilitator and classroom teachers would make ISS more effective. One participant (12.5%) suggested that current policy and procedures be re-written, create a plan to increase parental involvement of ISS participants, add the behavior modification class to the schedule of frequent ISS participants, establish
assignment accountability, provide participants with computer usage opportunities while in ISS, and empower the ISS teacher.

Table 24

Q12: How can ISS become more effective in your opinion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior modification program</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined environment</td>
<td>3 of 8</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Communication between teachers</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy Needed</td>
<td>2 of 8</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-written policy &amp; procedures</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased parental involvement</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empower the ISS teacher</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Modification classes add to schedule</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Accountability</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow computer usage</td>
<td>1 of 8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Discipline Data

In completing this program evaluation, I was able to obtain student discipline data of the student participants for the current in school suspension program. In the 2017-2018 school year, there were 260 students serviced in in school suspension that year. Fifty-two of those students were students with disabilities (ESE) and 12 of those students were students with active Limited English proficiency plans (ELL). Students under the Every Child Succeeds Act (ESSA), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and the Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE) laws all require specific accommodations and amenities as a part of their educational experience.

The data from the 2017-2018 school year identified that a considerably more males frequented in school suspension than females. Honing in a little deeper also revealed a distinct difference in the minority students’ verses non-minority students’ rate of frequency in in school suspension at Eminence High. One hundred and sixty two (62%) of the student participants are listed as minority based on school demographic
data, compared to 94 (36%) of their demographically identified non-minority counterparts.

Table 25

*Student in school suspension data for the 2017-2018 school year.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General education students</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Students (ESE)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners (ELL)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/ Hispanic/ Multi-Racial</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian / White / Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data suggested that cultural competency and diversity training at Eminence High may be emergent and necessary to divert subconscious and unintentional racism that may persist among faculty and staff issuing discipline referrals. The data also suggested that cultural proficiency and diversity training may be necessary to assist educators in how to create lesson plans and teach and engage students and parents of other cultures.

**Student Achievement Data**

In completing this program evaluation, I was also able to look at student achievement data of the in school suspension student participants for the 2017-2018 school year. Students being able to remain connected to the course content material and student work completion were the areas where administration and faculty conflicted in response data regarding program benefits and challenges. I decided to use grade point average (GPA) as a measurement of student achievement. Since work completion was the chief complaint from classroom teachers about in school suspension participants and administration felt, in school suspension participants were benefiting from being assigned to in school suspension, which allowed them to remain connected to their classroom.
content material, I used grade point averages to determine which stakeholders’
perspective offered more legitimacy.

I took the grade point averages of the students who frequented the in school
suspension program three or more times during the 2017-2018 school year. There were a
total of 71 (27%) in school suspension participants who were assigned in school
suspension three or more times during this school year. Of those 71 students, 45 (63%)
students have a current GPA less than the state required minimum of 2.0. Twenty-Six
(37%) students have a current GPA above the state required minimum of 2.0. These data
suggest that the classroom teachers’ perspective, that student participants of in school
suspension were not completing the course work, appeared to be valid. Data also
suggested that the current level of accountability of the student participants when in ISS
and ISS facilitator have to increase.

When referring back to the in school suspension data and the need for cultural
proficiency and diversity training, the same is revealed in reviewing the student
achievement data. Of those students who visited ISS three or more times within the same
school year, only 20 (28%) were non-minority students. Ten (66%) of those non-minority
students have GPA’s above the state required 2.0 minimum. Compared to 35 (49%)
minority students who are below the state required minimum. Educators have to become
aware of their preconceived judgements, personal biases, and prejudices to make the
playing field fair and equal for all students.

Lastly, the data suggested that use of the current in school suspension program
was not serving the student participants well. The benefit, as outlined by administration,
was not holding true. The majority of the student participants with the most frequent
occurrences have grade point averages well below the state required minimum. These
data illuminate the need for organizational realignment and provide the need based
assessment data that the restructuring of protocols and procedures for in school
suspension at Eminence High is exigent.

Table 26

Student Achievement Data: Current GPA’s of students who frequented in school suspension three of more times during the 2017-2018 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MO.LA</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NI.WI</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LE.WO</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ST.HE</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>KL.CH</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LU.RA</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JA.EL</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LU.AN</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MO.SI</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RLJU</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>JA.SA</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KE.ME</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TY.RO</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>JA.UR</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>AN.KE</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>TY.WI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CA.RI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AL.WI</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>JA.TU</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NI.LE</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>RO.FA</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>AN.GA</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>DA.CO</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>KE.GI</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>MA.VA</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>KE.PO</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>JH.HA</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>VI.BR</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>MA.BU</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SA.SP</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>KA.RO</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>JE.JE</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>MA.GO</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>MA.SE</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>TR.LE</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>KI.WI</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>KW.WI</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>JE.FL</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>LY.WH</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>AK.RA</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>JO.PU</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>SH.JO</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>KA.BE</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>DO.HO</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>JU.RO</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>RO.KE</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>BR.FU</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>CH.WA</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>ZA.HO</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>SH.CA</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>BR.PA</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>DE.SM</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>JA.SO</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>TY.RO</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>BO.PA</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>KA.HA</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>LA.JO</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>OZ.AR</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>TE.RO</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>BR.CO</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>SH.WA</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>DE.AG</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>HA.YA</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>JA.CO</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>SH.WH</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>JO.MO</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>JY.CO</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>EX.AJ</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>NI.JO</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>AN.JO</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>LA.ER</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Changes

In describing comprehensively the organizational change I would make at Eminence High, with regard to the ISS program, my focus and attention primarily goes to what the teachers reported as the biggest challenge, student work completion, and what the administrators report as the biggest challenge, teachers providing the work for students. For me, the two issues are the same, although each group directed their attention...
to a symptom. I see the problem at its core. The problem, as I see it, is that participants of the current ISS program at Eminence High failed to receive adequate, fair, and appropriate instruction while in ISS. Whether the teacher provided the work or the students completed the work is all secondary to the quality of education the student is receiving while penalized to in school suspension. When this continues to occur over multiple ISS placements, the achievement gap continues to widen between ISS participants and their non-participant peers.

Based on the research and data retrieved during this study, it is evident that once a student is assigned ISS there is great uncertainty from teachers, administration and the ISS facilitator if the student will be productive or connected to the content material learned in class while in ISS. This uncertainty can lead to assumptions about the student and assumptions about the teacher or ISS facilitator, but ultimately it reflects the program and its ability of ensure all students receive a fair and appropriate education while in ISS. “A system is a perceived whole whose elements hang together because they continually affect each other over time and operate toward a common purpose” (Wagner et.al., 2006, p. 97). ISS often operates in isolation from the school day, and it should not. It is a part of the system and its elements should continue to function and operate toward our common purpose: to educate the whole child. ISS’s essential responsibility is to the students it serves. When students’ behavior versus their ability becomes the focus, the student loses. ISS, regardless of the student’s offense, has to educate the whole child. This includes teaching and re-teaching social and behavior modification strategies and techniques to reduce recidivism.
My interest in in school suspension originated about a year after working at Eminence High. My office used to be flush against what was once the ISS classroom. I would often hear the conversations and treatment of the students in ISS. These conversations were not always positive conversations. In addition, from my observation, the curriculum used did not appear to bring about any change in behavior for the participants. In my role as a school counselor, I also heard the cries and pleas from the students and parents about missing work that the student incurred while in ISS. The most common explanation from the student was, “I don’t understand the work” or “I wasn’t there when the teacher explained how to do it.” From the teachers’ perspective, there is often an implied expectation of the student to stay afterschool for instruction that could have occurred during the time he or she was in school in ISS. Many of our students and their families lack transportation. Therefore, the school bus is the only way they can get to and from school. Surprisingly, during the ISS stay, the student does not receive any social or behavior modification work while in ISS to reinforce appropriate behavior. It is a vicious cycle that I have unfortunately witnessed year after year.

I also selected this issue to address within this organizational change because of its technical and adaptive characteristics. Some parts of this organizational change can be changed through simple technical changes that will require minimal professional development and training. Other parts of this organizational change will require a complete change of thought process and role functionality. This adaptive change will be more complex and harder to change. “Adaptive challenges are difficult because their solutions require people to change their ways” (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009, p. 69). Just as diligently as we are working to change the fixed mindsets of the students, as
educational leaders, we also have to work to change the thoughts, perceptions, and perspectives of the teachers, which can pose a huge challenge to organizational change.

The “AS-IS” diagnostic chart (Appendix F) reflects the existing problem situation with the current ISS program at Eminence High school. The chart explains how the context, culture, and conditions at Eminence High directly influence the competencies of the teachers and students at the school. Often, the assumption is that these students do not care about their education, so why should we continue to pour efforts into them. I use the word “assumption, to mean a way of understanding and making sense of” a particular situation (Wagner et.al., 2006, p. 127). Identifying these assumptions and illustrating them out in my “AS-IS” chart helps to clarify how this program is operating and the need for immediate change.

As it is currently, students who serve a consequence of ISS, work on their missing work in isolation, without direct instruction during that time period in ISS. Depending on the cognitive ability of the student, this can be a daunting task. As specified earlier, many of the participants of ISS are special education students and therefore, they lack the added support and direction they would receive in a regular classroom, when they are in ISS. This in turn affects their overall academic achievement. Missing assignments that accumulate while a student is in ISS can turn into missing work at the end of the semester, often causing the student’s grade to be less than acceptable.

Context

Every organization has external factors that influence how it performs as an organization. External forces are the context by which the organization exists. For Eminence high, one of the contextual factors that is persistently apparent at this school is
that it has a low socio-economic status student population. As stated earlier, Eminence is the only title one high school within the district with over seventy-five percent of its student population receiving free or reduced lunch. When students are hungry and lack their basic foundational needs being met at home, it is hard to come to school and remain focused. These students are more likely to have a gloom and doom perspective clouding their judgement and affecting their ability to focus. With all of this occurring, often the discipline issues in the classroom rise, as do the referrals. Ultimately this leads to a trip to ISS as a consequence for the unwanted behavior.

Another contextual challenge that influences Eminence greatly is the huge attendance barrier it faces with many students missing 2 to 3 days a week on average from school. Schools within the district strive to maintain an annual 95% attendance rate per grade level. Over the course of the following school years (2015-2016, 2016-2017, 2017-2018) the annual attendance rate has averaged out to be about 91% for all three school years. Every Child Succeeds Act places accountability on individual states to identify their early warning indicators. Florida acknowledges attendance below 90% as an early warning indicator. In the 2017-2018 school year specifically, Grades nine through eleven had an annual attendance rate of 90%. Twelfth grade students that same year were at 92%.

Although the goal is 95%, student attendance at Eminence High hovers closely around the states early warning indicator of 90%, especially among underclassmen students. “Children from homes and primary social networks most consistent with the expectations and style of the school have a distinct advantage in school” (Comer, 1984, p. 326). Many parents and students of Eminence high do not share the priority mindset of
school attendance. Therefore, attendance stifles academic achievement gains, while teacher evaluation scores and the school grade suffer. When students are behind academically and feel that they are inadequate in the classroom, disciplinary problems increase. This in turn leads to increased discipline referrals and then frequent ISS assignments.

The last contextual factor influencing how Eminence high functions as an organization is the large percentage of teacher turnover year after year. As stated previously, the lack of regard for regular school attendance greatly affects teacher evaluation scores and school grade. Teacher Evaluation and school grade in turn, greatly affects teacher motivation to remain at Eminence High. Many teachers each year give up the fight and in search for an easier workload, less disciplinary issues, and higher achievement gain, leave Eminence contributing to the twenty to twenty five percent of faculty turn over each year.

Culture

Ultimately, the culture of an organization dictates how that organization operates. Those “powerful meanings and mindsets held individually and collectively throughout the system” (Wagner et al., 2006, p. 102). Culture tends to be the thought processes and perception of organization members. Regardless of policy and written perception, culture is the driving force of what actually gets accomplished.

For Eminence high school, many of the teachers lack relationship and or connection with their students. I have observed that teachers, whom students reverence and respect, tend to have less classroom disruptions and discipline violations. Hence, making the point that student teacher relationships pose an invaluable asset towards
combatting discipline referrals. Comer, 1984, highlights that no learning occurs without a significant relationship (p. 327), further substantiating the relevance of the need of potential new hire teachers to desire student teacher relationships.

At Eminence the faculty turnover rate each year hovers around twenty percent. Each year students can anticipate three to four new teachers on their schedule. It’s hard to build relationships when every year your teacher is either new to the school or new to the field of education altogether. “School leadership is second only to classroom teaching in ensuring student achievement” (Killion & Hirsh, 2012, p. 14). Each year Eminence High experiences enormous turnover, resulting in the hiring of many brand new teachers. New teachers often struggle with classroom management skills and when they encounter disruptive students, they rely heavily on punitive methods of discipline, which can translate to a high number of referrals written. The cycle begins again, leading to the student receiving ISS for a consequence, and thus the student’s academic achievement continues to suffer. The classroom teacher is vital to the academic achievement success of their students. When the teacher student relationship strengthens, the discipline issues decrease and subside.

Conditions

Conditions in education are external things that affect and interrupt the learning environment. In his book titled Change Leadership, Wagner explains that conditions are “the external architecture surrounding student learning” (p. 101). The conditions of Eminence high are that discipline violations are extremely high. Many students derive from socioeconomic disadvantaged homes and may not always exhibit school appropriate behaviors. Additionally, some students come to school and intentionally cause
disruptions or skip class. Each time those students run the risk of receiving discipline referrals because of their violations. If the referral is processed, it is likely that the student will be given ISS as a consequence.

Consistency with addressing the behavioral violations on Eminence’s campus is vast to say the least. Administration, consisting of the four assistant principals and our one dean have their hands full daily with a vast array of higher level discipline and investigative tasks. Additionally, their role requires them to be in the classroom providing instructional leadership, support and coaching to teachers and coaches. Therefore, the discipline violations often take precedent and often cause administration to neglect their other duties and responsibilities. This constant interruption can lead those misbehaving into either ISS or OSS. Regardless, student learning is being stifled and the achievement gap for those students continues to grow wider.

Attendance at Eminence high is a major challenge as well. Classroom teachers sometimes overlook behavior or defiance violations from students who have very poor attendance history. Teachers often feel conflicted by addressing the violations, when the bigger issue is increasing the direct instruction time and closing the achievement gap of Eminence’s most vulnerable population. Some teachers would rather allow the student to remain present in class and receive the classroom instruction, rather than send the student to the building office for chastisement for the behavior violation. Often students who have missed so much classroom instruction will choose to act up on purpose to receive in school suspension to avoid the classroom environment.
Competencies

Many teachers are uncertain about the behavior tracking policy at Eminence High. Although the student code of conduct is provided to both teachers and students at the beginning of the year, many teachers struggle with those soft competencies and personal beliefs about what constitutes a violation. The policy, written in a clear and concise manner, is understandable by all, however what the policy does not account for are the feelings, the personal and emotional struggles that teachers face when determining what actually constitutes as a violation.

Moreover, the actual procedural safeguards of enacting a referral for discipline, attendance and dress code are often in question as well. Some teachers have a strict classroom policy where they regularly check student attendance for their class as well as the students’ other classes to determine if the student is skipping their class. Additionally, as discipline issues arise in class, some teachers will stop and immediately write a referral and call parents, while others may wait until the end of the day to address the discipline issue that arose in class. Failure to make parental contact regarding the behavioral issues that arise vary depending upon the teacher. These individuals may lack the hard competency skills necessary to address the issues consistently within their classroom.

While the inconsistencies occur for one reason or another, teacher competency, whether in the policy and procedure or in the belief and personal opinion about the infraction, may encourage students who continuously violate code of conduct rules. It is my belief that many teachers lack the authoritative mindset to address the discipline violation when it occurs. Many teachers at Eminence feel that it is the responsibility of the administration team to address such violations.
One question I answered in completing this study was, “What are the challenges that the ISS program at Eminence High faces as seen by teachers and administration?” Additionally, within my research, I have answered the question of whether the current program is effective as seen by faculty and administration. In both questions, the faculty and administration responses were clear and stood out. Both groups appear to know that the program is necessary, yet both groups know that the program needs an overhaul to become effective. The challenges of student work completion and teachers not sending work to ISS consistently are symptoms of a larger and deeper issue.

In completing this study and working to uncover the perceptions of the stakeholders about the current ISS program at Eminence High, I still have some unanswered questions. First, I wondered why the participants believe that ISS doesn’t decrease inappropriate behavior among participants. In addition, what role if any would the survey participants feel they played in the success or demise of the current ISS program? With this in mind, I still would like to know how the students perceive the consequence of ISS. Additionally, what is the student’s perception of the goal of ISS? Do students feel that ISS has served as a deterrent for them committing an offence? Lastly, I would have liked to receive parental input about their student’s assignment to ISS.

For my next steps, I would work with the current faculty and staff to develop a leadership committee to oversee the operational changes and needed to ensure that ISS’s focus is to continue student learning. “Competencies are most effectively built when professional development is focused, job-embedded, continuous, constructed, and collaborative” (Wagner, et al., 2006, p. 99). In order to ensure this change plan occurs, the leadership committee would need to consist of people from each content area
department, who have influence and power within their departments. People who can teach the other teachers in the department and maintain a level of focus and collaborative environment.

Likewise, I would include involvement in the community from business partners, and potential employers to come in and teach and reinforce to students Tony Wagner’s seven survival skills for the 21st century, and how those skills apply to the workforce that they will soon enter. In addition, students would work with community figures that would serve as mentors to these students and provide additional opportunities for character, social, and emotional development. Someone who would commit to meeting with these students and allow them to have a voice to express their feelings and help steer them back on track with positive motivation and reinforcement. As it relates to the change plan, I would use mentor-tracking sheets to monitor student discipline and achievement data for the duration of the school year. Peter Block (2008), in his book Community, the structure of belonging, talks about when citizens care for each other, they become accountable to each other (p.30). When students know that people within their own communities are coming to see them weekly or monthly, and those individuals have an interest in their performance in school, it may shift the students’ mindset and their emotions. Once consistent mentorship is established, data on those student participants should be extracted to determine the level of influence and impact the communal relationship has caused.

**Interpretation**

In describing the results from this study, one thing to note was that the majority of participants agreed that the use of ISS is necessary on the campus of Eminence High. These data suggest that the faculty and staff of Eminence understand that out of school
suspensions do more harm than they do good. These educators do not anticipate inappropriate behaviors declining any time soon, yet they know that an alternative option for students to receive consequences and remain in school is ultimately the best option for them.

Although the data information gathered states two opposing views, the core of the issue that revealed itself is that students in ISS are not remaining connected to the classroom material being taught. Hence, ISS participants are not receiving direct instruction on material they are missing while away from the classroom. The study set out to determine effectiveness of the overall program. After reviewing the data, it was revealed that the teachers’ perceptions of the program is that ISS has not been effective in deterring inappropriate behavior, modifying behavior of its participants, or providing content level instruction to students while in ISS.

These results are significant because they reveal that although ISS is doing well at preventing students from being out of school while serving consequences for inappropriate behavior, the program is doing very little for correction of said inappropriate behavior once student is in ISS. The restorative justice practices and behavior modification techniques currently implemented do not possess fidelity. Furthermore, students know they did something wrong, they know this because they got in trouble, but the student was not taught any new skill or technique to either prevent this from happening again or how to better deal with a situations such as this next time they arise. Moreover, and in my opinion of the highest priority, direct instruction is missing in ISS. Many of the students assigned to ISS are special education students. Many of them lack the academic language and foundation necessary to independently study. Although
the facilitator present in the room is an instructional allocation, he or she may lack certification in core content area subjects, and can offer little to no help to students with regards to their academic work.

In reviewing the results from this study, I think that the results turned out this way because of who answered the survey and interview questions. It was interesting to see that the teachers blamed the program’s inefficiency on the students and the facilitator. The administration team blamed the program’s inefficiency on the teachers. I would presume that if we polled the students, they too would lay fault on another group as well. Neither of the participant groups looked inward and found fault with their own role in the success of the current ISS program. Overall, the results were valid and reliable. I would have like to see more ownership regarding the role each participant group could have contributed to the success or demise of the program.

Judgments

After reviewing the results from the data collection, I was able to answer most of my primary and secondary questions. With respect to questions regarding student work completion and repeat offenders, I felt the answers to the interview and survey questions thoroughly explained the participants’ perceptions to my primary and secondary questions. Overall, my survey and interview questions were straight forward and ultimately answered my primary and secondary questions.

Primary exploratory question one, which stated, what do participants (Teachers, ISS facilitators, and school-based Administrators) perceive as working well in the current in school suspension program at Eminence High School? The survey and interview results answered this question with a positive response. What appears to be working well
for the current program is the use of an alternative to out of school suspension and an alternative location where students can remain on campus and receive coursework.

Primary exploratory question two stated, what do participants (Teachers, ISS facilitators, and school-based Administrators) perceive as not working well in the current in school suspension program at Eminence High School? The survey and interview results answered this question stating recidivism and assignment completion as the two major items participants viewed as not working well with the current program. With recidivism being the higher priority of the two, because the recidivism rate increasing contributes to the assignment completion epidemic.

Primary exploratory question three stated, what do participants (Teachers, ISS facilitators, and school-based Administrators) perceive as the biggest challenge with the current ISS program at Eminence High School? The survey and interview results answered this question stating that repeat offenders, work completion and student perception were the top three biggest challenges with the current program.

Primary exploratory question four stated, what do participants (Teachers, ISS facilitators, and school-based Administrators) suggest as ways to improve the ISS program at Eminence High School? Survey and interview participants responded that increased communication between the ISS facilitator and classroom teacher, ISS facilitator taking accountability for work completion by students, and total restructuring of the current program, would improve the ISS program at Eminence High School.

Primary exploratory question five stated, according to the participants (Teachers, ISS facilitators, and school-based Administrators) how effective is ISS at deterring code of conduct violations? The survey and interview participant responses answered this
question stating that the current ISS program is not effective at all at deterring code of conduct violations. Participants acknowledged the perception that although students were aware of the imminent consequence of ISS, it did not appear to reduced conduct violations or inappropriate behaviors from occurring. Participants’ perceptions were that ISS in and of itself was not enough of a deterrent to ward off conduct violations.

Primary exploratory question six stated, according to the participants (Teachers, ISS facilitators, and school-based Administrators) what benefit, if any, do students who have been ISS participants seem to gain from ISS?” The survey and interview results answered this question stating that at the present, there does not appear to be evidence of a benefit. Participants explained that based on their perceptions currently, ISS does not appear to have a benefit for its program participants. The data collected revealed that the intended benefit of allowing students to remain connected to the classroom content, did not appear to be happening. Many of the student participants were not engaged in the work sent to ISS from the classroom teacher, and thus work completion and completed work returned to the classroom teacher became minuscule.

Secondary exploratory question one stated, what do participants (Teachers, ISS facilitators, and school-based Administrators) have regarding any impact the ISS program has had on school wide behavior among students? The survey and interview results answered this question stating the current program has not improved student behavior among students.

Secondary exploratory question two stated, what perceptions do the participants (Teachers, ISS facilitators, and school-based Administrators) have regarding any impact the ISS program has had on the behavior of student participants of the ISS program? The
survey and interview results answered this question stating that the current program has not had much impact on the student participants as evidenced by the repeat offenders that receive the same consequence repeatedly.

Secondary exploratory question three stated, what perceptions do the participants (Teachers, ISS facilitators, and school-based Administrators) have regarding any student participants of ISS being given the opportunity to receive missing work from the teacher of record. The survey and interview results answered this question stating that they were in agreement with students being able to receive their missing work, yet, had an issue with the return rate of the completed work. It seems that the completed work never makes it back to the teacher, and therefore, teachers would like more accountability from the ISS facilitator to ensure that the work is completed.

Secondary exploratory question four stated, what do stakeholders report as the influence of ISS on the student body? The survey and interview results answered this question stating that the current program has a very small level of influence on the student body as a whole. It is not reverenced enough to deter from code of conduct violations.

Secondary exploratory question five stated, what do stakeholders report as the influence of ISS on the students who participate in ISS? The survey and interview results answered this question stating that the current program has a very small level of influence on the student participants as evidenced by the continuous repeat offenders.

Providing a comprehensive description of my study results, I would have to say that I do not believe that the data results were negative or positive. I think that the results are valid, reliable and truthful, as told by the participants. The results outlined where the
clear deficits lie and where improvements need immediate attention. By taking these clear and obvious deficits and making organizational changes while shifting mindsets, I believe the outcome can be extremely positive for the students, faculty, and staff.

**Recommendations**

My recommendation for organizational change would be to create or use a platform, where students in ISS would log in via computer, laptop, or mobile device and follow their scheduled classes. They would be able to interact with the teacher and class and receive the same instruction that the students in the class are receiving. This ensures that the student is connected to the content material taught in real time. It also ensures the teacher knows whether or not the student participated. Work submission can be online through Schoology or Google Classroom. There is entirely too much technology available to schools and classroom teachers today. The ISS classroom needs to mirror that of a regular classroom and student participants in ISS shouldn’t be subject to work in silos on worksheets.

I would also like to add restorative practices within the ISS classroom. Not only behavior modification techniques, but also a curriculum that allows students to voice their concerns, their truths, their fears, and learn from them. “Educators have embraced restorative practices, in which students participate in conversations with their teachers and peers to discuss problems at school” (Dubin, 2016, p. 18). A curriculum of sort that allows students to learn social and conflict resolution skills simultaneously as serving out their consequence.

The organizational change I would like to make is both adaptive and technical. The technical change, which is the simplest change to make would be the addition of the
skype in cameras, which would allow students in ISS to log in during their class period and participate in class. This process would include students having a laptop or mobile device with a camera and a link by which they could “zoom” into class and participate. I would also have an interface platform associated with this change that allows the student to post his or her work. This would alleviate the feeling of isolation and allow the student to remain connected to the course work. This change also ensures that the student does not accrue missing work from days missed while in ISS.

The adaptive change would be creating a culture that embraced this method of instruction in K-12 school settings. “Educational technology encompasses any means of communicating with learners other than through direct, face to face or personal contact” (Bates & Poole, 2003, p. 5). In my opinion, and as I have seen over my career not, many educators are afraid of technology. They simply did not come up in an era that used it in the classroom, so they are reluctant to try it themselves. Our students today are technology experts and our teachers are the novices. This level of vulnerability often sends adults, much less educators into a panic. The thought of the student being more apt and astute about an area can be daunting. However, with a renewed mindset and a culture and atmosphere that embraces technology and all the advances that it allows, I think this scenario can be a win for all parties involved.

I selected the issue of in school suspension, because of my personal witnessing of the revolving door of the same frequent flyer students year after year involuntarily participating in a program that in my opinion is causing more harm than good. The data collected through survey, and interviews suggest there is a need for an organizational change with the current in school suspension program. As the student discipline and
achievement, data revealed our special populations and subgroup students are the
students frequenting ISS, and their data is not reflecting a benefit, gain nor significant
difference in their behavioral or academic statistics.

Student learning and the services, accommodations, and interventions provided to
students within the learning environment halt when they enter in school suspension. The
law that governs the rights and responsibilities for students with disabilities, makes
mention of the right to a free and appropriate education. The Individuals with Disabilities
Act of 2004 (IDEA), guarantees these rights to students who have a diagnosed disability
and are enrolled in a public school setting. ISS hosts hundreds of special education
students each year primarily as a solution to a technical problem. Nonetheless, these
students are in a “holding room” for lack of a better word, without direct instruction and
accommodations as listed on his/her individual education plan (IEP). Although the laws
were created and primarily protect the rights of disabled students, the rules and premise
should be applied to all students. All students should have this basic right. It should be a
given that all students are entitled to a free and appropriate education. This FAPE, as it is
referred to, should carry over into ISS as well.

Currently at Eminence High, the ISS facilitator is ESE certified and allows our
ISS program to run without violation to this federal mandate. In reflection, only two of
the past five ISS facilitators that have been in ISS since I began at Eminence were ESE
certified. Even with the certification, that still does not provide the content knowledge
needed to assist students in every subject area. This federal mandate requires that
instruction continue regardless of the environment. It is in this area that Eminence High
falls short. We are not in compliance with ensuring that instruction continues to occur.
SECTION FIVE: TO-BE FRAMEWORK

Introduction

Organizational change is a complex task. It takes a skillful and strategic leader to guarantee that the change occurs as intended. “The structure of maintaining order is highly conspicuous in the educational situation where the prerogative to maintain discipline is given to the teacher” (Aboluwodi, 2015, p. 136). Change leaders know they have to be strong and share the vision they have for the school and the students with the teachers who will carry out this task. Teachers are the individuals who will put this vision and plan into practice daily in the classrooms. Leadership has to include teachers at every step of the change process.

The primary issue that arose from the data collected in this study was about the receipt of direct instruction students receive while assigned to in school suspension. Several questions remain. Are students in ISS receiving a free and appropriate education during the time they are in ISS? Does this educational right turn off when the student commits an offence? Moreover, is this right applicable to all students or just ESE students? Change leaders have to have answers for these questions. My plan to collect and analyze data for this change plan would include the help of the leadership team at Eminence High. It would require input and data from the dean, principal, assistant principals, and teachers. “Increasing student achievement is the only valid way to determine effectiveness of education” (Yell, Shriner, and Katsiyannis, 2006, p. 4). Working together collectively as a community, we would analyze and review the data and make changes to ensure equity and effectiveness of the education we provide.
Review of Literature Related to Change

**Discipline in Schools**

Teacher student relationships have an immense impact on the classroom behaviors that irrupt during instruction time. “Positive attachment to school and positive adult and peer relationships are the greatest protection against risky behaviors and nurture healthy youth development and academic success” (Weiss, 2017, p. 1). When students feel safe and valued, they will in fact behave. Baruti Kafele (2013), in his book entitled *Closing the Attitude Gap*, acknowledged that “true learning cannot begin until the environment dictates that it is okay to learn” (p. 91). The current state of Eminence High’s ISS program does not say to students upon entering that it is okay to learn. The room is bare and empty other than student desks with only a few desktop computers and a few core subject books that students can utilize while in the room. Nothing about the room says it is okay to learn here.

In school suspension operates at Eminence High in isolation from what the other programs within the school have going on. Although the premise is to isolate the individual as method of punishment, the ultimate goal and expectation of the school is to educate primarily. Although the hope is that students learn core subject material from English, Math, Science, and Social Studies, there is an overt expectation, obligation even, to teach social, and survival skills as well. “A strong normative culture of respect, trust, and accountability for learning” (Wagner, 2006, p. 111) has to occur. It has to become the norm and educators in the building have to consistently look at the data from those students who spend considerable amounts of time in ISS. The push has shifted to include instruction for those student missing foundational instruction from their education.
Aboluwodi (2015) looked into the practice of retributive punishment as a discipline measure. The idea behind retributive punishment is that punishment issued should either “reform or deter” (Aboluwodi, 2015, p. 136). As educational leaders, we must take a hard look at the goal of ISS. Is the act of punishing for the offense or violation committed, used to reform the individual or just to deter others from committing the same offence or violation? Aboluwodi, in his journal article, compared utilitarian and retributive theories of punishment. He explains how Utilitarian theory of punishment focuses on deterrence and rehabilitation, whereas Retributive theory of punishment is focused on repayment and punishment for wrongdoing (Aboluwodi, 2015, p. 137).

Equally, another approach to discipline in school has emerged. Referred to as Restorative Justice, this practice allows individuals who have committed an offence to learn from the perspective of the person harmed. Similar to the restorative justice practices found in the criminal justice field, justice is achieved by the offender making amends with their victim and or victims and repairing the harm done to the community. “Restorative Justice is about building bonds rather than just issuing punishments, it serves as the goals of education by ensuring that young people are given the chance to grow through their mistakes in unique ways” (Penny, 2015, p. 2). I have seen over my career that the perceived disrespect from either party prior to the ISS event has crippled the academic progression that needs to occur between student and teacher once the student returns to the academic environment. ISS is a place where introduction to restorative circles, post conflict resolution, peer mediation, social and emotional learning skills can begin. It would be best practice to have a restorative justice program that functions school wide, where components of restorative justice continue in the classroom
environment as well. However, within the confines of ISS is a premier opportunity for the restorative justice process to begin and take flight.

**Education for All**

Yell, Shriner, and Katsiyannis (2006) highlighted how the IDEA and NCLB acts have been improved by this revised focus and specificity. The article thoroughly explained all three acts and the laws that were generated from each. The authors also focused on how the improvements proposed in the new federal law specifically impacted school districts, building administrators, and classroom teachers. The authors expressed the guaranteed right of FAPE and how that should look within school setting. They highlighted how the law not only holds classroom teachers to a higher standard of being highly qualified, but also the paraprofessionals who assist our students under the direction of teachers. There is a specific requirement of a highly qualified paraprofessional as well. The journal summates the specifics of FAPE and discipline within a school context. The law protects students with disabilities, so that even when a student “is removed from his or her current placement because of weapons, drugs, or infliction of injury or because of violation of school code” (Yell, Shriner, & Katsiyannis, 2006, p. 18) the school district remains obligated to maintain and continue to receive the services required in the student’s IEP. Although the focus was on special education students, it is noteworthy that these same laws and practices should be afforded to all students.

The primary concern and objective within this district’s strategic plan is student achievement. Focus area one of the 2016-2018 Milbrook County schools strategic plan stated that students are the number one priority (Moxley, 2016, p. 3). This one main goal
referred to all students, not just the students who behave and go to class on time and turn in all their work. It also referred to the students who skip class, break rules, never turn in assignments, and are disruptive in class. “ALL MEANS ALL,” which happens to be the 2016-17 school year district mantra. The research conducted and outlined within this study will assist district leaders to consider and formulate a district wide in school suspension protocol and standard of operating procedure for all schools.

Consistency Across the District

School climate is a determinant of how a school functions. School administration’s ability to impact school culture and discipline issues determines how many students receive in school suspension and out of school suspension yearly. In a study conducted by Gregory, Cornell, and Fan, (2011) the trio set out to explain the relationship of school structure and support to suspension rates for black and white high school students. In the study, they defined structure and support to be a representation of “high academic press” and “sense of community” (Gregory, Cornell, & Fan, 2011, p. 908). The study expressed how several low socio-economic schools developed their school culture through elevated academic expectations and communal peer relationships to formally impact achievement gains for the positive. The findings also revealed that schools must take on a parental role, having such influential impact on a student daily. The article, notes that schools that worked diligently to be inclusive and encouraged the student body to feel a part of the community experienced a decline in discipline issues. Gregory, Skiba, and Noguera (2010), in their journal article titled The Achievement Gap and the Discipline Gap: Two Sides of the Same Coin, emphasized that racial gaps in academic achievement may be contributed to discipline practices such as exclusion in
school. Zero tolerance school policies are not increasing the academic achievement, nor are they necessarily preventing incidents from occurring. What they are doing is placing a greater divide between students’ academic achievement levels and it disproportionately affecting students of color.

Conversely, schools whose teachers and administration took on an authoritative and involved parental role with the student body experienced a decline in discipline issues as well. Documented in the journal article that low structure and low support schools were regarded as least authoritative, and thus had higher suspension rates. This research is inescapable to in school suspension programs across the district. When students do not feel a part of the community and included as a member of the group, they will continue to act out. Similarly, teachers have to assume some role and position as the supportive authoritative figure rather than just the authority in the room. Kids know when adults care. They can sense it and they learn to adapt according to the authority figure in the room.

In her master’s thesis, DiMino (2013) highlighted that her study is the catalyst into the absence of uniformity and provided the probable cause for further investigation and exploration concerning the disparities that exist in in school suspension programs. The research I conducted during my dissertation will assist the field of education by providing school based and district leaders a better understanding of the need for uniformity and consistency within in school suspension programs school by school across the school districts. Arcia (2007) reminded us that the students we serve may come from communities and have family lives that we may never be able to alter or influence; however, as a school district and school leader, it is our obligation to remain positive
beacons of hope for these students. The burden to address discipline issues impacted by variables inside or outside of the classroom should not rely solely on the classroom teacher and building administrators. The district leaders have to have a voice and a plan in this arena to offer consistency and equity to all students; regardless of geographical housing location within the county.

Simultaneously a needs assessment must be conducted at the school level to determine how ISS will exist on its campus under the supervision and direction from the district. Douglas Reeves (2009) discussed how administration and educational leaders have to complete an organizational change assessment for their school. Honest open dialogue about where the school currently is and where leaders would like the school culture to move towards is a part of that needs assessment analysis process.

Ultimately, within one school district there should be consistency with regards to the utilization and procedural regulations within ISS. Every school within the school district operating an In School Suspension program should essentially operate the same. Similarly, how the district provides a blueprint, scope, and sequence for content level course progression, ISS needs a curriculum and a set of operating procedures that allows for consistent and effective instruction while students are in the program.

**Technology Connecting the Dots**

Technology is an essential part of students’ lives today. Students in grades Kindergarten through third grade have cell phones and can use them with ease as compared to older adults possessing the same technology. Let us face it; we are living in a technological age. John Brown (2002) acknowledged how instrumental the invention of the internet has been to the world by comparing it with the introduction of electricity to
the world. He stated that the internet will be that essential. Wagner, much like Brown, acknowledged how the internet has revolutionized the field of education. Wagner (2008) explained that the internet will shape both the way students’ learn in addition to what they are able to learn. The use of the internet has afforded students much more access to information at an earlier age. His explanation translated that the lessons received in classrooms today, in part due to the internet, should extend far beyond the four walls of the classroom.

So why should this be any different for students in ISS? Technology is available and present in our schools. Why should students who have committed an offence and are serving their consequence have their educational services diminished in the process? Hunter and Jordan (2009) discussed the use of technology in the classroom among students and teachers. They highlighted the need for an immediate response and suggested the use of webcams, instant messenger, face-to-face conferencing, and other platforms to enhance an educational experience for all students.

They also suggested that these online platforms provide an opportunity for students to interact with peers and their teachers in a manner in which they learn and relate. This wave of online networking is already a part of their daily routines, and classroom teachers have to find a way to integrate what students already use into the classroom learning. It is during this time, when the teacher has to become comfortable with technology and reversing the roles and allowing students to become the teacher and exhibit the skills and interest they possess.

In my change leadership plan, I will challenge and encourage the school administration to develop an expectation among classroom teachers, ISS facilitator and
the students that the use of technology with the students assigned to ISS will occur to continue effective content instruction.

Envisioning the Success TO-BE

Envisioning the success TO-BE (Appendix F) allowed me to identify and analyze areas of weaknesses found within the current program -- AS-IS status -- within the in-school suspension program at Eminence High School. I reviewed the effectiveness of the program and discovered several next steps to develop the vision for my change project, expressed in my TO-BE chart. Using the Four C’s Framework: Condition, Competencies, Culture, and Context, I devised a plan to enhance and increase productivity for the current in school suspension program for students, staff, and district. Becoming proficient at using the Four C’s framework afforded me increased leadership skills and a better understanding of school wide operations and the impact culture has on school discipline.

ISS has been operating and functioning at Eminence High for over five years and the benefits of the program have yet to be determined. The goal of this TO-BE change plan (Refer to Appendix G) is to ensure sound academic services continue for all students, while in in school Suspension. Instruction should also continue for all students while in ISS. Additionally, embedded in the structure and curriculum of ISS is social and character development skills.

Contexts

The context of Eminence High is that area around the school is desolate and unfortunately, many of the students come from low socio-economic status homes. Due to this reality, roughly 75% of our student population are on free or reduced lunch.
Administration is working diligently with city officials (commissioners, mayor, etc.) to revive the area and bring jobs and businesses to the area. The community has seen the effort from administration and have bought into the notion that the school does care about not only the students, but also the community. A direct result of this effort was the increase in attendance for our students. Parents now encourage and promote school attendance. Teacher retention has increased. Year to year fewer and fewer teachers leave the school. They are now a part of the community as well and work effortlessly with students to build capacity and community, which leads to culture change.

**Culture**

A renewed culture will emerge from Eminence high students, faculty, and staff once the in school suspension program has streamlined protocols and procedures to ensure fidelity and effectiveness. Teachers will become vigilant in addressing discipline violations and administration will use in school suspension for specific violations.

Moreover, teachers and administration are working collaboratively to promote a sense of community among the student body. Teachers and administration are using more authoritative and supportive approach, allowing for academic press, nestled with love and concern for student progression. If a violation warrants an in school suspension visit, the teacher shall provide direct instruction and assignments via the technology in both the classroom and ISS classroom. Students in ISS know that they have made a mistake and feel they can learn from their mistake and continue as a part of the community rather than an outcast.
Conditions

The conditions at Eminence High have improved tremendously since the leadership change plan was initiated. Code of conduct violations are on the decline with less and less violations being accrued each month. Discipline issues no longer affect academic instruction and growth within the classroom. Students focused and engaged in their curriculum and in the class interactions, have less time to cause distractions and make disruptions. Administration now operate as true instructional leaders with time in classrooms observing lessons and assisting teachers build capacity and grow as educators. Lastly, ISS is now an operable classroom where administration can visit and see direct instruction occurring either via technological device or face to face with a teacher present.

Competencies

At Eminence High, teacher competency has increased exponentially. Relationships are forming, the students and teachers feel welcomed, and a part of a greater community. By doing this, teachers have reduced the classroom disruptions and teachers are exhibiting a more supportive and authoritative approach with the students in their classroom. These efforts have released a sense of community and equity by all. Lastly, many of the teachers have incorporated restorative practices in their classroom to resolve conflict as it arrives.

Conclusion

A summation of chapter five reveals the to-be results once all of the strategies and interventions are in place and thriving. A review of the literature regarding organizational change related to in school suspension provided a wide variety of strategies that allow for
a more effective and consistent experience for student who are participants of the ISS program. In the next chapter, I will look deep into each area of change and provide specifics regarding the implementation and practice of these change areas.
SECTION SIX: STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS

Introduction

Specifically in addressing the organizational change plan for the ISS program at Eminence High, four main areas were revised to make the program operate in the benefit of the students and the school. Using the research and data gathered throughout this study, my change plan offers suggestions to the school administration and to district leaders on how to improve the use of ISS so that academic instruction for those students assigned to ISS remains at the quality and consistency that Eminence High students deserve.

Strategies and Actions

Please refer to (Appendix H) for a detailed charted outline of the strategies and actions I have proposed for the improvement of the current ISS program at Eminence High. The chart provides four distinct strategies for enhancement. First surrounds creating an environment in ISS that promotes learning. Second, requires teachers to become data diggers. Third, requires direct instruction to continue when students are in ISS. Lastly, describes how ISS should be a part of the school community and not operate in isolation from the school.

Strategies that I have suggested for Eminence High surround developing a sense of community among the student body to deter and curb the constant behavioral infractions. “Students’ perceptions of their school surroundings shape their response to schooling and their investment in their education” (Taines, 2012, p. 54) Encouragement of all students is important, but especially of those students in ISS. By incorporating restorative practices with students in ISS, conflict resolution skills and social and
emotional learning can occur. The ISS facilitator, restorative practices committee, or school counselor, will work with students and teachers to bring healing and closure to the school community. This simple act can determine if the student re-integrates back into the student body after the offense.

Along with community, it is also important that all stakeholders on campus create environments that imply that it is okay to learn in this area. All classrooms, including the ISS classroom should suggest upon walking in the room that learning is the expectation, encouraged, and acceptable in this space. When students are in ISS, they should expect that they will learn and not have their education halted while in ISS. Manifesting this expectation should remove the stigma that ISS is for catching up on missing work and reviewing. Students have an expectation that they will be present in their core subject classes and participate in the lesson provided for the day. This further helps builds community, because it helps students support each other in the learning process.

Another strategy I have suggested is for administration and teachers to become data diggers. “The proper use of data centered methods in education is a clearly defined and incredibly effective pathway to academic excellence” (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2010, p. xxii). When educators rely on the data they can observe trends and make predictions about ways to correct and close the achievement gap. Similarly, we can use data trends to observe inappropriate behavior occurrences and ISS assignments. Relying on the previous strategy to develop relationship and community with students, will allow opportunity to ask questions surrounded around thought process, feelings and emotions at the time the offense occurred. Again, relying on data, educators can help to eliminate
those triggers or create barriers to prevent the triggers from manifesting in the academic environment.

The last strategy I offer to Eminence high is that administration incorporate technology into every lesson. This is an integral strategy that works well with the other three strategies. This is a natural occurrence in the life of a teenager. “Today’s kids are always multiprocessing – they do several things simultaneously – listen to music, talk on the cell phone, and use the computer, all at the same time” (Brown, 2000, p. 13). This multiprocessing that Brown suggests, is how students’ today learn. It just makes sense that educators should and would take advantage of this opportunity to merge content knowledge with technological advances that students already naturally adapt and respond to positively. Within the Millbrook district, every student has an email and portal account with which students’ can save and receive documents and even access their course textbooks. A campus wide expectation is that when a student receives an ISS consequence, the student’s classroom coursework is uploaded through their portal via google documents. Therefore, students would have access to their work immediately upon entering ISS. The classroom teacher would be able to monitor and track when assignments are completed. This would eliminate classroom teachers relying on the ISS facilitator’s report on whether or not the student completed the work. It also eliminates the need for the teacher to send any work via third party, and run the risk of it not being delivered, or student saying I did not receive it. This option allows the ISS facilitator to have a streamlined process of how students should be obtaining their work.

Specific actions should occur because of my strategy suggestions. Building administrators should work with faculty to incorporate restorative practices in every
classroom including the ISS classroom. Instructional coaches can incorporate restorative practices and teachers can weave these fundamentals into the lesson presented each week. Peer mentoring and mediation programs should be developed and encouraged on campus to help build community and promote positive connections to the school and student body. By using classroom circles educators can assist with trust and relationship building among students and teachers. “When there is trust between students, it creates a social environment in which students can safely risk self-disclosure, authenticity, confrontation, and expressing affection” (Clifford, M. A., & Center for Restorative Process, 2015, p. 14). This action can also include administration and teachers taking a consciously authoritative and supportive role in each students’ life.

Similarly, creating classrooms and student spaces that promote learning is essential. Signage in the rooms should endorse and encourage students to take academic risks and struggle through conflict and frustration. Each classroom should be equipped with technological devices (iPad, Chromebooks, Tablets, etc.) that allow for integration of guided technology into the classroom lesson. Likewise, the expectation among facility needs to be that technology will be a part of every lesson. This means that students who do receive ISS consequently should be able to log in and participate in their class via computer, webcam, skype, zoom, etc. This has to become an instructional practice, norm, and expectation among faculty and students. Continuous direct instruction is the expectation. It should also become expectation and normal practice that within content departments, a rotation list exists, that allows each content area department has representation in the ISS room weekly to answer questions and assist the students with projects or specific assignments not completed via the live session with the classroom.
teacher. Each department chair can create and monitor this list. Instructional coaches, along with Administration will ensure that the list is fair and that compliance is occurring. These students should feel, as much inclusion and support as the students not assigned to ISS because truth be told they probably need it more.

My last action step involves administration leading professional development sessions assisting faculty with technology as well as with data interpretation, analysis, and intervention. “The practices of data driven instruction are inextricably bound up with the process of assessment” (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2010, p. 6). Data can reveal a wealth of information for educators; however, without a solid foundation on how to disaggregate this information, it just remains in its raw form, data. Data that requires a special eye and foundational knowledge of what it all means. Administration can provide internal professional several times a year to faculty as whole group and as departments to ensure all faculty understand how to look at the data they collect. Becoming data diggers as I refer to it, allows educators to look deep into the makings of each students. Not just looking at the test scores, but rather fishing out the patterns and gaps that are blatantly obvious, yet, blindly hidden unless glimpsed with a trained eye.

Conclusion

The four strategies provided for Eminence High school weave together quite eloquently. Each on its own can provide major change in school culture; however, collectively the strategies and action plans can offer faculty, staff, administration, and students, tremendous benefits. It is imperative if Eminence high administrators want to curve the chronic revolving door of behavior infractions, close the achievement gap, and correct the attitude gap, while simultaneously increasing test scores and school grade;
these strategies and action steps outlined can assist. In chapter seven, I address policy implications and this affects my organizational change plan and program evaluation.
SECTION SEVEN: IMPLICATIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

At Eminence High, like many other schools within the district, In School Suspension does not have written policy and procedures outlined for the facilitator. The only expectation of the facilitator is to keep the students quiet and working for the specified time that the students are assigned to ISS. Each school year, hundreds of students serve their consequence in in school suspension and never learn from the alleged behaviors that landed them in ISS in the first place. I believe that a policy should exist that requires procedures be followed regarding teachers and their obligation to still teach and be accountable for the academic advancement of students while in ISS. Just as they sign a contract annually to renew their contracts, an additional contract is provided, where teachers would acknowledge their commitment to all of their students, which would include those who are temporarily removed from their classroom environments. This contract is collected at the start of the school year, and held by the administrator in charge of evaluating said teacher. Likewise, students would sign a similar contract abiding by the rules for the time period specified for them to be in ISS. Student contracts would be housed with the discipline files of the respective student.

The lack of policy and procedural safeguards specifically relate to my program evaluation of Eminence High school and the organizational change plan I proposed, because under the current programming processes, the students participating in ISS are underserved and academically neglected. In my change plan, I outline a plan to assist with this issue and provide structural safeguards to ensure every student who participates in in school suspension will experience the same free and appropriate education
guaranteed to them by the federal government. By bringing to the forefront attention of
all faculty, that regardless of whether the student is in class or not, if he or she is on
campus (i.e. In ISS) there is a commitment to continue with instruction for the day. It is a
message to the students that we will not dismiss and diminish their educational
experience just because they misbehave or mess up. It is a way to continuously provide
opportunities for students to learn and to encourage academic growth, even in reprimand.
The monitoring will occur through the ISS facilitator who will make administration
aware when a student in ISS does not have work available through their portal, or the
teacher was not available when the student logged in to the class.

Policy Statement

Instead of teachers reluctantly sending work to the ISS facilitator, I am proposing
a new policy. The policy change I am recommending is where teachers utilize the
electronic portals and platforms already available, such as Google Classroom, Schoology,
blackboard and or zoom, to engage the student while he or she is in ISS. These are all
platforms currently available through the district’s internet interface that can be used
more frequently in the regular classroom and exclusively in ISS. Each student registered
in the district has an electronic portal and email. Students have the ability to save
documents through their portal into a file with their name. Teachers can access the
students’ files as well if the work is stored there.

Web based interfaces like Google Classroom, Blackboard, and Schoology allow
classwork, homework and instructional material to be shared with students electronically.
It can also serve as a resource for students to refer back to previous discussed material as
needed. Students can download and complete assignments inside of the platform. If
teachers get in the habit of operating their classes and creating their lessons through one of these formats, it is already ready to go, should a student go to ISS. There would not be any extra work or time on the part of the teacher as everything is already online for any student to access. Google Documents is another web-based platform that allows documents and much more to be shared between individuals who may not be in the same space. This is a great resource for teachers to use as well. They can create quizzes, chat rooms and other items to engage students who may not be in the classroom during direct instruction.

Zoom is a video conferencing tool that students can log in to the classroom during their assigned class period and receive instruction as if they were sitting in class. The teachers can email the students with log in information for the session and the student would log in and go from there. The ISS classroom would need laptops or chrome books with video capabilities. As would the teacher also, need a laptop or Chromebook with video ability.

This method keeps the student connected to the classroom teacher, and to the content material. It also allows the teacher to ensure the student has instruction to complete the assignments provided while in ISS. It further allows the student to submit the work electronically to the teacher and alleviates the claim “I did the work, and the facilitator lost it” or other creative variations of why the work was not turned into the teacher. This new implemented procedural policy can ensure that the student continues to receive quality educational services and that he/she is held accountable for the same quality of work, because he/she received the same level of instruction.
I selected in school suspension because of the lack of policies and procedures for the program. The facilitator each year has to create and feel his/her way around trying to make the program structured and discipline enough to promote fear and aversion of the program among the student body. Each year, the ISS facilitator, which is usually a different person than the previous school year, struggles to strike a balance and ensure that the students behave while remaining task oriented and complete assigned work. This continuous conundrum each year leaves Eminence high students at a greater deficit. “Existing in school-suspension programs have great potential for success; however, the way such programs are currently operating, they leave room for much improvement” (Vanderslice, 1999, p. 5). Improvement is necessary if we want to offer a solid educational foundation that helps our students prepare for a society, which is not yet here.

Analysis of Needs

Conduct violations and inappropriate behavior among student body continue to permeate Eminence High. As a result, the recidivism rate of students enrolled in in school suspension year after year continues to grow. Therefore, in this section, I will offer a reason and analysis regarding the need to re-organize and re-structure the current in school suspension program at Eminence High school. I will explore the six distinct areas of analysis: Educational Analysis, Economic Analysis, Social Analysis, Political Analysis, Legal Analysis, and Moral and Ethical Analysis. Through this thorough analysis, I will provide an exhaustive understanding of the problems involved as it related to the recommended policy.
Educational Analysis

While completing an educational analysis of Eminence High school and the current In school suspension program, I am reminded of the purpose and goal of elementary and secondary schools, which is to assist students with development academically, mentally, morally, socially and ethically. The goal of in school suspension is to allow students who violate the code of conduct, to experience a consequence without interrupting the educational experience. “The program attempts to protect the overall learning environment by isolating disruptive students and protects the community by keeping the offending students off the streets” (Vanderslice, 1999, p. 5). In many cases, students whose schools do not operate an in school suspension program are immediately subjected to out of school suspension and all connection to the classroom environment and the instructional content is lost. This leaves these students more vulnerable for criminal activity.

However, in conducting this research it has become apparent that the foundation of the education process and purpose of in school suspension may not be sufficiently fulfilling its expectation with respect to the students in the current in school suspension program. Many of the students’ who participate in the current in school suspension program, rarely receive direct instruction on the information or missing assignments they are expected to complete while in in school suspension. The current ISS facilitator, nor any of the previous facilitators were certified in every subject area needed, which makes it difficult for students to obtain adequate instruction on work that classroom teachers expect to be completed upon a student’s return.
“The development of this policy should be a shared responsibility among administration, faculty, and students. The final foundational component of an in school suspension program is the development of rules and procedures” (Vanderslice, 1999, p. 5). I propose implementation of the policy that requires teachers at Eminence to sign and agree to continue to provide quality instruction to students who are on campus but out of the classroom (i.e., in ISS). This policy requires teachers remain committed to their students’ success and provides a structure and expectation that is beneficial to all participants.

**Economic Analysis**

As stated earlier in this study, the ISS facilitator is an essential part of the effectiveness of the program. At Eminence each year the discussion comes up of whether to keep an instructional allocation or use a support personnel allocation for the ISS facilitator. As it is, the position does not require the facilitator to be a certified teacher, however my experience has revealed that students fair better in ISS when the facilitator possess a teacher certificate. Each year the cost of the allocation becomes an issue. The students in ISS deserve a licensed educator facilitating the classroom. “No matter what in school suspension model is used, the instructor will make or break the concept. Some researchers suggest that instead of serving as sergeant at arms, the adult in charge should assume the role of a supportive resource” (Vanderslice, 1999, p. 6). In chapter six, one of the strategies offered was to train administration and teachers to be authoritative supportive roles in each students’ life. It is important that the facilitator possess these skills to ensure behavior modification can occur.
In addition, with the proposed procedural shift the cost of and maintenance of the technology used (i.e.: computers, software and licenses) will be an impacted factor as well. My procedure does not require the school to implement anything other than what is already in use from the district. Although Eminence tends to work with what we have, often things are broken and never replaced or repaired. I would be, however requiring the school and the district to maintain and keep functioning properly all of the technology related equipment and all of its accessories, which I anticipate and predict would be an incurred economic expenditure. In school suspension would need a class set of chrome books assigned to the classroom. This estimated expense is at $200.00 per computer for a set of 20 computers, with a grand total of $4000.00. The district offers Google Classroom professional development courses for teachers periodically throughout the year. Many of the trainings are outside of the school day, so sub coverage would not be an issue. In addition, the internal professional development department at Eminence high can provide training to teachers during content personalized learning PLC days, which would alleviate the need to have teachers miss days for training.

Social Analysis

Many students lack respect and reverence for the classroom teacher. In schools today, we see students who identify as a parentified child. These children “are placed in the role of an adult to fulfill responsibilities that are normally the obligation of a mother, father, or adult caregiver” (Barker, 2003, p. 315). These students may feel they are equal to adults in the school and have a hard time reverting to the role of a child while in school. “Today’s young people are growing up with a very different relationship to
authority and self-control” (Wagner, 2006, p. 6). Some students are responsible for their own wellbeing and this can cause constant struggle between student and teacher.

In her highly publicized book titled The New Jim Crow, Michelle Alexander explained how “ex-offenders experience an existential angst associated with their permanent social exclusion” (2010, p. 162). I make the comparison that students who have been isolated in their punishment may also return to the learning environment with similar existential angst. First, more than likely they already feel inadequate and academically deficient, and now they are further disconnected from the classroom progression after having several days absent from content material.

The social analysis of this policy change helps to alleviate the social exclusion and feelings of inadequacy when students return to the classroom environment. It also allows student and teacher to develop a better working relationship, which can foster a supportive role and reduce the conflict and apprehension that often exists between students and teachers. The policy change will allow students to continue to receive the support and instruction in spite of the infraction. They can remain connected, instead of ostracized and pushed aside for behavioral or adolescent mistakes.

**Political Analysis**

The political analysis of this policy change is subtle yet can produce blatant results. With the proposed policy change, if the student achievement increases, this would directly align with the school improvement goals and thus improve school grade. This shift for the positive could ignite parental involvement and increased parental and community engagement.
The policy change also depends upon those who have power and influence within the school, who may oppose the new changes. “American public education is highly politicized and becoming more so, with constituencies making demands on the politicians or school board members they elect” (Wagner, et al., 2006, p. 65). Due to the demands, many educators resist change and reject any perception of one more task to complete. Overcoming the political climate within school culture to deflate the naysayers and have this policy implemented with fidelity and effectiveness is a strong challenge that building administration must prepare for.

In addition, the cost of purchasing more Chromebooks specifically for students in ISS may not be a favorable topic. Administration will need to discuss with the School Advisory Committee (SAC) and with the school’s bookkeeper about funds that may be available from either the SAC or Title 1. Nonetheless, administration is going to have to sell this expenditure and expressly confess how the benefits of this expense directly affects students and their academic progression. Administration will be able to see work completion increases, which will increase overall grades, thus affecting student grade point averages rising. Those rising GPA’s allow graduation rates to increase, thus affecting school grade.

**Legal Analysis**

Specifically with regards to students who are enrolled in the special education program at Eminence High, who receive ISS as a consequence, the legal ramifications can become quite an issue. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA), which is the law that dictates the rights of all students enrolled in an ESE program, provide strict guidelines, by which school districts must comply. Under
IDEIA, students are to receive a free and appropriate education. The law also specifies that the accommodations notated on the IEP, should be followed and maintained daily. This mandate does not cease if the student is in school suspension. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) impacted the change and restructuring of IDEIA law. Between the two mandates, schools have a higher level of accountability to do no harm and to reduce the achievement disparities that persist between its most vulnerable population and its high performers.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General education students</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Students (ESE)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners (ELL)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/ Hispanic/ Multi-Racial</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian / White / Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2017-2018 school year, 52 exceptional education students participated in ISS. Fifty-two students who, according to IDEA, are mandated to receive specific accommodations and services according to their IEP. In that same year, 12 English language learners with active limited English proficiency plans (LEP) also lost accommodations and services as a result of being a part of in school suspension.

**Moral and Ethical Analysis**

The school to prison pipeline is a term that describes students who struggle through their respective educational system, having exhibited high achievement deficits from their peers and extensive suspension history, then ultimately end up in prison or jail. Researchers for years now have completed studies to show how the over use of zero-tolerance discipline tactics and subjective and bias disciplinary consequences have affected minority and/or low income students. “Despite the strong relationships that exist
between troubled educational histories and subsequent arrest and incarceration, the specific ways in which schools may either contribute to or prevent, the flow of students into the criminal justice system remains largely unexplored” (Wald & Losen, 2003, p. 4). Although research is still lagging in expressing the ways in which school mimic and or contribute future incarceration rates; the parallels to time spent in jail and time spent in school suspension are uncanny. I’ve even had students tell me it is school jail.

Ethically, there is a responsibility of all educators to do no harm. It is explicitly documented in the code of ethics each educator signed upon accepting the job. Although ISS is typically reverenced as the lesser of the alternative OSS. It is important to realize that it is a program, not a place. The ISS room should not be used as a holding area. (Vanderslice, 1999, p. 5). As this study has concluded, the implications from not having direct instruction and the isolation have proven ineffective in reducing the inappropriate behaviors and reducing the recidivism rate.

Morally, having the insight and the conviction that allowing students to go without direct instruction, simply because they misbehaved is wrong. Our educational system has to identify those predatory rules and or policies that target at risk and underserved students. Again, although at its surface, ISS appears to be a solution with great benefit, once evaluated and reviewed, you will easily find that its procedural safeguards only protect the teacher and unintentionally inflicts more harm on its participants. As revealed in this study, this behavior causes a cycle of dysfunction and those students who are most at risk are the ones that suffer on this journey to failure.
Implications for Staff and Community Relationships

The proposed policy impacts school staff relationships in that the mindset and unconscious feelings towards inappropriate behavior and conflict has to be addressed by educators from the onset. “While Brown v. Board of Education placed the technical burden of ensuring that all children received an equal opportunity to education, it did not solve for the adaptive work of recognizing the micro and macro practices of biases that are intertwined in individual educators and the systems that they serve” (UnboundEd, n.d.). Unchecked bias and unconscious maltreatment and disdain will work as antagonist to the work that the policy intends to cover. Administrators, teachers and support personnel all have to experience a level of consciousness about themselves and the unresolved maladaptive thought processes that they may carry. Building capacity in teachers and in their abilities to manage classroom behavior, conduct courageous conversations and their ability to confront the conflict as it irrupts will be the catalyst for culture change school wide and decreased discipline referrals. Along with the teachers, the ISS facilitator, school counselors and administration all have an obligation to take a stand and assist with ensuring that unchecked bias from any staff member is not being taken out on this vulnerable population. Students can receive ISS for a myriad of offenses. At the end of the day, it is the responsibility of the schools Administration to continuously keep in the forefront of the minds of everyone on campus our oath to do no harm. This can be done seamlessly throughout the school year through professional development and ongoing staff trainings.

Students are a reflection of the families and communities in which they come from. The social and cultural make up of a neighborhood, dictates the communication
and interaction observed between families and schools. However, “school is just one context of students’ lives, and educators are unlikely to reduce the disruptive or delinquent behavior of children without the help of families and the community” (Sheldon & Epstein, 2016, p. 21). The policy proposed relies on educators at Eminence High to cultivate and develop community and parental relationships in an effort to reduce and even eliminate the inappropriate and disruptive behaviors. “Sanders (1996) found that school safety increased when community members were involved with after school programs, community patrols to make sure students arrived to school safely, and mentoring at-risk students” (Sheldon & Epstein, 2016, p. 10). As a measure of good faith to promote school wide culture and a sense of belonging the school leaders must embrace the community and allow community leaders and influencers to be a part of the “spheres of influence” that shape our students and their identities. School administration should consider ways to reach out and personally invite parents or guardians of students who repeatedly frequent ISS to come to school. Scheduling a multi-tiered system of support meeting with all teachers and school site support staff, may help parents to feel supported and a part of their child’s academic success.

The policy implications identified for other stakeholders include the Millbrook School District, and the support and resources the district provides to Eminence High. It is unfair for school districts to hold principals accountable for improved student results; when the districts themselves fail to provide necessary resources needed to succeed. School principals should have the authority to select staff and remove unproductive staff, and provide technical assistance, professional development and coaching to address problems as seen on their campuses. In addition, it is my belief that school principals
should have the opportunity to implement proven practices, that are researched based and have the potential to correct the issues present on their respective campuses.

District leaders must establish “reciprocal accountability,” holding principals accountable, but also holding themselves accountable for providing or not providing the support. (Bottoms & Schmidt-Davis, 2010, p. 21). In the past five years, I have seen three principals serve at Eminence High. With each change of the guard, those enthusiastic principals have tried to make changes and initiated committees and faculty to lead the charge, only for district leaders to either, denounce the effort of the change initiative or refuse to provide support and resources for the initiative to succeed.

District leaders must encourage and support building principals in their efforts to implement change within their respective schools. Without the support and backing of the district, building principals lack the confidence and creditability to evoke change within the school community and within the local community.

With the change plan and policy implications derived from this study, teachers and students are additional stakeholders who will be impacted and affected the most. The change and implementation process will depend on their level of investment in the program change and how well they implement the procedures. Eminence High’s funding, will be affected by the change plan. Therefore, the bookkeeper and the schools internal budget will be consulted to ensure that the proposed expenses can be derived from some funding source as well as maintained for years to come.

Lastly, the changes proposed will affect the information technology department. The proposed changes will all depend on the ability to obtain a class set of computers for
the ISS classroom and IT’s ability to format and prepare those computers for access in the ISS classroom.

**Conclusion**

In chapter seven, I have outlined a policy that I believe will benefit both school and student. The policy requires teachers at Eminence to acknowledge and commit to serve all students always. It is just that simple. I want it to be clear that just because the student was removed from your classroom environment temporarily that the responsibility and obligation to educate them during that timeframe has diminished. The policy I recommend ensures that teachers, administrators, parents, and most of all students, know what is obligated and expected when a student becomes a participant in the school’s in school suspension program. This chapter highlighted a need analysis for educational, economic, social, political, legal and moral and ethical issues.

The educational analysis identified in this policy relates to opportunity for students to learn from their mistakes and still have the same educational experience as their peers. This component is key not only to the academic success of the student, but also to the social and emotional psyche of all student participants.

Within the economic analysis, I explain the need for the monetary funding to ensure that students in ISS receive the same educational experience as the students seated in class. These funds allow Eminence High to purchase a class set of Chromebooks for students in ISS. This is a necessity to implementation of the policy and its success.

Highlights of the social analysis surround efforts to ensure students who participate in ISS, keep their emotional and social wellbeing intact while separated from their classroom environment. Restorative practices and school counselor interventions
can help secure students and their emotions. Again, providing a continuity of services to all students, especially this population who need conflict resolution training the most.

Reviewing the political analysis revealed that all stakeholders will need to see the value in supporting these students. It is easy to defend not assisting those who have violated the rules. However, administration and the educational leaders on campus must remain vigilant in silencing the naysayers. They must illuminate the value in this group to ensure this vulnerable population is not overlooked.

The legal analysis highlighted the IDEIA law and its federal mandate placed on all school districts. In regard to ISS, students under IDEIA cannot just be “housed”. IDEIA students must be educated and allowed access to educational material. In regard to Eminence High and this study, this mandate is for all students. We can no longer accept that the students are in a holding location to complete their time in ISS. They must continue to learn and receive an education.

Lastly, the moral and ethical analysis described in this chapter, points to the unconscious bias that is present in everyone. However, school administrators have to be conscious of this bias and work tirelessly to ensure that faculty and staff operate in a professional manner and do not cause harm.

The latter portion of chapter seven sums up the understanding of how the policy change will affect stakeholders involved. District leaders, the school principals, ISS facilitator, teachers, bookkeeper, and the district IT department were acknowledged as the stakeholders who will be impacted primarily. These individuals or departments ability to accept the ideal that this policy change will benefit the students at Eminence High will determine the future success of the program.
SECTION EIGHT: CONCLUSION

Introduction

In conclusion, the issue that is the theme of this dissertation was the effectiveness of the in school suspension program at Eminence High school. The issues that morphed from this research, was in regard to student participants of ISS and their ability, obligation and right to receive direct instruction. This theme directly relates to student learning because school is the one place under obligation to teach, develop, and cultivate young minds. It is nearly impossible to learn and become academically astute when you’re not present when academic instruction is occurring. Students who repeatedly miss direct instruction time further exacerbate their academic deficits and lower their chances for on time high school graduation. “In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right that must be made available on equal terms. Chief Justice Earl Warren, Brown v. Board of Education (1954)” (UnboundEd, n.d.). In other words, every student is afforded the basic right of a free and appropriate education, regardless of unsavory behavior, conflicts, or attendance issues.

Discussion

The purpose of this program evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of the current in school suspension program at Eminence High School. In determining the answer to this question, I collected survey and interview data from personnel at Eminence High school. In addition, I collected discipline data from the school’s data storage source to compare with the staff reported data to identify trends and patterns.
This process has addressed my purpose because I have been able to research, revealed the procedures, and protocols that are evident in ISS. These data have led to the conclusion that ISS operates in isolation from other school activities and that no one is quite clear on the purpose of ISS. Many referred to is as a place where consequences are served. Others see it as a place where behavior modification and correction can take place.

I have addressed my goals throughout this program evaluation process by evaluating student learning and identifying how ISS influences student behavior. In conducting the interviews and surveys, the data revealed that during ISS participation, students might have their education halted. During this time, most students work independently absent from direct content instruction. Classroom teachers provide assignments; and it is the student’s responsibility to complete the work. Very little instruction or assistance is provided to the student while in ISS. Many students may spend on average two to four days in ISS. That is a long time for a student who is already academically deficient and unmotivated to teach him or herself.

My organizational change plan addressed the issues raised in my program evaluation after analyzation and review of the data. The organizational change plan required the use of technology to allow students to remain connected to the course content. This ensures ISS participants would be able to interact with the teacher and class and receive the same instruction that the students in the class are receiving. In addition, the organizational change plan adds restorative practices within ISS and non-ISS classrooms to allow rule breakers to remain connected to their peers. In the past, the offence is committed, the student serves their ISS time, and then they return to the classroom, the offence occurred. There lacks any
process to re-integrate that student back to the classroom environment. During this process, the social and emotional psyche of a teenager remains broken. Without these restorative practices, occurring in and outside of ISS the offence is not acknowledged and the school community of which the student belongs cannot be repaired. The use of restorative practices, such as restorative circles, social emotional learning, conflict resolution and restorative justice in conjunction with meeting with the school counselor allows this organizational change plan to help address the issue of ISS operating in isolation and the uncertainty of what the goal of ISS really is.

My policy for which I advocated addresses the issues revealed in the evaluation of ISS and in the organizational change plan. The major issue raised from program evaluation and the organizational change plan from the teachers’ perspective was the lack of work completion and or cheating while students were in ISS. The primary issue raised from administrations’ perspective surrounded the teachers’ not providing work for the students to do while in ISS to keep them busy. Through my evaluation and policy recommendation, the policy derived appears to solve both problems to the benefit of the student. The use of restorative practices helps to decrease the secondary issue raised by teachers and administration, which was repeat offenders in ISS and increasing recidivism rates. In addition, it also addresses the lack of school connection and commitment by students who participate in ISS. Restorative practices allow the student to learn and manage feelings and emotions that often manifest in behavioral outburst. By allowing the offender to come face to face with their offender, apologize and hear from the victim of how this impacted them, the offender is afforded the opportunity to learn crucial social and emotional skills, problem solving skills, and conflict resolution skills. All needed
skills that survey participants thought were occurring in ISS, but as the data revealed were not actually occurring.

**Leadership Lessons**

As a leader, I have learned that ultimately student safety, growth and development is the priority. Although safety is a foremost concern in schools today, as it should be with the recent climate of this country as it relates to school shootings. Still, at the essence of what we do, we have to keep student growth and development at the forefront.

The leadership lesson that I have garnered from this study is that although in school suspension, has always been thought to be a much better alternative than out of school suspension, my endeavor for the truth, revealed that it could be just as harmful as an out-of-school suspension. Students’ assigned OSS are expected to disengaged and be unproductive while on suspension. What is not expected is that the same could occur with a student assigned to ISS and coming to school every day.

As a leader, change is inevitable. Wagner, et al, (2006) suggests that as change leaders we must “choose a priority and stay relentlessly focused on it” (p. 202). In reviewing the school improvement plan, I noticed that in the past five years ISS has never been an area of focus. Although the areas addressed in the school improvement plan does touch most of the students who participate in ISS, the school has never thought to address, evaluate and/or improve the practices that occur in ISS. It is my belief that if strategic planning were to occur with ISS, then it could pose as more of a positive asset to the school wide culture.

Another leadership lesson learned throughout this study was about changing school culture. “Culture is reflected in behavior, attitudes, and beliefs of individuals and
groups” (Reeves, 2009, p. 37). As a leader seeking to effectively change the culture, attitude, and climate, of the school my behavior, attitudes, and beliefs must reflect the desired behaviors as well. Students in ISS can fall victim to ISS. “More often than not, students who are suspended from school do not receive assistance with academic, social, or emotional issues that contributed to the incident for which the student was suspended” (Raffaele Mendez, (2003), p. 25). Direct instruction is non-existent, they are isolated from general population of students, and they are expected to sit in silence if there is not any work for them to do. It sends the message to students in ISS that as children they cannot mess up and make mistakes.

Therefore, as the leader, I have learned now that ISS has to become just as important as the English and Math class curriculum. Each subject area has a blueprint and a curriculum to follow. So should ISS. This may seem unimportant to teachers of upper level and advanced placement teachers. However, the reality is that it’s just as important for those students as well, because they are a part of the school culture and from time to time, those students receive ISS as well.

Observations and learning walk-throughs should occur frequently and the expectation has to be that every time administrators enter the ISS room, students are engaged, learning, developing and growing. This is our mandate. Students in ISS need to know that although they made a bad choice, they can recover. They can develop, learn and grow through this experience. They have to know that the supportive faculty and staff are here to help them through this without judgement and bias.

The knowledge I obtained through this process will I now implement in my advocating for students, with teachers, parents and administration. I will become more
diligent in my conversations with students, about the expectation of what is going to happen in ISS. Lastly, I will be sure to express to the ISS facilitator, the need to make learning a priority in the ISS classroom as well.

**Conclusion**

In school suspension or in school jail? Which one are our schools replicating day after day for one hundred and eighty days of the year? I have heard of students returning in August on the first day of a new school year and return to in school suspension. Are we as educators, in the business of correcting character or issuing out consequences? What is the priority when students violate the code of conduct?

It is easy to assume that by assigning a student to ISS for a code of conduct violation that miraculously, behavior modification and corrective action is going to occur. The reality is that this does not just happen. It takes thoughtful, caring, and understanding educational leaders, with vision, foresight and compassion to move these students from a path of disorder and destruction onto a path of purpose and promise. It takes a program that is determined to coach the student through their indiscretion and mend the relationship between the student and the school community.

Simultaneously, these students must receive an education. Just because they have to serve a consequence for their indiscretion, does not mean that their education has to cease. Similar to jail, ISS can become a holding cell, where students just sit around and watch the clock. Coursework may or may not be provided, however, regardless, they must sit quietly and if there is not any work for them to complete, they watch the wall and the clock. What is this teaching the student about the issue that landed them in ISS in the first place? Behavior Modification programs coupled with restorative practices must
be taught in ISS in conjunction with their academic work. With all the technology available today to communicate, why are students still sitting in ISS watching the wall, when they could be on a computer watching their teacher and receiving direct instruction?

Today the field of education is very complex. It has grown from its origins in a one-room schoolhouse to a conglomerate entity operating often times on a business model. “Students’ perceptions of their school surroundings shape their response to schooling and their investment in their education” (Taines, 2012, p. 54). Students need to know, just as they did back in the one room schoolhouse, that the educators that surround them every day, truly care for their wellbeing. Dr. James Comer is coined for the phrase, “no significant learning occurs without significant relationship,” and this statement could not be more accurate than in these current days of education. A genuine level of compassion is the only way students who often operate as such because of the victimization received by society and school, will have the opportunity to grow and develop. “School connectedness; defined as a student’s feeling part of and cared for at school - is linked with lower levels of substance abuse, violence, suicide attempts, pregnancy, and emotional distress” (Wald and Losen, [2003], p. 5). As educators and as school leaders our job is to increase school connectedness. Students need to make mistakes and mess up, it is how they learn, grow and develop. The educators in the building have to be supportive and offer guidance, skill training and unbiased re-direction along with academic instruction. It is the only way that school discipline issues will decrease and further deter school disruptions.
Eminence High school has recognized the unique challenges it faces, and has evaluated its current in school suspension program. Its purpose was to determine the effectiveness of the current in school suspension program. The results of my research and program evaluation has yielded valuable information and confirmation of the need for such a re-structure, re-alignment, and re-organization of the current in school suspension program in order to ensure it is servicing its students effectively.
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Appendix A: Informed Consent, Adult Participant Survey

My name is Monique Griffin-Gay, and I am a doctoral student at National Louis University, Tampa, Florida. I am asking for your consent to voluntarily participate in my dissertation project. The study is entitled: In school suspension: Effective or Futile. The purpose of the study is evaluate whether the current in school suspension program is working as intended with the maximum benefit to the students and the school.

My project will address the procedure and protocol for assigning in school suspension at Leesburg High school. I will use the data I collect to understand the process and changes that may possibly need to be made regarding in school suspension.

You may participate in this study by signing this consent form indicating that you understand the purpose of the study and agree to participate in a printed survey that I will give to you, to be completed and returned using specific instructions I will include at the end of the survey. It should take approximately 15 minutes for you to complete the survey. All information collected in the survey reflects your experience and opinion as a teacher, administrator, or parent having a student who was at some point during this study; involved in the in school suspension program at Leesburg High school.

Your participation is voluntary and you may discontinue your participation at any time. I will keep the identity of you, the school, the district, and all participants confidential, as it will not be attached to the data and I will use pseudonyms for all participants in the report. Only I will have access to all of the survey data, which I will keep in a locked cabinet at my home or on a password protected hard drive for up to 5 years after the completion of this study, at which time I will shred all survey data. Participation in this study does not involve any physical or emotional risk beyond that of everyday life. While you are likely to not have any direct benefit from being in this research study, your taking part in this study may contribute to our better understanding of the in school suspension program and its procedures at your school and what changes, if any, need to be made.

While the results of this study may be published or otherwise reported to scientific bodies, your identity will in no way be revealed. You may request a copy of this completed study by contacting me at mgriffingay@my.nl.edu.

In the event you have questions or require additional information, you may contact me at: mgriffingay@my.nl.edu; or my personal email address creative1consulting@gmail.com. If you have any concerns of questions before or during participation that you feel I have not addressed, you may contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Carol A. Burg, email: cburg@nl.edu or the NLU’s Institutional Research Review Board: Dr. Shaunti Knauth, NLU IRRB Chair, shaunti.knaauth@nl.edu, 224.233.2328, National Louis University IRRB Board, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60603.

Thank you for your participation.

______________________________
Participant Name (Please Print)

______________________________    ______________
Participant Signature                      Date
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Monique Griffin-Gay

Researcher Name (Please Print)

____________________________________

Researcher Signature

____________________________________

Date
Appendix B: Teacher Survey

Please read each question and circle the number that corresponds to your answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most Times</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) When you write a discipline referral on a student, does the consequence result in the student usually receiving ISS as the consequence?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Is there communication to notify you when your students are assigned ISS as a consequence?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) As the teacher of record for a student assigned to ISS, do you visit the ISS room to meet with your student and provide instruction?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) When students are assigned ISS are the missing assignments and materials provided to the student while they are in ISS?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) When students are assigned to ISS, are teachers aware of what the rules are for makeup work and students getting caught up after being assigned to ISS?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the student?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the teacher?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Do your students who have been assigned ISS in the past typically get re-assigned to ISS within 30 days of being dismissed?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Do students who return from ISS typically have all of the missing work completed?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions:</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) The use of ISS for student discipline consequences allows students to remain connected to the content material learned in the classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Although student behavior violations are assigned ISS as a consequence, inappropriate student behavior has not decreased.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Teachers within my school perceive ISS as an effective behavioral intervention.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) I feel students who misbehave should serve out of school suspension (OSS) rather than in school suspension (ISS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) I feel repeat offenders/participants of ISS program is the greatest challenge of this program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Classroom Teachers and the ISS facilitation teacher collaborate in an effort to benefit the students in the ISS program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please read each statement and circle the number that corresponds to your answer.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16) In your opinion the use of the ISS program has improved school behavior school wide.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) I feel that the current ISS program at my school should be discontinued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) I am able to notice an immediate positive behavior change from students who return to my class from ISS.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) What is working well with the ISS program in your school?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
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20) What is not working well with the ISS program in your school?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

21) What are the challenges with the current ISS program in your school?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

22) How can we address these challenges? Please be specific.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

23) Please provide three things that you would like to see change about the current ISS program.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

24) What are your views regarding students being able to complete their missing work while in ISS?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix C: Administrator Survey

*Please read each question and circle the number that corresponds to your answer*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most Times</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Would you say that communication to notify teachers of when their students are assigned to ISS as a consequence is consistent?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Do you as the administrator on campus visit the ISS room to see these students assigned?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Have students who have been assigned ISS in the past typically get re-assigned to ISS within 30 days of being dismissed?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I am able to notice an immediate positive behavior change from students who return to class from ISS.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Students who return from ISS typically have all of the missing work completed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) The use of ISS for student discipline consequences allows students to remain connected to the content material learned in the classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Although student behavior violations are assigned ISS as a consequence, inappropriate student behavior has not decreased?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Teachers within my school perceive ISS as an effective behavioral intervention.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I feel students who misbehave should serve out of school suspension (OSS) rather than in school suspension (ISS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) I feel repeat offenders/participants of ISS program is the greatest challenge of this program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Classroom Teachers and the ISS facilitation teacher collaborate, in an effort to benefit the students in the ISS program?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read each statement and circle the number that corresponds to your answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) Have you ever assigned a student to ISS at your current school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Is there an expectation that the missing assignments and materials will be provided to the student while they are in ISS?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Would you say that the teachers of students assigned to ISS understand the procedure for make-up and missing assignments from the students assigned to ISS?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the student?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Are the procedures outlined for ISS beneficial to the teacher?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) In your opinion the use of the ISS program has improved school behavior school wide.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) I feel that the current ISS program at my school should be discontinued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) What is working well with the ISS program in your school?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

20) What is not working well with the ISS program in your school?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

21) What are the challenges with the current ISS program in your school?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
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22) How can we address these challenges? Please be specific.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

23) Please provide three things that you would like to see change about the current ISS program. Explain Each.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

24) What are your views regarding students being able to complete their missing work while in ISS?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
Appendix D: Informed Consent, Adult Participant Interview

My name is Monique Griffin-Gay, and I am a doctoral student at National Louis University, Tampa, Florida. I am asking for your consent to voluntarily participate in my dissertation project. The study is entitled: In school suspension: Effective or Futile. The purpose of the study is evaluate whether the current in school suspension program is working as intended with the maximum benefit to the students and the school.

My project will address the procedure and protocol for assigning in school suspension at Leesburg High school. I will use the data I collect to understand the process and changes that may possibly need to be made regarding in school suspension.

You may participate in this study by signing this Consent form indicating that you understand the purpose of the interviews and agree to participate in two 30-minute interviews, with possibly up to 5 email exchanges in order clarify any questions I may have regarding your interview data. All information collected in the interviews reflects your experience and opinion as a teacher, administrator, or parent having a student who was at some point during this study; involved in the in school suspension program at Leesburg High school.

Your participation is voluntary and you may discontinue your participation at any time. I will keep the identity of the school and all participants confidential, as it will not be attached to the data and I will use pseudonyms for all participants. Only I will have access to all of the interview tapes and transcripts, and field notes, which I will keep in a locked cabinet at my home or on a password protected hard drive. Participation in this study does not involve any physical or emotional risk beyond that of everyday life. While you are likely to not have any direct benefit from being in this research study, your taking part in this study may contribute to our better understanding of the in school suspension program and its procedures at your school and what changes, if any, need to be made.

While the results of this study may be published or otherwise reported to scientific bodies, your identity will in no way be revealed. You may request a copy of this completed study by contacting me at mgriffingay@my.nl.edu.

In the event you have questions or require additional information, you may contact me via email mgriffingay@my.nl.edu; or my personal email address creative1consulting@gmail.com. If you have any concerns of questions before or during participation that you feel I have not addressed, you may contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Carol A. Burg, email: cburg@nl.edu; or the National-Louis Institutional Research Review Board: Dr. Shaunti Knauth, NLU IRRB Chair, shaunti.knauth@nl.edu, 224.233.2328, National Louis University IRRB Board, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL  60603.

Thank you for your participation.

_______________________________________
Name (Please Print)

_______________________________________    ________
Signature                                   Date
Monique Griffin-Gay

Researcher Name (Please Print)

_____________________________________    ______________

Researcher Signature                                                Date
Appendix E: Interview Questions, Faculty, Staff, & Administrators

1. What is your job role at this school:
   a. Faculty _______
   b. Staff _______
   c. Administrator _______

2. What do you perceive as working well with the current in school suspension program at your High School? Explain
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________

3. What do you perceive as NOT working well with the current in school suspension program at your High School? Explain
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________

4. What do you perceive as the biggest challenge with the current ISS Program at your High School?
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________

5. What would you suggest as ways to improve the ISS program at your High School?
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________

6. Has ISS improved school wide behavior among students? Why, or why not?
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
7. What procedures are in place to ensure students who receive ISS are given the missing work from their teacher of record?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

8. In your opinion what is the goal of ISS?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

9. In your opinion how does the use of ISS directly and indirectly impact its participants?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

10. In your opinion how does the use of ISS directly and indirectly impact the school and the student body as a whole?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

11. To what extent is ISS effective in achieving its goal in your opinion?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

12. How can ISS become more effective in your opinion?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix F: Baseline AS IS 4 C’s Analysis

Context
- Low economic status student population
- 75% F/R lunch
- Attendance is a huge issue at the school
- High teacher turnover annually

Culture
- ISS not viewed as a deterrent for code of conduct violations
- Many teachers do not have a relationship or connection with students, which exacerbates discipline issues
- Students fall further behind in learning gains without direct instruction
- Teachers not motivated to produce makeup work for student assigned to ISS

Competencies
- Teachers lack needed relationship with student to deter classroom disruptions
- Many teachers unwilling to follow Behavior Tracking System to properly overt inappropriate and unnecessary code of conduct violations
- Personal biases about students and behavior prevent objectivity in dealing with student and their academic needs

Conditions
- Code of conduct violations prevalent
- Discipline issues take precedence over academic growth
- Administration inundated with discipline issues from repeat offenders
- ISS becomes alternative classroom for ESE students who cannot exceed 10 days suspended annually

Numerous discipline issues warrant in school suspension as a consequence of code of conduct violations, which affects student achievement

Baseline AS IS 4 C’s Analysis for In School Suspension Program
Appendix G: Baseline TO BE 4 C’s Analysis

Context
- Low economic status student population
- 75% F/R lunch
- Attendance is on the rise
- Teacher retention annually is on the rise

Culture
- ISS viewed as deterrent for code of conduct violations
- Teachers & administrators have authoritative & supportive relationship with students, which reduces discipline issues
- Students feel academic pressure to be successful as part of a collective community, not as a silo
- Teachers provide instruction and assignments via school based technology

Competencies
- Teachers build communal relationships with students
- Many teachers reduced classroom interruptions by taking the supportive authoritative approach
- Teachers incorporated restorative practices within classrooms to work out conflict and disagreements as they occur

Discipline issues are sparse to nonexistent. Students self-correct for inappropriate behavior or peers mediation circles suffice as consequences for most code of conduct violations

Conditions
- Code of conduct violations declining
- Discipline issues no longer affect academic growth and instruction
- Administration operates as instruction leaders and visit classroom including ISS classrooms
- ISS is a viable classroom where direct instruction occurs for ALL students
- Peer mentoring occurs between students

Baseline TO BE 4 C’s Analysis for In school Suspension Program
### Appendix H: Strategies and Actions Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Action</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create an environment that implies its ok to learn in ISS.</td>
<td>Decorate the ISS classroom to encourage and promote learning through the consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- signage in the room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- technology accessible in the room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- facilitator demeanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop teachers to become Data Diggers!</td>
<td>Teachers whose students repeatedly frequent ISS become data experts on these students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reviewing academic history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identifying achievement gaps from assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an expectation that teachers incorporate technology into every lesson.</td>
<td>- Reviewing discipline issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Instruction provided to students while they are in ISS consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Offer teachers continuous professional development on technology and its use in academic lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Students use electronic devices (laptop, chrome books, desktops, iPad) to connect to classroom during assigned ISS time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teachers visit their students in ISS to encourage work completion and assist with questions and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a school wide culture of community.</td>
<td>Ensuring that ISS does not operate in isolation to other programs occurring at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Incorporate restorative practices in every classroom including ISS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop a peer mentoring/mediation program that provides contact and interaction with ISS participants regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Encourage the use of classroom circles in classrooms inside and outside of ISS to build community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Train administration and teachers to take an authoritative supportive role in each students life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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