



1981

An Analysis of Student Suspension Factors in Relationship to School Board Policies and Other Selected Variables

Dorothy Petak
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Petak, Dorothy, "An Analysis of Student Suspension Factors in Relationship to School Board Policies and Other Selected Variables" (1981). *Dissertations*. 2009.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2009

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1981 Dorothy Petak

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT SUSPENSION FACTORS IN
RELATIONSHIP TO SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES AND
OTHER SELECTED VARIABLES

by

Dorothy Petak

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

January

1981

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Robert Monks and Dr. Jasper Valenti for their expert guidance, support and encouragement provided throughout the course of this study. A special thanks is due to Dr. Melvin Heller, the Chairman of her dissertation committee for his invaluable assistance, not only with the dissertation, but for his delightful sense of humor that transformed so many of his classes as a Professor of Educational Administration, into joyous occasions as well as learning experiences.

The author further wishes to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Dr. Morven Ngaiyaye for his help in the design of the study, and Dr. James Carpenter for help provided in the analysis of the data, and interpretation of the statistical results that made the completion of this study possible.

In addition, the author is especially grateful to her husband, Hymen, for his patience, understanding and moral support.

VITA

The author, Dorothy Petak, is the daughter of Meyer and Pearl Moscowitz. She was born July 16, 1928 in Chicago, Illinois, and is the proud mother of a son, Steven, and a daughter, Karen, who are both medical doctors..

She received her elementary education at Hibbard elementary school in Chicago, Illinois, and her secondary education at John Marshall High School, also in Chicago, where she graduated with high honors, in 1946.

In June of 1949, the author graduated from Roosevelt University, receiving a Bachelor of Science degree with a major in Biology. In April 1966, she obtained a Master of Arts degree in Biology from Northeastern University in Chicago.

The author has been an employee of the Chicago Board of Education for twenty-eight years having served as an elementary school teacher, high school biology teacher, high school assistant principal, and as principal of the Howe Elementary School, her current position.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | ii |
| VITA | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| CONTENTS OF APPENDICES | viii |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Purpose of the Study | 4 |
| The General Plan and Analytical Methodology | 7 |
| Reviewing Related Literature | 13 |
| The Investigation | 14 |
| Chapter Summary | 18 |
| Organization of the Study | 20 |
| II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE | 22 |
| Suspension Policies--Legal Background | 22 |
| Suspension Policies--Legal Background, Chicago Public Schools | 67 |
| The Impact of Court and Legal Decisions on School Personnel | 76 |
| Alternatives to Suspension | 91 |
| Alternatives to Suspension--Legal Implications | 99 |
| Suspension--Some Potentially Related Variables | 103 |
| III. PRESENTATION OF DATA | 114 |
| Collection of Data | 114 |
| Statistical Treatment | 116 |
| Statistical Analysis of Data | 116 |
| Significant and Non-Significant Results | 118 |
| Chapter Summary | 163 |

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES | 165 |
| Introduction | 165 |
| Pilot Study | 167 |
| Analysis of Data Derived from the Mailed Questionnaire, FIRO-B Test and Other Sources | 179 |
| Summary of Questionnaire Responses | 187 |
| Post-Questionnaire Interview Results | 188 |
| In-Depth Analysis of Suspension Variables | 195 |
| A Comparison of Two High Schools with Similar Characteristics but Differing Suspension Rates | 249 |
| Chapter Summary | 260 |
| V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 262 |
| The Problem | 262 |
| Purpose of the Study | 264 |
| The Procedure | 265 |
| Major Findings | 266 |
| Conclusions | 269 |
| Recommendations for Further Research | 272 |
| Recommendations for Principals | 273 |
| REFERENCES | 275 |
| APPENDIX A | 280 |
| APPENDIX B | 289 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. T-Test, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools for the Five Year Period, 1972-73 through 1976-77 | 121 |
| 2. T-Test, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools that Answered the Mailed Questionnaire and those that Failed to Answer the Mailed Questionnaire | 127 |
| 3. T-Test, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools where Teachers were Aware of Article 30 in the Board/Union Contract | 129 |
| 4. T-Test, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools Having a Student Behavior Code and Those that had no Code | 132 |
| 5. T-Test, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools Having a Teacher Handbook and Those that had no Handbook | 134 |
| 6. T-Test, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools Having Frequent Inservice Sessions Relating to Discipline and Those Having Few Inservice Sessions | 136 |
| 7. ANOVA, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools with Enriched, Moderately Enriched and Basic Curricula | 140 |
| 8. ANOVA, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools with Mixed Racial Groups | 142 |
| 9. T-Test, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools with Predominantly Black Students and Schools with Mixed Races | 144 |
| 10. T-Test, A Comparison of Mean Suspension Rates Between Chicago Public High Schools with Principals who Approve of Suspension and those who Disapprove of Suspension | 148 |
| 11. Pearson Correlation Coefficient, A Comparison of FIRO-B Scores Between Forty Principals of Chicago Public High Schools | 150 |

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 12. T-Test, A Comparison of FIRO-B Total Scores Between Principals with Moderate Scores and Principals with Low Scores | 154 |
| 13. ANOVA, The Relationship between Type of Curriculum and Poverty Level in Chicago Public High Schools | 158 |
| 14. ANOVA, The Relationship between Total Score Earned by Chicago Public High School Principals on the FIRO-B and Type of Curriculum | 159 |
| 15. Interaction Analysis, A Two Way Analysis Between Principal Approval and Inservice Training Compared to Suspension Rates in Chicago Public High Schools . . . | 160 |
| 16. Interaction Analysis, A Two Way Interaction Analysis Relating the Variables of Inservice and Approval in Predominantly Black Schools | 162 |
| 17. Suspension Rates of Schools with No Inservice Sessions Relating to Discipline | 181 |

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX A Mailed Questionnaire and Chart of 57 Chicago Public Schools | 280 |
| I. Mailed Questionnaire | 281 |
| II. Summary of Data Collected for 57 Chicago Public High Schools | 285 |
| APPENDIX B Letters | 289 |
| I. Letter from School Board Official | 290 |
| II. Cover Letter Mailed to Chicago Public School Principals . | 291 |
| III. Followup Letter Mailed to Chicago Public School Principals | 292 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent court rulings in the area of student suspension and the increasing number concerning successful lawsuits brought against schools by suspended students, as well as the recent interest exhibited by HEW, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for keeping accurate statistics on the number of students suspended by schools, all point to the need for school superintendents, principals and other school personnel, to take a closer look at their respective school policies, rules and practices concerning student suspension.

An examination of the literature indicates that little has been done in the way of identification of factors related to school suspensions. Studies concerning student rights and articles in educational journals and newspapers concerning the topic, concentrate upon possible legal effects of various court decisions upon school administrators. Upon perusing the literature it was ascertained that few research studies have been conducted that might identify factors that have a relationship to suspension rates in schools.

Writing in the Phi Delta Kappan of December, 1974, Flygare wrote:¹

¹Flygare, Thomas, "Two Suspension Cases the Supreme Court Must Decide," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1974, p. 257.

1. Many school systems will be required to revise their suspension procedures substantially to conform to court decisions.
2. Schools will have to provide notice and hearing after the removal of disruptive students.
3. Schools will have to provide notice and an impartial hearing prior to non-emergency suspensions.
4. School board hearings on student discipline could not be informal hearings at which the board interprets its own rules and intuitively determine if the spirit of those rules has been violated.
5. School board members have to be certain to exercise good faith in all student disciplinary actions. Failure to do so could result in personal money damages being levied against them.

Flygare's prophesy indicated he had much foresight, for on January 22, 1975, the Supreme Court of the United States, in a 5-4 decision, held that a student must be notified of charges against him, if suspended (*Goss v. Lopez*). Subsequently, on February 25, 1975, the high court set standards on lawsuits against school officials (*Wood v. Strickland*) whereby it was proclaimed that ignorance is no excuse if a school official violates a student's civil rights, no matter how good the official's intentions may be.

A third Supreme Court decision concerning student rights in the realm of suspensions involved the Chicago Public Schools. On March 21, 1978, the Supreme Court ruled that students who are suspended from school illegally can collect only nominal damages unless they prove they suffered actual harm. (Patrick 1978)

²Oster, Patrick, "Supreme Court Rules on Student Suspensions Here, Chicago Sun Times, March 22, 1978, p. 22.

According to Patrick Oster, of the Chicago Sun Times, the court said that proving that an illegal suspension resulted in mental suffering and emotional anguish would be required before damages could be awarded.

The court rejected the argument that the right involved in the case, to have an opportunity to tell one's side of the story before any suspension, is so important that some damages should be automatic upon proof of violation.

The Justices actually considered two cases. The first involved Silas Briscoe, who while a sixth-grader at the Barton Elementary School in Chicago, was suspended for twenty days for wearing an earring, a violation of school rules. The principal had banned earrings during the 1973-74 academic year because he viewed them as a symbol of membership in a youth gang, which he was trying to discourage.

Briscoe, backed by his mother, refused to take the earring off and was suspended for twenty days. He sued in federal court, asking \$5,000 in damages because he had been thrown out of school without a hearing.

In the second case, Jarius Piphus, a fourteen year old student at Chicago Vocational High School, also was given a twenty day suspension in the same academic year after the principal saw him smoking marijuana. Piphus was suspended without a hearing, and he too sued the School Board for violation of his rights.

The high court then unanimously reversed a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago that these two students were entitled

to damages even if their suspensions were justified and there was no proof of damage.

Interestingly enough, the students in question were suspended before 1975, when guidelines were set down for the suspension of students.

Since the *Wood v. Strickland* decision proclaimed that ignorance of the law is no excuse if a school official violates a student's civil rights, it is therefore important that public school administrators find methods of maintaining discipline in the schools without violating the constitutional rights of students. Suspensions and expulsions, while not outlawed as disciplinary measures, can no longer be used without following due process procedures.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate factors that might have a bearing on the rate of student suspensions in public schools, with the focus upon High Schools in the City of Chicago.

The questions to be answered were:

1. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools since the change in Chicago Board of Education policy concerning suspensions was enacted in 1975?
2. Are there significant differences in the proportions of suspensions among schools where teachers are aware of the clause in the Union Contract relating to student discipline and in schools where the majority of teachers are not aware of the clauses?
3. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions among schools that have printed student behavior codes and those which do not?

4. Are there significant differences in suspension rates between schools having school handbooks for staff and those that do not?
5. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools that have had in-service meetings concerning student discipline and those that have had one or no meetings?
6. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools offering a variety of curricular alternatives and those with conventional offerings?
7. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing racial compositions?
8. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing socioeconomic status?
9. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with principals who approve of suspensions and those who do not?
10. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools in relationship to the personality type of the principals, measured by the FIRO-B psychological test?
10. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools exhibiting a combination of variables listed and those which do not?

The study consisted of four distinct steps: (1) formulating the general plan and analytic methodology, (2) reviewing the related literature, (3) developing a formal survey to be sent to Chicago Public High School principals and an informal interview outline, as well as administering the FIRO-B test of personality, and (4) submitting the results to statistical analysis.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of the study, the following terms were used as indicated:

Proportion of suspensions--The number of students suspended per one hundred students in a given school year.

Curriculum--Curriculum is a word that is defined in many ways. For our purposes it will be used in reference to the school and all parts of schooling that function together to form the school environment. Elements of curriculum are specific content of courses themselves, the materials utilized in schools, the extracurricular activities and most important, the people who operate the schools.

Limitations of the Study

In 1972, the Office of Civil Rights began collecting data on school suspensions and found that the Chicago Public Schools, both elementary and high schools, had the greatest number of suspensions in the entire country, and were among the twenty worst districts in the OCR survey.³ This study also indicated that secondary students were suspended nine times as frequently as elementary students during the 1972-73 school year and statistically a child is more likely to be suspended if he is black, poor and in high school.

³Children's Defense Fund, Washington Research Project, "School Suspensions, Are They Helping Children," Sept. 1975, p. 12.

On the basis of these findings by OCR, the investigation was planned to include only Chicago Public High Schools because these schools not only had the highest number of suspensions in the nation, but because secondary students also were more frequently suspended than elementary school students. Relationships between suspension rates in Chicago Public Schools and various factors such as poverty, race, and other variables could be set up to shed light on the problem of ever increasing suspensions in a city that is sorely in need of stability in the schools.

The elementary schools were not included because the scope of the study would have been too broad.

The investigation was planned and conducted within the limits set forth below:

1. The study was limited to Chicago Public Schools.
2. The study was limited to High Schools.
3. Some parts of the study were limited to High School principals in the Chicago Public Schools who answered the questionnaire sent to them.

The General Plan and Analytical Methodology

The General Plan

The general plan for conducting the research included the study of Chicago Public High Schools in order to analyze the relationships between the rate of student suspensions and other selected variables.

A letter was written to an official of the Chicago Board of Education requesting the release of statistics and data relative to suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools for five concurrent years, starting in the year 1972-73, the first school year that the school board began to keep statistics, as a ~~result of a federal mandate~~. Permission to contact principals for the purpose of this study was also requested. Permission was granted, and as a result, a letter was sent by the Deputy Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools to all District Superintendents, requesting the voluntary cooperation of Chicago High School principals.

In addition, The American Friends Service Committee of Chicago, an organization that is deeply committed to guarding student and citizen rights, shared their suspension statistics obtained from HEW, as well as their literature.

Other materials obtained from the Board of Education and cooperating principals and used in this study were:

1. School Board Policy statements concerning student discipline and suspensions
2. Union Agreements containing discipline clauses
3. Student Behavior Codes
4. Teacher Handbooks
5. Curricular courses of study
6. Selected North Central Reports

A list of all Chicago Public High Schools was obtained, and a packet containing a questionnaire, a FIRO-B psychological test, and a

letter requesting cooperation and other materials that would assist in the study was mailed to each principal.

Prior to the mailing of these materials, informal interviews were conducted with eight high school principals in the Chicago Public School system, in order to field test the interview questions. Their answers to these questions fell into some uniform categories, which were then incorporated into the final questionnaire.

The principals were requested to report information about the following topics:

1. How the number of students suspended in their schools had varied since 1975 when the Chicago Board of Education adopted a new policy in conformance with the Supreme Court decision of *Goss v. Lopez*.
2. The extent perceived by the principal that the new policy had either handicapped or helped with the decision making process in relationship to school discipline.
3. The extent perceived by the principal that teachers are aware of their rights to bar disruptive students from their classrooms (guaranteed them in the Union Contract).
4. Principal knowledge of specific legal decisions affecting student suspension procedures.
5. The extent of special programs in the school that meet the needs of students with special problems, including the presence of alternatives to suspension.
6. The presence or absence of a student behavior code was ascertained, and a request for a copy of the code was requested.
7. The presence or absence of inservice meetings specifically related to discipline, as well as the effectiveness, as perceived by the principal, was ascertained.
8. The presence or absence of a handbook of rules and regulations for the teachers was ascertained, and a request for a copy of the handbook was requested.

9. The type of philosophy concerning student suspension was ascertained when each principal stated his views concerning the topic.

Of the 57 questionnaires sent to Chicago Public High School principals, 41 or 72% were returned. Suspension data, racial and socioeconomic data of the student bodies and school membership were obtained for all 57 schools through the Department of Research and Evaluation of the Chicago Board of Education. The number of questionnaires and packets that were not returned totaled sixteen or 28% of the selected schools.

Forty principals completed the FIRO-B test, an instrument that explores the way people interact with other people. This instrument measures three dimensions of personality: Inclusion, Control, and Affection. The results of the 1977 edition of this test, revealed the personality type of each principal. Personality types were then compared to the philosophies expressed by each principal regarding suspension, in order to ascertain whether principals with high or low scores in each of the three areas had common views concerning the topic of suspension. no

Further contact with Chicago High School Principals was made at the annual Administrative University sponsored by the Chicago Board of Education, and at the conferences held by the Chicago Principal Association during the 1977 school year. Two High School principals, who failed to return the written questionnaire were informally interviewed, and their answers were included in the group of pilot interviews conducted in order to establish content validity of the

written questionnaires sent out six months prior to the dates of the aforementioned conferences.

Content validity of the written questionnaires was established, as the answers and views expressed verbally were congruent with the written answers of the subjects. The two principals who failed to answer the questionnaires admitted that they highly favored suspensions, but did not want to be included because they did not want their suspension rates publicized. These principals were not aware that suspension rates of all Chicago Public Schools were in the public record, and that their statistics were already included in the study protected by the assignation of a school number instead of a name to afford anonymity.

After the data were statistically analyzed, two schools, having similar student bodies, but differing suspension rates, were compared in order to determine the factor or factors that might contribute to the disparity. The two schools selected were approximately the same size, and had similar student bodies who were primarily black youngsters of the same poverty level.

Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed using SPSS, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, using the T test primarily and Analysis of Variance. This package is an integrated system of computer programs designed for the analysis of social science data. SPSS enables the

social scientist to perform an analysis through the use of natural language control statements.

According to the SPSS manual, whether the intent of the researcher is to construct broad or middle range social theory or to describe social reality, the intellectual process of inductive social research ideally takes the following form:⁴

1. The researcher begins with a set of ideas concerning the operation of certain aspects of social reality. This involves the isolation of variables at the conceptual level and the formation of some general notions concerning their interrelationships and causal effects upon each other.
2. An empirical data base is generated (or located from existing data files), containing indicators of the conceptual variables in which the researcher is interested.
3. The researcher then formulates more concrete hypotheses concerning what pattern of interrelationships should be found in the empirical indicators if the original ideas about the operation of social reality were correct.
4. The data are then analyzed using one or more of a variety of statistical techniques in order to determine whether the expected pattern of relationships can actually be discerned in the data.

The SPSS system includes a number of the most commonly used procedures in social science data analysis, and it was, therefore possible to use existing subprograms and procedures to analyze the data in this study.

The variables examined in this study were keypunched on 57 cards, although full data were available for 41 of the 57 cards. Each card represented one of the 57 high schools included in this study.

⁴Nie, Norman H. et al., SPSS, 2nd ed., McGraw Hill, 1975, p. 2.

Significance of the data fed into the computer was based on ANOVA or analysis of variance. T tests were employed in most of the runs because when the number of groups employed in an analysis is relatively small, T tests based on appropriate standard error of difference formulae suffice in the determination of the significance of differences.

In this investigation, differences between possible effects, rather than the effects themselves were evaluated. Therefore, groups were used as a means of comparison. The schools were grouped by treatment, or the basis on which they were differentiated according to variables, and the group means were used as a basis for comparison. T is the statistic used in calculating the probability associated with the testing of hypotheses, and is a statistic generally applicable to a normally distributed random variable where the mean is known and the population variance is estimated from a sample.

Reviewing Related Literature

The literature reviewed for the study included books, magazine articles, newspaper articles, pamphlets, dissertation abstracts and dissertations. The purposes of the review were to gain insight and knowledge of previous studies, procedures and findings in the area of suspension procedures as related to the law and to discover factors that might have a bearing on the rate of student suspensions in public schools, so that school administrators might be

assisted in coping with pressures brought to bear upon them by courts, governmental agencies and the public in general.

The Investigation

The investigation began on November 16, 1977, the date the proposal for this study was officially approved. However, data and literature pertaining to this study had been accumulated since 1975, when the Goss v. Lopez decision was rendered.

Informal pilot interviews were held with eight Chicago Public High School principals, during the fall and winter of 1977 in order to establish content validity for the final written questionnaire, which was mailed out the first week in January, 1978. Self addressed envelopes with stamps were included in the packet as well as a cover letter explaining the study, which had been approved by officials of the Chicago Board of Education.

Much of the information for this study was collected by interview and questionnaire. According to Engelhart, the statement and definition of a problem should guide the collection of data.⁵ The data collected by interview should be relevant to the problem and should be sufficiently representative to justify generalizations. In addition, the interview can be used to verify the validity of information obtained through surveys.

⁵Engelhart, Max, Methods of Educational Research, Rand McNally, 1972, pp. 87-101.

Interviews are generally classified as either fixed-alternative or open-ended, and sometimes both types are essential in data gathering. While fixed-alternative items are useful in promoting uniformity in the collection of data, the open ended questions appear to be more appropriate when the objective is to not only discover the respondent's attitude towards some issue, but also to learn something about his level of information.

Engelhart also suggests that if interviewing is used to validate data collected by a mail questionnaire, the fixed-alternative questions must be identical.

The purpose for conducting interviews for the study was two-fold: (a) to verify validity of information obtained through the questionnaire; and (b) to provide an indepth discussion of some selected topics dealing with variables that might have a relationship to the suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools. To this end, a preliminary interview was held with eight Chicago Public High School principals in order to test the sample questions that would be included in the questionnaire that would subsequently be mailed to the fifty-seven high schools included in this study.

Each of the eight principals in the preliminary pilot study was interviewed in an informal setting in such varied places as Curie High School and the Center for Urban Education during the summer and fall of 1977 when inservice training sessions for principals were held by the Chicago Board of Education.

The interview included several fixed-alternative questions as well as open-ended questions. In addition, the survey included

identifying personal information such as name, institutional affiliation, length of time as a principal in the particular high school, and other experience as an administrator.

The preliminary interviews served as a pilot study to ascertain whether the formulated questions were clear and whether data elicited would shed light on the problem.

The principals in the pilot study were asked the following identifying questions:

1. What is the name of your current school?
2. How many years have you been at your school?
3. If you have been at your school less than five years, name the institution where you were employed prior to your appointment at your current school.

Twelve fixed-alternative type questions were then asked, which were:

1. Does your school have a printed student handbook or behavior code?
2. Does your school have a handbook of rules and regulations for staff?
3. Are regular inservice meetings relating to student discipline held for your staff? If so, how many have been held per year for the past five years, or for the length of time you have been a principal at your school?
4. Are there any unique programs in addition to standard curricular offerings in your school? If so, name some of these programs.
5. Are you aware of the clause in the Board/Union contract relating to discipline? If so, what does this clause mean?
6. Roughly, what proportion of your teachers, do you believe, are aware of this clause?
7. Can you name some specific legal decisions by courts related to student suspensions?

8. Have legal decisions affected student suspensions in your school? If so, in what way?
9. What programs have you that meet the needs of students with special problems?
10. Do you have alternatives to suspension in your school? If so, what are they?
11. What alternatives to suspension would you institute if possible?
12. What effect has teacher awareness of the clause in the Board/Union Contract had on the numbers of students suspended in your school?

Several open-ended questions were also asked during the pilot study, which were:

1. What is your personal philosophy regarding student suspensions?
2. How have the number of students suspended in your school changed since 1975 when the Board of Education adopted a new policy?
3. To what extent has this policy either handicapped or helped with your decision making?
4. Describe the effectiveness of inservice sessions related to discipline in your school.

All eight of the principals interviewed in the pilot study understood the fixed-alternative questions, as well as the open-ended questions, therefore these questions were included in the format of the mailed survey.

Some returned questionnaires were received during the months of January and February of 1978. Followup letters were sent in March, supplemented by personal telephone calls. After 72% of the packets had been returned, interviews with seven Chicago High School principals, who were not included in the pilot study were held during March,

1978, at the Chicago Principal Association Conference and during the summer of 1978, at the week long Administrative University sponsored by the Chicago Board of Education, the third week of August, 1978.

The purpose of the post questionnaire interviews for this study was to validate data collected by the mailed questionnaire. The post questionnaire interviews involved only the open-ended questions of the questionnaire as the identifying information remained constant, and the fixed-alternative questions were integrated into the open-ended questions. The seven principals were selected for interviewing because they had established a good rapport with the interviewer in prior interactions and did not appear to be inhibited in expressing their opinions.

As packets, containing the surveys and FIRO-B tests were returned, the answers to the questions were tabulated for conversion to key punch cards as a preliminary step to statistical analyses, and the psychological tests were handscored. The data for the key punch cards were then assembled according to the variables ascertained from the questionnaires, FIRO-B tests, and interviews, which substantiated information written on the returned questionnaires. The key punch cards were then used with the appropriate subprograms in the SPSS package in order to establish significance.

Chapter Summary

The procedures of the study conformed to the format outlined below:

1. Review of the literature--the writer reviewed books, dissertation abstracts, dissertations, magazines, pamphlets and newspaper articles. The material provided insights and knowledge of previous studies, procedures and findings in the area of suspension procedures as related to the law, and the factors that might have a bearing on the rate of student suspensions in public schools.
2. Collection of Data--from the review of the literature, ten factors or variables were identified that appeared to have a relationship to student suspension rates in the public schools. The following steps were then taken:
 - a. A letter was written to an official of the Chicago Board of Education requesting the cooperation of the Department of Administrative Research in securing suspension data for Chicago Public High Schools over a five year period, from 1972-73 to 1976-77.
 - b. A letter was written to the American Friends Service Committee requesting cooperation in securing materials relating to the subject of suspensions. Some selected members of this organization were also interviewed.
 - c. Other materials were obtained from the Chicago Board of Education and cooperating principals, such as copies of Board/Union contracts, teacher handbooks, student handbooks, curricular courses of study, and some copies of High School North Central Reports.
 - d. Preliminary informal interviews were conducted with eight Chicago High School principals in order to ascertain principal knowledge and attitudes about suspension policies and procedures. The questions were then refined and incorporated into a questionnaire that appears in the appendix of this study.
 - e. A packet containing an explanatory letter, a questionnaire and a FIRO-B test was mailed to each of fifty-seven Chicago High School principals, along with a large stamped self addressed envelope.
 - f. Post-questionnaire interviews were held with seven of the Chicago Public High School Principals who had returned the written questionnaires, in order to establish content validity.
 - g. Questionnaire, interview and FIRO-B test results were tabulated for transfer to key punch cards as a preliminary step prior to statistical analysis.

3. Statistical Treatment--A factorial design utilizing analysis of variance (ANOVA), a subprogram of the SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, was used to analyze some of the data. The SPSS program for the T Test and the Pearson Coefficient Correlation were used to test for significance of the other questions. Eleven questions included in this study were answered following the various tests for significance. The results appear in Chapter III.
4. Discussion of Interview Questionnaire Results--The responses of the persons interviewed orally and their written answers on the questionnaires were analyzed and compared. Two High Schools with similar racial, socioeconomic status and size, were selected for an in depth comparison to determine factors that might explain their widely divergent suspension rates. The analysis appears in Chapter IV.

Organization of the Study

The study consists of five chapters, a selected bibliography and appendices.

Chapter I includes an introduction to the study, the purpose of the study, definition of terms and methodology and procedures.

Chapter II contains a review of the related literature and research relative to factors that might have a bearing upon suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.

Chapter III covers the data used in this study, statistical tests and procedures and presentation of the data derived from suspension statistics, the questionnaire and the FIRO-B psychological examination. This chapter contains only statistical test results without analysis, which is covered in Chapter IV.

Chapter IV covers the questionnaire and interview results, as well as an analysis of the data derived from the survey, interviews and FIRO-B tests. This chapter also contains an indepth comparison

between two Chicago High Schools having in common a similar student body, and similar size, but that have a difference in their suspension rates.

Chapter V provides an overview of the study. A summary of the study along with conclusions, implications and recommendations are included in this chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors that might have a bearing on the rate of student suspensions in public schools, with the focus upon High Schools in the City of Chicago.

Chapter I contains an introduction to the study, definitions of terms and methodology and procedures.

The purpose of Chapter II is to present a review of the related literature and research relative to pressures brought to bear upon administrators by court decisions mandating due process procedures for students prior to suspension, and the roles of principals in maintaining a safe and peaceful learning environment within legal parameters that guarantee due process rights to students.

Suspension Policies--Legal Background

START

Dean William R. Hazard of Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, in two unpublished papers, outlined the legal history upon which due process for students in schools has been predicated.¹

¹Hazard, William R., Student Rights: A Brief Outline; Due Process: Origins and Development in Education, Aug. 6, 1975, pp. 1-10.

(1971)

According to Dr. Hazard, the principal sources of rights for all citizens come from the Federal Constitution, Civil rights legislation, State constitutions and statutes, and Federal and State court decisions.

The Federal constitution contains specific amendments upon which courts tend to base their decisions concerning human rights. These are:

1. 1st Amendment--Freedom of speech and religion
2. 4th Amendment--Freedom from search and seizure
3. 8th Amendment--Freedom from cruel and unusual punishment
4. 14th Amendment--Due process and equal protection clause

The Illinois State Constitution in Article 10, sec. 1, provides for free public schools, and sec. 3, prohibits the use of public funds for sectarian purposes. In addition, a School Code is published and updated yearly.

(1975)

William R. Hazard, who is also a practicing lawyer, maintained in an article written for the Kappan, that local control of schools is in a terminal state because the courts, along with state and federal governments, have taken over.²

In his article, "Courts in the Saddle: School Boards Out," Dr. Hazard stated, "Over the past two decades state and federal courts have exercised increasing influence on school policy making and, by pre-emption, have taken the policy making play away from local boards

²Hazard, William R., "Courts in the Saddle: School Boards Out," Kappan, Dec., 1974, p. 259.

in many important issues."³ (p. 219) As a result, educational policies, in his thinking, are the product of constitutional, statutory, and case-law interpretations.

In recent years, the courts have moved decisively into the area of pupil rights, teacher rights and the vast area called equal protection under the law. The constitutional rights of school children and teachers have been defined in a rash of state and federal court decisions, outlined by Hazard.

To the extent that decisions conflict with challenged board policies, the court decision becomes the operative policy. According to Dr. Hazard, policies barring pupils' wearing of buttons, armbands, and extreme hair styles have fallen before constitutional challenges and have been replaced by case-law upholding individual rights of pupils and their access to constitutional protections. However, in summary, the author clearly states that the impact of court made policy on the schooling process is largely unknown.⁴ (Hazard, 1974).

⁽¹⁹⁷³⁾ Hillary Rodham, in the Harvard Educational Review, wrote an article examining the changing status of children under the law. He maintained, that traditionally, the law has reflected a social consensus that children's best interests are synonymous with those of their parents, except under the few circumstances where the state is authorized to intervene in family life under the doctrine of *parens patriae*. In 1973, when this article was written, little consideration

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 260.

had been given to the substantive and procedural rights of children as a discrete interest group. However, the author recognized a trend in the law to change children's status in two ways; by extending more adult rights to children and by recognizing certain unique needs and interests of children as legally enforceable rights.⁵

In his article, "Children Under the Law," Rodham was concerned with judicial decisions ⁽¹⁹⁷³⁾ anent children's rights, particularly because the United States Supreme Court has been active in this regard and because it remains the final arbiter of the Constitution. Consideration of children's rights before the Supreme Court has primarily been in the areas of education, child welfare, and juvenile court procedures. Rodham felt that the court had avoided "taking the easy way out" with a flat holding that all rights constitutionally assured for adults may be extended to children. Instead, he claimed the court had carefully tried to carve out an area between parental dominion and state prerogatives, where certain adult rights can be extended to children under specific circumstances.⁶

One of the first specific children's rights precedents, Brown v. Board of Education,⁽¹⁹⁵⁴⁾ occurred in the area of education.⁷ In Brown, the Court held that the Constitutional rights of black school children were violated by segregated education, and emphasized the

⁵Rodham, Hillary, "Children Under the Law," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 43, No. 4, 1973, pp. 497-499.

⁶Ibid., p. 498.

⁷Brown v. Board of Education, 347 US 483 (1954).

critical importance of education both to children and to the general public.

In 1967, the U.S. Supreme Court decided that children in juvenile court were constitutionally entitled to certain due process guarantees previously granted only to adults in criminal court, a landmark case known as Gault.⁸⁽¹⁹⁶⁷⁾ For the first time, children had the following rights in court:

1. Notice (to both parent and child) adequate to afford reasonable opportunity to prepare a defense.
2. Right to counsel.
3. Privilege against self incrimination.
4. Right to confrontation and cross examination of witnesses.

Rodham analyzed the situation, stating that the Gault⁽¹⁹⁶⁷⁾ decision restricted its holding to precisely procedural guarantees and not others. The decision also declared generally that "neither the Fourteenth Amendment nor the Bill of Rights is for adults alone,"⁽¹⁹⁹⁸⁾. This and similar language in the opinion suggested future grounds for arguing the constitutional rights of children.^{9(Rodham, 1973)}

Two years following the Gault decision, the U.S. Supreme Court decided that children are "persons" under the Constitution.^{10(Gault, 1967)} In 1969, in Tinker, the Court held that students could not be suspended for the nondisruptive wearing of armbands. According to

⁸In re Gault, 387 US 1, 61 (1967).

⁹Rodham, Hillary, "Children Under the Law," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 43, No. 4, 1973, pp. 498.

¹⁰In re Gault, 387 US 1, 61 (1967).

(1974),
 Flygare, the Court added the proviso that conduct by the student which
 "materially disrupts classwork or involves substantial disorder or
 invasion of the rights of others, is, of course, not immunized by the
 constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech."^(p. 173) ~~Justice Abe~~ Justice Abe
 Fortas held that neither students nor teachers "shed their constitu-
 tional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse
 gate."^(p. 173)

In an article, "Student Rights," appearing in the Harvard
Educational Review in 1974, prior to the United States Supreme Court
 decisions anent suspension due process rights for students, Flygare (1974)
 maintained that local courts, despite the Tinker decision, have been
 quick to sanction the curtailment of school expression in situations
 where the disruption was not substantial. He cited the case of
Schwartz v. Shuber, 298 F. Supp. 238 (Ed NY 1969) whereby one court
 approved suspensions to punish distribution of literature because
 administrators thought the handout "could conceivably cause a disrup-
 tion."^(p. 173) Another court affirmed the suspension of a student for wearing
 an emblem which had been the source of school tension the previous
 year.^(Flygare, 1974)

Other courts, according to Flygare,^(Flygare, 1974) justified similar
 suspensions on the ground that some student behavior, while

¹¹Flygare, Thomas J., "Student Rights," Harvard Educational
Review, Vol. 44, No. 1, 1974, p. 173.

¹²Ibid., pp. 173-174.

(Sullivan v. Houston
1973)
28
(5th Cir. 1973)

essentially free speech, shows defiance to school officials.¹³

Flygare maintained, in his article, that the student rights movement had placed excessive reliance on challenges to the way in which decisions have been made rather than on the validity of the decisions or the authority of administrators to make them.¹⁴ (Flygare, 1974)

Flygare also bemoaned the fact that in most states, students could easily be suspended or expelled because the power of administrators to determine the length of exclusions, even if grossly out of proportion with the alleged offense, had gone virtually unchallenged.¹⁵ (Flygare, 1973)

According to Dr. William R. Hazard, the Gault decision (1965) was a turning point in the student rights movement, because for the first time, civil rights under the U.S. Constitution were applied to minor children. Children were recognized as citizens and entitled to rights of due process. This decision apparently laid the foundation for a Supreme Court decision dealing with the right of a child to an education, for deprivation of education by suspension or expulsion without due process, appeared to be contrary to the rights given children to due process. According to Dr. Hazard, due process rights

1973

¹³Sullivan v. Houston Indep. School Dist., 475 R. 2nd 1071 (5th Cir. 1973).

¹⁴Flygare, Thomas J., "Student Rights," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 44, No. 1, 1974, p. 173.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 173.

of pupils excludes the right to learn.¹⁶ Education is not a fundamental right and is not protectable by the U.S. Constitution.

Due process, then, is the peg upon which the Court based its 1975 decision, Goss v. Lopez, which in essence guaranteed that due process be granted before students could be suspended.¹⁷ What then is meant by due process? Dr. Hazard, in his unpublished mimeograph, presented at the AASA Academy for School Executives in Baltimore, Md., on August 6, 1975, traced the origins and development of due process in education. His summary contained the following salient facts:¹⁸

1. The concept of due process is rooted deep in common law.
2. The process recognizes the rule that a person shall not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without an opportunity to be heard in defense of his right.
3. This rule was a part of the common law prior to the adoption of the Magna Carta and as a principle of inherent and natural justice, was secured by the Magna Carta and the successive federal and state constitutions.
4. The 5th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution protect the right to due process, that persons cannot be deprived of life, liberty or happiness, without due process of law.

Dr. Hazard, contended however, that "due process" depends on the facts and circumstances of each particular case. He cited the U.S. Supreme Court:

"Due process" is an elusive concept. Its exact boundaries are undefinable, and its content varies according to specific factual

¹⁶Hazard, William R., "Due Process: Origins and Development in Education," Unpublished paper presented at AASA Academy for School Executives, Baltimore, Md., Aug. 6, 1975.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid.

contexts . . . whether the Constitution requires that a particular right obtained in a specific proceeding depends on the complexity of factors. The nature of the alleged right involved, the nature of the proceeding, and the possible burden on that proceeding, are all considerations which must be taken into account.

Although the concept of due process may be nebulous, there are two fundamental elements always present: (1) notice of the charge, and (2) an opportunity to defend and be heard in an orderly proceeding adapted to the nature of the case. *stop*

According to Dr. Hazard, due process embraces two aspects, procedural and substantive:^{19 (Hazard 1975)}

Procedural due process refers to those processes designed to assure that the person has notice and an opportunity to be heard before a competent tribunal.

Substantive due process embraces the notion of "fundamental fairness" and applies, as a standard for judicial review: the punishment or state action must be reasonably related to the objective sought to be accomplished by that action.

Substantive due process implies that state action cannot be unreasonable, arbitrary or capricious. In the case of St. Ann v. Palisi, 495 F. 2nd 423 (5th cir. 1974), a school district issued a regulation permitting pupils to be suspended for their parents' misconduct.^{20 (Hazard 1975)} In finding the rule violative of substantive due process, the court noted:

The children do not complain that they were denied the constitutional right to an education, but that they were punished without being personally guilty. Thus a cardinal notion of liberty is involved and substantive due process is applicable . . . Since there are alternative paths to restoring teacher authority and since (the regulation in question) is not justifiably or reasonably necessary, we must hold a compelling governmental interest.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid.

There was a dissenting opinion filed.²¹ This opinion challenged the application of the "compelling interest standard" and made the point that would be obvious to most observers of school operations, that

a school has a compelling interest in maintaining discipline and any rational rule to achieve that end should meet the constitutional test. There is doubt that any rule of discipline could ever be defended in terms of a compelling interest in the exact rule. There are generally viable alternatives to almost every course of human conduct, however rational that conduct may be.

Dr. Hazard, in his presentation on Due Process, at the AASA conference of August 6, 1975, emphasized the point that for the most part, school issues raise the question of procedural due process.²²

The due process questions raised typically are:

- a. Does the school rule or regulation, when applied to pupil X encroach on the pupil's right to life, liberty, or property?
- b. If there is such an encroachment, does it affect a constitutionally protected interest or right?
- c. If it does so encroach a protected right, was the pupil protected by the appropriate procedural incidents of notice and hearing?

Dr. Hazard, then proceeded to outline the applications and development of the due process concept, indicating that the U.S. Supreme Court's recognition of the constitutional rights of children is a recent development.

²¹St. Ann v. Palisi, 495 F. 2nd at 429.

²²Hazard, William R., "Due Process: Origins and Development in Education," Unpublished paper presented at AASA Academy for School Executives, Baltimore, Md., Aug. 6, 1975, p. 18.

He reiterated, that prior to the Brown decision, there was little judicial concern for or recognition of constitutional rights of children. The prevailing view held that schools were special places, designed and operated for the benefit of children, and short of arbitrary, capricious, or malicious actions by the appointed officials, the Courts were extremely reluctant to intervene in school matters.

In the development of the due process concept in educational settings, it was necessary to ascertain if a person's access to schooling embraced any interest or right protected by the 5th or 14th Amendments' notions of due process. The Court had to decide whether education is somehow a "property" interest and whether the states' interference with one's school attendance by suspension, expulsion or other "punishment" interfere with the pupil's liberty interest.²³

Some other points of interest concerning due process in an educational setting made by Dr. Hazard were:

1. Whatever due process protects, the right extends against school districts and their employees inasmuch as the school is clearly an arm or extension of the state.
2. Since, under the 10th Amendment and a long line of definitive court decisions, education is a state responsibility, schools fall within the limits of the due process clause of the 14th Amendment. In the language of the Supreme Court in the Barnette case (West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 1 (1973)):

The Fourteenth Amendment, as now applied to the States, protects the citizen against the State itself and all of its creatures--Boards of Education not excepted. These (boards) have, of course, important, delicate, and

²³Ibid., p. 4.

highly discretionary functions, but none that they may not perform within the limits of the Bill of Rights . . .

3. Although Brown did not deal directly with liberty and property interests of school children, the Court concluded that the opportunity of an education is a right, which once undertaken by the state, must be made available to all on equal terms.

Dr. Hazard noted that the issue of due process in school, really does not depend on whether education is a "fundamental right," but that the critical question is whether school officials must give the pupil due process as a condition of interfering with some specific claims "right." This point is critically important because the Rodriguez decision held that education is not a fundamental right.²⁴ The Rodriguez decision, however, did not determine the due process question.

How can one connect educational "rights" with constitutionally guaranteed rights? The following U.S. Supreme Court decisions outlined by Dr. Hazard appeared to lead into decisions indirectly guaranteeing some educational rights to students:

1. In Meyer v. Nebraska, the Court said that liberty includes . . . the right of an individual to acquire useful knowledge (268 U.S. 510 1925).
2. In Pierce v. The Society of Sisters, the Court held that the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the education of their children is protected by due process (262 U.S. 390 (1923) at 399).

In 1975, the Supreme Court finally had a foundation in finding both a protectable liberty interest and a protectable property interest in pupils' school attendance.

²⁴San Antonio Independent School Dt. v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 1 (1973).



To deal rationally with due process concerns in school matters, according to Dr. Hazard, it is necessary for the Courts to determine if the specific individual interest claims falls within the 14th Amendment's "life, liberty and property" and, if so, to identify the procedures that satisfy the due process requirements.²⁵

Since the Gault and Tinker decisions established the rights of children to due process, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision rendered in January, 1975, affirmed the procedural due process rights of a public school student who is threatened with a short suspension. The case, Goss v. Lopez, affirmed a District Court which had "found each of the suspensions involved, to have occurred without a hearing, either before or after the suspension, and the statute unconstitutional insofar as it permits such suspension without notice or hearing."²⁶

Since one of the purposes of this dissertation is to determine whether there is a relationship between the Goss decision and the rate of suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools since the decision was rendered, it would behoove one to go into the background of this case.

During a period of student unrest affecting the Columbus, Ohio Public School System in 1971, a number of students were suspended

²⁵Hazard, William R., "Due Process: Origins and Development in Education," Unpublished paper presented at AASA Academy for School Executives, Baltimore, Md., Aug. 6, 1975, p. 7.

²⁶Norval Goss et al. v. Eileen Lopez et al. in The United States Law Week, 43 LW 4181-92 (January 21, 1975).

under Section 3313.66 of the Ohio State Code-A section, which enabled a principal to suspend a student for misconduct for ten days. The principals were also required to contact the parents within twenty-four hours and explain the reasons for the action; it did not, however, require a hearing.

Robert E. Draba, summarized the decision in his article for the Administrator's Notebook.²⁷

Nine students from three schools who had been suspended without a hearing filed an action against the Columbus Board of Education and several administrators. The complaint sought a declaration that 3313.66 was unconstitutional in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, for it permitted administrators to deprive students of their right to an education without a hearing. In addition, the complaint sought to enjoin administrators from further suspensions under 3313.66 and to require them to expunge references to past suspensions from the files of the students involved in the action.

Largely agreeing with the students, the three-judge District Court declared the plaintiffs were denied due process of the law, since they had been suspended without a hearing, and further held that suspensions under 3313.66 were unconstitutional. The Court also ordered that references to the plaintiffs' suspensions be removed from their school records. Although the District Court stopped short of prescribing rigid procedures, it did indicate that notice and hearing prior to suspension were minimum requirements. In emergency situations, however, it noted that a student may be immediately suspended, and the notice and hearing may follow. Additionally, the District Court observed that during a hearing a student should have an opportunity to respond. Finally, it stated that at the hearing the school does not have to permit the student to have counsel.

In their appeal to the Supreme Court, various administrators of the Columbus Public School System contended that the Due Process Clause does not apply to suspension, for there exists no

²⁷Draba, Robert E., "Short Suspensions: The Goss Decision Establishes a Student's Due Process Rights," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 23, No. 4 (1975).

constitutional right to a public education. The Court observed, however, that "the Fourteenth Amendment" forbids the State to deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law. In this regard, a student has protected property interest in educational benefits and a protected liberty interest in reputation; therefore, to deprive a student of his educational benefits and his good reputation without due process of the law violates the Constitution.

In developing a student's protected interest in educational benefits, the Court asserted that protected interests in property are created and defined "by an independent source such as state statutes or rules entitling the citizen to certain benefits. Since the State of Ohio, through its laws, created and defined a public educational system entitling students to certain benefits, these benefits cannot be withdrawn without due process.

The administrators in their appeal had also argued that "even if there is a right to a public education protected by the Due Process Clause generally, the clause comes into play only when the State subjects a student to a severe detriment or grievous loss."²⁸ They asserted that a ten-day suspension is neither a "severe detriment" or a "grievous loss"; therefore, the Due Process Clause should not apply to short suspensions. The high Court, however, disagreed and stated, "A 10-day suspension from school is not de minimus, and may not be imposed in complete disregard of the Due Process Clause.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 1-4.

Having responded to two objections against applying the Due Process Clause to suspensions of public school students, the Court turned to the question of what the due process rights of students are who are being threatened with suspension. In doing this, they also indicated a concern for school systems when they indicated that "judicial interposition in the operation of the public school system of the nation raises problems requiring care and restraint."²⁹

The Court required that a student facing suspension must at least be given:

1. oral or written notice of the charges against him and a hearing;
2. an opportunity to hear the evidence the authorities have and an opportunity to respond if the student denies the charges; and
3. notice and hearing before the student is removed from the school.

The Court also indicated that "there need be no delay between the time notice is given and the time of the hearing." The Court held, however, that "the student first be told what he is accused of doing and what the basis of the accusation is." It conceded, though that:³⁰

there are recurring situations in which prior notice and hearing cannot be insisted upon. Students whose presence pose a continuing danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process may be immediately removed from school.

²⁹Epperson v. Arkansas, 393 U.S. 97, 104, cited by the Court in Goss, p. 4185.

³⁰Draba, Robert E., "Short Suspensions: The Goss Decision Establishes a Student's Due Process Rights," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1975.

In such cases the necessary notice and rudimentary hearing should follow as soon as practicable.

It is interesting to note that the high Court refused to require:

that hearings in connection with short suspensions must afford the student the opportunity to secure counsel, to confront and cross-examine witnesses supporting the charge or to call his own witness to verify his version of the incident.

The Court indicated, that in order to reduce the possibility of unwarranted suspensions, the disciplinarian may "summon the accuser, permit cross-examination, and allow the student to present his own version of the incident." Moreover, in difficult cases, this disciplinarian may permit the student to have counsel. Since the Goss decision was split 5-4, there was a minority dissent filed. Chief Justice Burger and Justices Blackman and Rehnquist joined Justice Powell in dissent. Justice Powell, writing for the minority, agreed with the majority that property interests "are created and their dimensions are defined by existing rules and understandings that stem from an independent source such as state law." But he claimed:³¹

the very legislation which "defines" the "dimension" of the student's entitlement, while providing a right to an education generally, does not establish this right free of discipline imposed in accord with Ohio law. Rather, the right is encompassed in the entire package of statutory provisions governing education in Ohio of which the power to suspend is one.

He observed that the majority suggested that Ohio "conferred an unqualified right to education," when in fact the dimensions of the right had been defined and qualified by the structure of Ohio law.

³¹Ibid., pp. 1-4.

Next, he noted that regardless of how a student's education-entitlement is defined, "a deprivation of not more than 10 days' suspension from school, imposed as a routine disciplinary measure, does not assume constitutional dimensions." In taking this position he sided with administrators. He argued, that the Due Process Clause applies only when the state subjects a person to "severe or a grievous loss." In this regard, Justice Powell observed that the Ohio statute permitted "no serious or significant infringement of education" and "the record in this case reflects no educational injury" to students.

Justice Powell then questioned whether a suspension sufficiently damaged a student's reputation and affected his "liberty" to warrant the protection of the Due Process Clause. He noted that in Roth, the Court,³²

held that a nontenured teacher who is not rehired by a public university could not claim to suffer sufficient reputational injury to require constitutional protections.

Referring to Roth, Justice Powell stated: "Surely a brief suspension is of less serious consequence to the reputation of a teenager."

Mr. Draba, in summarizing the Goss decision, also noted that Justice Powell reminded the Court of prior decisions in which the discretionary authority of school officials was affirmed.³³ He supported the authority of the States and school officials "to prescribe and control conduct in the schools." Some considerations, Justice Powell alluded to, included the interest of a state in an

³²Ibid., p. 4; Board of Regents v. Roth, 408 US. 564 (1972).

³³Ibid., pp. 2-3.

orderly school, the interest of the student in learning the importance of rules and discipline, and the unique aspects of the teacher-student relationship.

Justice Powell also expressed the concern that the federal courts would be called upon whenever routine school decisions are challenged, and that government infringement in the operation of schools may be escalated.

Mr. Draba, in his article on the Goss decision, attempted to ascertain the impact of the Goss decision. He surmised, in 1975, when this article was written, that in some school districts, it would not substantially alter administrative procedures regarding short suspensions, because many administrators have already adopted practices which conform to the minimal requirements established by the Supreme Court. These procedures were often adopted to conform to the due process requirements established by state statute or by school board policy. Administrators in these districts, predicted Draba, may want to make their current procedures more explicit to ensure total compliance with Goss.³⁴

However, the author, indicated that other school districts that have provided few of the safeguards of Goss, will be constrained to develop procedures which protect them against unnecessary litigation. Administrators confronted with the possibility of revising procedures under which students are suspended, he felt, should not be intimidated by Goss, because if such administrators understand both

³⁴Ibid., p. 3.

the "letter" and the "spirit" of the law, the realization that the very simple procedures in connection with short suspensions are necessary, will become apparant.

If a student is given oral or written notice and a hearing, during which time the evidence against him is made known, and if he is given an opportunity to respond, the procedural due process rights to which he is entitled have been met.

The Court, demonstrating a sensitivity to the resources of the school administrators, actually fashioned a restrained and reasonable set of procedural safeguards which retains considerable discretionary administrative authority. In most cases, an administrator may provide notice and a hearing at the same time, in all cases he may "summon the accuser, permit cross examination, and allow the student to present his own witness." In select cases, the administrator may provide notice and a hearing after a student has been suspended, and in "difficult cases" an administrator may permit counsel. These concessions by the Court retain considerable discretionary authority and represent its confidence in the judgement and good will of public school administrators throughout the land, in the opinion of Daraba.³⁵

Draba also felt that the Court "imposed requirements which are, if anything, less than a fair-minded school principal would impose upon himself to avoid unfair suspensions." However, the Court was concerned with "unwarranted suspensions," a substantive rather

³⁵Ibid., p. 3.

than a procedural issue that had already been outlined in their decision. The Court wanted to provide a context for a student to deny the charges against him and tell the student's side of the story. The Court seemed to anticipate that the student's denial and story would trigger a further investigation. The intent of the Court seemed to be that administrators would interpret Goss as a tool to prevent unwarranted suspensions.

The Court, however, failed to provide guidance for administrative action in several areas. First, under what conditions should an administrator suspend a student and provide notice and a hearing "as soon as practicable"? Second, under what conditions should an administrator "summon the accuser and permit cross examination"? And third, under what conditions should the administrator permit counsel?

In 1975, speculation about the potential impact of Goss was a venturesome task. Some of the implications of the decisions as seen by Draba were:³⁶

1. The Goss decision would be utilized to support claims of due process rights in other areas in which administrators and teachers make discretionary decisions.
2. The Goss decision might activate additional attacks of overly broad and vague school regulations.
3. Since the Goss decision requires notice and a hearing, school districts may be required to hire additional administrative personnel to prepare notices, gather information and conduct hearings. Districts may also instruct administrators to devote less time to others areas of responsibility and more time to fulfilling the requirements of Goss. If the latter is chosen, it is possible that administrators may have less time to provide leadership for the improvement of instruction.

³⁶Ibid., p. 4.

Mr. Draba concluded that the U.S. Supreme Court exhibited considerable confidence in the good faith and judgment of administrators, by refusing to impose "truncated trial type procedures" for all short suspensions. The Court also recognized the importance of discretionary authority for efficient school administration; however, the court asserted that efficient school administration requires a rational model of decision making regarding short suspensions and prescribed such a model with its opinion in Goss.

While Mr. Draba viewed the Goss decision as a positive structure that would assist school administrators, other points of view appeared in the press following the decision. Some of the views, both pro and con, appeared in editorials, letters to the editor and articles written under bylines.

Among the voices raising questions about the wisdom of the Goss decision was James J. Kilpatrick, who wrote in the now defunct, Chicago Daily News on February 7, 1975:³⁷

The students filed suit contending that they had been denied due process of law for want of a hearing. They demanded that their school records be purged of any reference to the suspensions . . . In its decision of January 22, 1975, the Supreme Court affirmed.

Taken at face value, Justice White's majority opinion seems harmless enough. The majority did not impose a requirement for the full panoply of due process rights. The court made it clear that any student "whose presence poses a continuing danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process may be immediately removed from school."

In order to reach that conclusion, the majority had to find that a student's right to a public school education is a form of

³⁷Kilpatrick, James J., "Judges Take Over the Classroom," The Chicago Daily News, Feb. 7, 1975, p. 10.

property. Then the majority had to conclude that even a single day's suspension is a taking of property, which demands due process of law.

As the dissenters pointed out, in a stiff opinion by Justice Lewis Powell, the majority has thus identified "an entirely new constitutional right." The court "unnecessarily opens avenues for judicial intervention in the operation of our public schools."

We may be certain that disruptive students will seize opportunities, to explore these inviting new avenues. It will not be easy for lower federal judges to avoid extension of this due process doctrine.

In the everyday operation of a school system, teachers and principals must make countless decisions having to do with grades, promotion, and the like . . . If the Court will now require due process procedures whenever such routine school decisions are challenged, the impact upon public education will be serious indeed. The discretion and judgement of federal courts across the land often will be substituted for that of the 50 state legislatures, school boards, and teachers who hereto fore have been responsible for the administration of the American school system.

. . . Teachers and principals have to be free to maintain order in the classrooms. Only in the most serious cases, involving expulsion or physical punishment, should a trouble-making student be permitted to take his due process rights to court.

Strangely enough, while Mr. Kilpatrick tended to hold conservative views in past articles, his analysis of the Goss decision was quite similar to that of the American Federation of Teachers President, Albert Shanker, who usually espouses the liberal view on social issues. In the American Teacher, of March 1975, Mr. Shanker was quoted:³⁸

The question is whether the outcome will be a desirable one from the point of view of better education and more effective teaching. There is good reason to believe that the ruling will only serve to create further difficulties for teachers and schools already overwhelmed by discipline problems.

³⁸Editorial, "Shanker Raises Questions on Pupil-Suspension Rule," American Teacher, March 1975, Vol. 59, No. 7, p. 21.

The problem of discipline is a major one. There are many children in our schools who cannot function in regular school and classroom settings. Many are so disturbed as to engage constantly in fighting, shouting, and throwing things. One such student in a class requires the complete attention of the teacher.

The AFT president went on to note that while some student suspensions had been unfair, failure to suspend disruptive students is also unfair.

In the pamphlet, Juveniles and the Law, a San Francisco school teacher, corresponding with her niece, who lived in Columbus, Ohio, at the time of the Goss decision, wrote:³⁹

I see by yesterday's newspapers that the Supreme Court has ruled in the case of Goss v. Lopez, and they ruled that the students should not have been suspended. But they gave as their reason for their decision the fact that Ohio gives everyone a free education. If that is so, the Court says, then students cannot have that education taken away without due process. I don't agree. First of all, students should have to earn that education. If they're going to misbehave, then they don't deserve an education at all . . . Second of all, five or ten day suspensions mean little. It's not as though they were being thrown out of school forever.

I would agree with Justice Powell. He didn't agree with the five-man majority. Powell said that you can't liken the rights of children to those of adults. It is a disservice, to students and the teachers who teach, to allow them to challenge teachers when they should be learning respect for the rights of others.

G. E. Crandell, a Chicago Public High School teacher, in a similar vein, wrote to "Voice of the People," in the Chicago Tribune:⁴⁰

³⁹Cutler, Charles L. and Schwach, Howard J., "You're Suspended--Can You Argue Your Case?" Juveniles and the Law, 1975, p. 21.

⁴⁰Crandell, G. E., "Why Teachers Quit," Chicago Tribune, Feb. 10, 1978, Sec. 4, p. 2.

I have been a school teacher for the last 20 years and am now teaching in a Chicago Public High School. I wish to tell your readers why more and more teachers are retiring before the age of 65.

Here are some of the reasons: mounting disrespect from students, permissive parents who fail to back up a teacher's censure, lack of student incentive, students who do not listen to a teacher . . . and not enough authority to expel disruptive students for good . . . The Supreme Court was wrong in removing this jurisdiction from the schools.

Philip Hager wrote an article in the Sun-Times, that was printed on January 23, 1977, that reinforced the views of those who felt that the U.S. Supreme Court had gone too far in removing authority from the schools. In his article, "Children's Rights Explosion," he stated:⁴¹

Nine years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court extended unprecedented procedural rights to juveniles facing delinquency proceedings. Now a vastly expanded assortment of rights is being demanded, and often granted, in behalf of children in courts throughout the United States.

"There's been an explosion in children's rights," Peter B. Sandman, director of the Youth Law Center in San Francisco said . . . "Isn't an overdose of due process as bad as an overdose of insulin shock . . . ?" Sandman concluded.

Some newspaper reporters had taken to satire. Frank Schneider of the New Orleans-Time Picayune, wrote in his column, "People and Things" on March 16, 1975:⁴²

Watch it, teacher. Your blackboard could be erased permanently, and you might get that proverbial apple right smack in the teeth. Children have rights too, you know. The U.S. Supreme Court has

⁴¹Hager, Philip, "Children's Rights Explosion," Chicago Sun Times, Jan. 23, 1977, Sec. 2, p. 2.

⁴²Schneider, Frank, "Teacher's Pests," New Orleans Times Picayune, March 16, 1975.

inserted its generous proboscis into issues that had been traditionally reserved for educators. They found that students rights have been violated in public schools all these years.

. . . You can breathe easy, kids. The supreme gentlemen in Washington have decreed that no teacher or principal can merely threaten you with discipline. They can't expel you or suspend you from school unless they give oral or written notice . . . and with any luck you can even drag them into court.

. . . Keep your fingers crossed kids. Soon, if things keep going as they do, there won't be any teachers (even with their magnificent salaries, they won't be able to afford court costs) and there won't be any schools . . .

Bob Wiedrich, another satirist, in his article, "Seat of Wisdom vs. Student Rights," on June 4, 1975 wrote about his experiences as a student of the Ogden School in Chicago in the 1930's:⁴³

Ogden School in the 1930s was a den of discipline. The court of last resort was the classroom teacher. There were no appeals. Few beefs ever reached the principal's office. They were settled long before that, sometimes with a stinging slap to the chops.

When that happened, a kid didn't run home to cry to mama or papa. Because if he did, he'd get another crack in the chops. . . . Individual freedom? The right to due process? You got to be kidding.

We kids were hapless serfs, peons, a blood and bludgeoned generation. But, oh, boy! Did we learn discipline and respect for authority. There wasn't a pupil in that school who didn't know who was the boss, both in the classroom and at home.

Now the United States Supreme Court has put an end to all that thru a series of decisions on student rights . . . There used to be a legal theory that stemmed from English common law entitled in loco parentis. This ancient dictum held that anyone standing in the shoes of a parent--a school teacher--had the same authority as that of a parent dealing with his child.

⁴³Wiedrich, Bob, "Seat of Wisdom vs. Student Rights," Chicago Tribune, June 4, 1975, Sec. 3, p. 4.

. . . Today, we find the Chicago Board of Education, forced by recent Supreme Court decisions to adopt new disciplinary guidelines, are sure to make teachers dedicated to classroom order the laughing stock of every pimplefaced punk in the public schools. Under the rules, principals can dismiss students who are really bad news, those presenting danger to life and limb. But for the run-of-the-mill troublemaker, who gives his teachers the razzberry, there is a complicated procedure that practically prohibits the dumping of a kid without some kind of hearing.

. . . Wonderful, if you're on trial for armed robbery. But it stinks if you're a 13-year old accused of using four-letter words on a teacher. Next thing, El Supremo will extend student rights into the home. Instead of the woodshed, there'll be jury trials in the living room . . . Someday we'll all gag on their unrealistic claptrap.

The Goss decision, however, elicited a positive response among other members of the press. The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial printed on January 31, 1975 expressed this positive view:⁴⁴

In a 5-4 decision the United States Supreme Court has held that even brief suspensions from public schools require "fair procedures" . . . Close decisions imply that the merits of a case are divided, and they are in this one. But the better case prevailed. As Justice White said, "Young people do not shed their rights at the schoolhouse door." And surely most well administered school systems already provide the procedures called for.

It is hardly controversial to say that schools' suspension practices should be fair, and that fairness requires notice of the charges, citation of evidence, and hearing a pupil's case if he has one . . . The introduction of fair practices in some places should help students without depriving school authorities of any powers they should be using. And where is a better place than at school for young citizens to learn to expect justice and to practice holding up their own end in pursuing it in matters involving them?

⁴⁴Editorial, "Fair Play at the Schoolhouse," Chicago Tribune, Jan. 31, 1975, Sec. 2, p. 2.

Carl T. Rowan, of the Chicago Daily News, on January 28, 1975 expressed the view that due process in the schools would stem discrimination:⁴⁵

. . . I find distasteful even the suggestion that the constitutional right of due process applies to 30-year olds but not to 14 year olds. Discipline is clearly a serious problem in our schools. But one source of the problem is the feeling on the part of . . . students that they are helpless in the face of school administrators who wield the untrammled power to act unilaterally. This power enables some school officials to discriminate against students and then suspend or expel them if they complain.

In his article, Mr. Rowan cited a national study that found that most students pushed out of school are minorities. He also quoted School Supt. Nolan Estes of Dallas, who testified in a court case that "institutional racism" exists in the Dallas school system, leading Judge Sarah T. Hughes to find that this racism was a factor in the high percentage of black students suspended for disciplinary reasons. Mr. Rowan also stated in his article, that of the twenty largest cities in the country, nineteen had a higher rate of suspension for minorities (in 1974) than for whites.

Mr. Rowan expressed the view that many suspensions and expulsions are justified and unavoidable. He stated that without them, some classrooms would be in constant chaos. But, he stated, "There is a major issue of national wellbeing involved in halting the harsh acts of discipline that are based on the frustrations, vindictiveness, petty prejudices and rampant racism of some teachers and officials . . . "

⁴⁵Rowan, Carl, "Due Process in Schools will Stem Discrimination," Chicago Daily News, Jan. 28, 1975.

Sid Harris, another satirist, wrote a rather serious article, on April 1, 1975, concerning children's lib. In commenting on the Goss decision he wrote:⁴⁶

I myself can see no objection to "children's lib," any more than to women's lib or gay lib or even, for that matter, to lab lib for laboratory animals experimented on without their permission. There is far too much manipulation by those in power these days, and the more restraints on their arbitrary decisions, the better for all of us.

It seems odd to me, in fact, that we have waited so long to give children what every ordinary adult expects before he is judged and convicted; the right to know why, make a defense, and win an acquittal. Such high-handed behavior in the past was not a symbol of "authority"--it was, rather, an illustration of arrogance and power at work.

Children, in every milieu, quickly absorb an acute sense of justice. What is "fair" and "unfair" leaps to the child's mind as a natural response. By the time they are ten, most kids are convinced that the adult world twists "justice" around to suit its own selfish ends.

I think they are right, and that discipline has nothing to do with harsh, irrational and arbitrary decisions made by some harrassed principal or overwhelmed teacher. Discipline is a problem in the moral order . . . Children believe what we practice, not what we preach . . . It is high time that we begin treating pupils as full-fledged citizens. It should not have taken the Supreme Court to force us to set this example.

Even "Advice Columns" had become embroiled in the issue of student rights. A distressed mother wrote to Ann Landers in 1977:⁴⁷

My two boys were suspended from school for wearing Farrah Fawcett T-shirts. The principal said the shirts were "vulger and inappropriate." He also said most women, when they go to the beach, wear more than Farrah had on when she modeled for that T-shirt.

⁴⁶Harris, Sid, "Children's Lib Long Overdue," Chicago Daily News, April 1, 1975, p. 10.

⁴⁷Landers, Ann, "T-Shirt Furor Flaunts Letter of the Law," Chicago Sun Times, Oct. 16, 1977, sec. 5, p. 4.

I insist that their rights of freedom of expression have been violated. What do you think? Signed, Ruckus in Texas

Ann Landers, in turn responded:

Dear Ruck:

I am unable to pass judgment on the T-shirts because I have not seen them. The school principal, however, has, and declared that they are "vulgar and inappropriate." Since he's in charge, that's good enough for me.

A mother who would send her children to school wearing T-shirts that cause their suspension teaches them to spit in the eye of authority. She also teaches them that they can get a lot of attention by refusing to follow the rules.

I'm in favor of revolution when rights have been violated, but kids aren't running the school. I feel sorry for those who try. They're going to have some rough days ahead.

Approximately thirty days after the Goss decision, the U.S. Supreme Court, on February 25, 1975, set standards on lawsuits against school officials. A summary of the Wood v. Strickland decision appeared in School Law News:⁴⁸

Ignorance is no excuse if a school official violates a student's civil rights, no matter how good the official's intentions are . . . is a decision which Justice Lewis Powell predicted could make board members and administrators more vulnerable than ever to suits for damages brought by aggrieved students.

In counterpoint to last month's Goss v. Lopez decision giving students broad due process rights during short-term suspensions from public schools, the High Court in this case reaffirmed with qualifications the school official's immunity from liability for damages in lawsuits brought by students claiming to be victims of unfair treatment.

The events that lead up to this landmark decision, occurred in Arkansas, where two high school students had been expelled by the

⁴⁸Hagan, Robert, "High Court Sets Standards on Lawsuits Against School Officials," School Law News, Vol. 3, No. 5, March 5, 1975, pp. 1-10.

board of education for spiking the punch at a party for parents. The students, all sophomores, and sixteen years of age, admitted mixing three bottles of beer into a soda pop punch, bringing it to a school function for parents and teachers, and serving it, apparently without noticeable effect. By calculation, according to the account given in the National Association of Secondary School Principals' publication, a Legal Memorandum, the punch contained no more than 0.91% alcohol, which plaintiffs claimed was insufficient to constitute a violation of the board's rule against serving an "intoxicating" beverage at school functions.⁴⁹

When rumors spread that the punch had been spiked, the plaintiffs were called in for discussion and they confessed. The board then held a meeting to which neither the students nor their parents were invited, and despite a plea for clemency by the principal, the board decided to suspend the offenders for the remainder of the year, a period of three months. At a second meeting, two weeks later, at which the students were represented, the board refused to relent because their rule prescribed a mandatory expulsion for the offense. According to the Legal Memorandum account, the students then brought action to block the board's decision.⁵⁰ Later the petition was amended to include financial damages against the board members as individuals under the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S. C. Sec 1983).

⁴⁹National Association of Sec. School Principals, A Legal Memorandum, June, 1975, pp. 1-7.

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 1-7.

The District Court originally favored the school board on the grounds that the board members were immune from damages, but the decision was reversed by the Court of Appeals, holding that the board's failure to present any evidence that the punch was "intoxicating" was a violation of the plaintiffs' constitutional rights. According to the Legal Memorandum, the case presented two issues to the Supreme Court:⁵¹

1. Are school officials immune from liability for damages under Sec. 1983 without proof of malice on their part?
2. Do federal courts have the right to re-examine evidentiary questions arising in school disciplinary questions, or the proper construction of school regulations?

The School Law News, quoted Justice Byron White on these important issues:⁵²

We think there must be a degree of immunity if the work of the schools is to go forward, and however worded, the immunity must be such that public school officials understand that actions taken in the good-faith fulfillment of their responsibilities and within the bounds of reason under all the circumstances will not be punished and that they need not exercise their discretion with undue timidity.

. . . It is not the role of the Federal courts to set aside decisions of school administrators which the court may view as lacking in wisdom or compassion. While students do have due process rights, "Section 1983" does not extend the right to relitigate in Federal court evidentiary questions arising in school disciplinary proceedings to the proper construction of school regulations, nor was it intended to be a vehicle for Federal court correction of errors in the exercise of a school administrator's discretion and judgement.

⁵¹Hagan, Robert, "High Court Sets Standards on Lawsuits Against School Officials," School Law News, Vol. 3, No. 5, March 5, 1975, pp. 1-10.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 1-7.

However, the clincher for school administrators, in this momentous decision was that ignorance of the law, cannot protect a school official against liability. A school administrator or board member must adhere to a standard based not only on permissible intentions, but also on knowledge of the basic, unquestioned constitutional rights of his charges. The School Law News also contained the following review of the decision:⁵³

What is Good Faith? The Circuit Court differed slightly from the High Court in its test of what a "good faith" decision on the part of a state official is. White said, "The official must himself be acting sincerely and with a belief that he is doing right, but an act violating a student's constitutional rights can be no more justified by ignorance or disregard of settled, indisputable law on the part of the one entrusted with supervision of student's daily lives than by the presence of actual malice."

The Court also held that a school board member is not immune from liability for damages under Sect. 1983 if he knew or reasonably should have known that the action he took within his sphere of official responsibility would violate the constitutional rights of the student affected, or if he took the action with the malicious intention to cause a deprivation of those rights. White said, "The most capable candidates for school board positions might be deterred from seeking office if heavy burdens upon their private resources from monetary liability were a likely prospect during their tenurs."⁵⁴

The School Law News, also summarized the views of August Steinhilber, Director of Federal Relations for the National School

⁵³Ibid., pp. 1-7.

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 1-7.

Board Association, in 1975, who predicted that the decision, "could cause some very good people not to run for the board because in many cases, their very livelihood could be endangered."⁵⁵ Steinhilber noted that board members, who are generally unpaid volunteers are likely to want individual personal liability insurance now that they are more vulnerable to damage lawsuits. He also observed that since the increased likelihood of lawsuits may drive up the premiums demanded by insurance companies, insurance may be difficult to obtain at a reasonable rate.

The Wood v. Strickland decision appeared to draw more controversy than did the Goss v. Lopez decision. While the Chicago Tribune heartily endorsed the Goss decision, the editors were wary of the Strickland decision as evidenced by their editorial of March 1, 1975:⁵⁶

The Supreme Court has again strengthened the legal position of school pupils relative to school authorities. A month ago it held, with our approval, that children have rights, and that pupils who were suspended were entitled to a statement of the reasons and an opportunity to explain their conduct. The court made it clear, also with our approval, that these rights were limited and did not include the right to a lawyer or cross examination.

Now the court has held, by the same 5-4 division, that school authorities can be sued for damages if they "violate the constitutional rights of the student affected." This time the majority of justices went too far.

As Justice Powell said, "Officials will now act at the peril of some judge or jury subsequently finding that a good-faith belief

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 1-7.

⁵⁶Editorial, "The Case of the Spiked Punch," The Chicago Tribune, March 1, 1975, Sec. 1, p. 8.

as to the applicable law was mistaken and hence actionable." As 5 to 4 decisions by the Supreme Court illustrate, the implications of constitutional rights are not always obvious to everyone. It puts an undue burden on school disciplinarians to make them subject to damage suits arising from decisions taken in good faith. This is especially true in view of the legal immunities that juveniles have and often abuse.

. . . Are the schools now to be as plagued by pupils' rights suits as the medical practice has been plagued by the more justifiable malpractice suits? The prospect is dismaying.

Dr. William R. Hazard, in his article, "Schooling and the Law," echoed Justice Powell's dissenting opinion when he stated:⁵⁷

One need not be an alarmist to predict that school discipline decisions will be made cautiously, if at all. Perhaps a dramatic reduction in the use of school exclusions in discipline proceedings is overdue and the exclusions may be vastly overrated as useful educational tools.

. . . We see in Wood the tragic paradox of mandated schooling turned sour, not by deliberate malefaction but rather by limited understanding and inadequate procedures to achieve the mandated end. Given the laws mandating attendance, schooling and teaching, and the school's limited capacity to deliver on the mandate, to legally punish the school authorities' good-faith decisions seems sadly unenlightened.

Bangser, rather than viewing Wood as an unfair intrusion into the decision making process stated this positive view, in his article, "The Role of the Federal Judiciary in Directing Student-Authority Interaction":⁵⁸

. . . In Goss it was determined that the quasi-adversary relationship which exists between students and the school disciplinarian would be improved if the children were allowed to communicate their position on "what really happened." In Wood, the Court's suggestions, while more indirect . . . , also propose that

⁵⁷Hazard, William R., "Schooling and the Law," Education and Urban Society, Vol. 8, No. 3, May, 1976, p. 317.

⁵⁸Bangser, Henry, "The Role of the Federal Judiciary," Education and Urban Society, Vol. 8, No. 3, May, 1976, pp. 301-302.

openness and conference may enhance public education. Without a concerted effort to include pupils in the process that established disciplinary guidelines, school boards must continue to wonder exactly how much those kids really do know about their constitutional rights. If Tinker, Goss and Wood teach us anything, it is that the enlightened control of student behavior, from the construction of school regulations to their implementation, cannot be conducted in a vacuum . . . The adoption of operations consistent with Wood are not easily developed, but it should be argued that erroneous administrative judgments made with a complete understanding of the prevailing case law, very likely will not result in money damages for the plaintiff-student.

School board members and school administrators, are not alone fearful of educational lawsuits, as teachers themselves sense danger, not only physically when teaching in a stressful environment, but monetarily. Bob Greene, a writer for the Chicago Sun Times, on August 25, 1977, in his article, "Worm in that apple for teacher?", wrote that instead of apples, students may start bringing their teachers subpoenas.⁵⁹ Because of this, the threat of school children bringing suit against their teachers, leaders of the education establishment were urging that teachers give serious thought to taking out malpractice insurance. Mr. Greene quoted Joan Sullivan Baranski, at that time, editor of Teacher magazine:⁶⁰

This is quite serious, because of what has happened in the last five years, it is very important that teachers give serious thought to obtaining malpractice insurance, either on their own or through unions. What's happening in the schools reflects what's happening in society in general . . . There are school districts in the country where malpractice insurance is already a part of union packages.

⁵⁹Greene, Bob, "Worm in that Apple for Teacher?", Chicago Sun Times, Aug. 25, 1977, p. 6.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 6.

. . . Parents used to hand their children over to teachers and trust the teachers to do their jobs . . . Now it's different . . . Teachers, however, should not live in fear of their students and still are the ones running the classrooms.

A school teacher, Robert H. Doane, wrote a letter to the Chicago Daily News, expressing his consternation:⁶¹

The Supreme Court has spoken for students' rights but without reference to students' responsibilities. When a person has responsibilities without rights, he is a slave; when he has rights without responsibilities he is a tyrant.

The narrow scope of the court's decision has, in a general way, assigned teacher and student to the respective roles of slave and tyrant. With the students, a group traditionally hostile to teachers, the latter must exercise legal responsibility without benefit of peer-group witnesses in case of confrontation. The students have a 25-1 advantage in the classroom, and no ultimate responsibility for school work or behavior.

Educational personnel, at all levels, appeared to perceive that personal liability involving monetary damages or the threat of lawsuits, had become a real possibility, as is evidenced by the aforementioned quotations by school board representatives as well as teachers. Shortly after the Wood decision, two Chicago Public School students sued the Chicago Board of Education for monetary damages on the grounds that they had been suspended from classes without being granted hearings.

Ironically, both of these students had been suspended prior to the Goss and Wood decisions of 1975. The two Chicago students, Jarius Piphus and Silas Brisco, each were suspended for twenty days without hearings. But the suspensions ended before the twenty-day

⁶¹Doane, Robert H., "Court Makes Teacher a Slave," Chicago Daily News, March 21, 1975, p. 16.

time limit when the students obtained injunctions against the Chicago Board of Education. Records show that Piphus, then fourteen years of age, was suspended January 13, 1974, from Chicago Vocational High School, after he was accused of smoking marijuana in school. Briscoe, then thirteen years of age, was suspended September 11, 1973, from Barton Elementary School, after attending class wearing an earring. School officials maintained that the earring was a symbol of street gang membership.

Lee Strobel of the Chicago Daily News, in his article, "Suspended Students Win Right to Sue," described the circumstances of the case.⁶²

It appeared that Piphus, represented by the Northwestern Legal Assistance Clinic, was admitted to classes after eight days, but denied \$3,000 damages sought in his behalf; Briscoe, represented by the American Civil Liberties Union and Operation Push, was let back in school after seventeen days, but denied \$10,000 damages sought in his behalf.

The students' cases were heard by Judge Richard McLaren, but after trial motions were heard and denied by Judge George Leighton, the Lower Court had found the students were not entitled to damages because they could not show they suffered financial loss or individual injury such as mental distress.

⁶²Strobel, Lee, "Suspended Students Win Right to Sue," Chicago Daily News, Nov. 24, 1976, p. 12.

The United States Court of Appeals ruled on Tuesday, November 24, 1976, that the Federal District Court was in error when it denied damages to the two Chicago students who had been suspended without hearings. The appeals court panel consisting of Judges Philip Tone, Latham Castle and Tim Clark found that the district court should have granted the students the opportunity to seek damages because their rights had been denied. The ruling, written by Tone, said the students would be eligible for additional "special damages" if they could show that they would not have been suspended if granted hearings.

In setting the damages, the appeals court said, the district court should make and award, "neither so small as to trivialize the right to a hearing . . . or so large as to provide a windfall."

David Goldberger, of the American Civil Liberties Union, which represented Briscoe is quoted:⁶³

Over the year the board (Chicago Board of Education) has been grossly insensitive to the rights of students . . . We knew what the law was and they knew it, and they weren't obeying it. The idea of the damages is that money talks, and that's what we went after.

The Chicago Board of Education then appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. After Goldberger received a copy of the School Board's appeal, he said he believed the Board was concerned that the appeals court's ruling that damages were appropriate would set a precedent. "As we understand it," he said, "they're very concerned about damages cases being brought against individual teachers and School Board personnel."

⁶³Ibid., p. 12.

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial, concerning the matter of monetary damages, contained the following thoughts:⁶⁴

. . . In schools it is difficult to strike a good balance between the authority of adults and the rights of children. But adult authority and pupil rights can coexist if both are reasonably defined. For the sake of the children, considerable adult authority is necessary, or a few bad actors can make learning nearly impossible for others.

The courts have not deprived school principals of the weapon of suspension. They have simply made its use conditional on a prior hearing, at which misunderstandings can be cleared up and policies disputed.

Suspension does little or nothing to advance the education of the suspended pupil, though it may provide relief for others in a school. Making suspensions somewhat less readily accessible as a disciplinary tool could result in increased use of other, better ways of dealing with pupils.

. . . In the ideal school, of course, adults and children have a cooperative relationship, rather than either running roughshod over the other . . . The award of damages can be a deterrent against repeated offenses as well as compensation for the aggrieved.

This editorial posture was incongruent with the Tribune's editorial of 1975, in which they lamented the Strickland v. Wood decision because it might encourage frivolous suits and monetary liability against school board members who serve without salaries.

On Monday, April 18, 1977, the Supreme Court granted the Chicago Board of Education a hearing to decide whether the city must pay damages to students suspended in violation of their constitutional rights. The school board's attorney, Michael J. Murray, told the high court that the appeals court decision requires that "general

⁶⁴Editorial, "The Courts and Suspensions," Chicago Tribune, Nov. 30, 1976, Sec. 3, p. 2.

compensatory damages must be awarded as a matter of law when any violation of civil rights has been established. This is clearly in conflict with decisions of other federal courts."⁶⁵

On Tuesday, March 21, 1978, the United States Supreme Court ruled that Chicago public school students who are suspended without hearings can sue for "substantial" damages only if they prove actual injury. The High court unanimously reversed a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals that Jarius Piphus and Silas Briscoe, were entitled to damages even if their suspensions were justified and there was no proof of injury.

Glen Elsasser, of the Chicago Tribune, summarized the court action. He wrote that the high court also ordered a new round of legal proceedings for the two Chicagoans, who charged that school officials violated the 1871 Civil Rights Act by suspending them during the 1973-74 school year.⁶⁶

Mr. Elsasser quoted Justice Lewis Powell, who wrote the court's opinion. Justice Powell said the two would be entitled to "nominal damages not to exceed one dollar" if the District Court determined that the suspensions were justified." Powell also wrote:⁶⁷

⁶⁵Elsasser, Glen, "High Court to Act on Suspension Case," Chicago Tribune, April 19, 1977, p. 6.

⁶⁶Elasser, Glen, "Court Limits the Scope of Pupils' Damage Claims," Chicago Tribune, March 22, 1978, p. 12.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 12.

By making the deprivation of such rights (to hearings) actionable for nominal damages without proof of actual injury, the law recognizes the importance to organized society that those rights be scrupulously observed . . . substantial damages should be awarded only to compensate actual injury or . . . to deter or punish malicious deprivation of rights.

Chicago School officials did not challenge lower court holdings that the students were denied a proper hearing, but contested the court of appeals' ruling that the students should be awarded damages for an "intangible" injury. Attorneys for the students argued that the suspensions were not erroneous, but that the lack of a hearing caused mental and emotional distress. They also contended that denial of a hearing violated the constitutional guarantee of the "feeling of just treatment by the government."

Because the cases had not been totally aired in lower courts, the justices sent them back so that it could be determined if the suspensions were justified. If they were, the students still would get nominal damages, no more than \$1.00, because the schools did not give them a hearing.

It is interesting to note, that at the time the suspensions occurred, there was no set Chicago Board of Education policy requiring hearings for suspended students, and the Goss decision had not yet been rendered by the Supreme Court.

A parent expressed his support of the concept of "nominal damages," rendered by the court, when he wrote to the "Voice of the People," in the Chicago Tribune:⁶⁸

⁶⁸Keith, A., "Court Decision Praised," Chicago Tribune, March 31, 1978, Sec 3, p. 2.

The United States Supreme Court's recent ruling that Chicago public school students who are suspended without hearings can sue for substantial damages only if they prove "actual injury" should be hailed as a great decision for our frustrated school staffs. As a parent who is fed up with the chaos in our schools, I believe it is about time we got rid of trouble makers.

Chaos in the schools has recently become a big issue. If students have full constitutional rights, do some of them have the right to disrupt classrooms and sometimes physically assault other students and sometimes teachers? The Supreme Court in recent years has been supportive of student rights at a time when violence in the schools has been soaring. Contemporary newspaper articles have dealt with this problem. An article in the Chicago Sun Times indicated that in the last ten years, violence and vandalism in the nation's schools had increased from an occasional incident to a daily, costly debilitating problem.⁶⁹ According to the American Educator Magazine, published by the American Federation of Teachers, the UPI article said that the incidents, first noticed in lower income, minority populated urban schools, have become commonplace in suburban and rural institutions. Teachers from across the United States reported insubordination, rapes, knifings, threats and other forms of violence directed at them on a regular basis. Some teachers' groups, the article stated, had won contracts forcing school boards to either transfer or permanently dismiss students who attack teachers, and had been provided with legal backing for actions teachers take when victimized by students.

⁶⁹UPI Article, Chicago Sun Times, July 5, 1978, p. 62.

The article also stated that some teachers attributed the increasing violence . . . to inadequate and inconsistent pupil conduct policies. Others blamed it on a lack of support by school administrators and boards for failure to prohibit "intruders with no business on school property." Some teachers felt that another contributing cause is the student's inability to grasp the relationship between education and future success.

There is no doubt that school violence and vandalism have moved, in just one decade, from being an ancillary problem in the life of the secondary school principal to a position of oppressive and ever present dominance. The National Association of Secondary School Principals published a pamphlet in 1975, dealing with the topic and came to the following conclusions:⁷⁰

Incidents of student crime appear throughout the nation. . . . The growing incidence of crime seldom centers around student-adult conflict, and the crime spree of the Seventies is flourishing despite school reforms made in response to student and parent demands for more freedom.

The long range objective of the principal is to erase the climate of fear, and to make schools safe for learning. The immediate task facing the principal is to maintain the safety and welfare of the students.

The pamphlet indicated that the contributing factors to school crimes are as complex as society itself, such as breakdown of family control, glamorization of violence on TV and street crimes by youth which spills into the school. Coupled with the self-serving philosophy and contempt for personal and public property exhibited by

⁷⁰-----, School Violence and Vandalism, NASSP, April 16, 1975, pp. 1-11.

many youths, are lethargic courts, openness of schools and the push for students rights.

The publication indicated that most principals support "student rights," but feel they must be balanced by responsibilities and that primary among them is the duty to respect the rights of others, the security of one's person and property.⁷¹

To many principals, and to teachers as well, the publication cautioned, this right of the majority of students and staff alike has all too often been overlooked in the desire to accord fair treatment to those accused of violence, vandalism, or disruption of the school and community. However, the NASSP pointed out that the recent decisions of the Supreme Court championing student rights show a careful and well reasoned effort to balance between these two interests. The organization felt, however, that whatever actions might be taken to accord greater opportunity and freedom to youth, that the necessary power to protect the school and its students be retained by the school system and its building principals. "Without such power," the NASSP cautioned, "the public schools cannot stand, and the loss will not be the principals'; it will be society's."⁷²

The following recommendations were made by the NASSP to reduce violence, vandalism and disruption:⁷³

⁷¹Ibid., pp. 1-11.

⁷²Ibid., pp. 1-11.

⁷³Ibid., pp. 1-11.

1. Additional security personnel will be needed. They should operate as members of the school staff and their training should be planned jointly by school personnel and by the juvenile officers of the police.
2. Prompt attention by courts to acts of alleged crime in schools is imperative. Delays and continuances should not be granted except for the most compelling reasons.
3. Curricular reform can play a part in redirecting negative student attitudes. The increased enrollment of youth in school has brought with it broader heterogeneity in the student populace. In many instances this broader student base includes students who read poorly and write incoherently.
4. Student involvement in any and all programs is imperative.

Suspension Policies--Legal Background,
Chicago Public Schools

The Chicago Region PTA had long been concerned with the problems generated as a result of massive suspensions and formed a Suspension Study Committee which issued their first report in September of 1967.⁷⁴ The following resolution was submitted to the Chicago Region PTA by the South Shore High School parent group:

Whereas: Suspension from school results in the student's falling behind academically, and

Whereas: Suspension leaves the student without proper supervision, and

Whereas: Suspension does not attack the cause of the offense, be it resolved that the Chicago Region PTA make a study of the process of suspending a student, and the possible alternatives.

⁷⁴Chicago Region PTA, Report of Suspension Committee, Sept. 20, 1967.

The study committee obtained its information by meeting with Board of Education staff at the levels of Associate Superintendent, District Superintendent, Principal and District parent-coordinator. They also met with the Illinois Youth Commission and the Chicago Police Department.

All sources agreed that "the continued presence in the classroom of children who present serious discipline problems can make effective teaching impossible. The sequestration of such children and the establishment of local social adjustment rooms in every school as needed, can provide significant alleviation of this problem."

The committee unearthed the Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education of 1893 and discovered the following statement:⁷⁵

Instead of suspending refractory and vicious children from our schools, provision should be made so that a child who is not manageable with better children shall be placed under the care of special teachers in a disciplinary school.

The committee also consulted the 1967 rules of the Chicago Board of Education, Chapter VI, Section 6, Article 9, which stated:

For gross disobedience or misconduct, a pupil may be suspended temporarily by the principal for a period not exceeding one school month for each offense. Every such suspension shall be reported immediately to the District Superintendent and also to the parent or guardian of the pupil, with a full statement of the reasons for such suspension. The District Superintendent shall have authority to review the action of the principal and to return the suspended pupil.

The Chicago Region PTA Study Committee in 1967 found that the Board of Education had no further policy concerning suspensions and that no data concerning suspensions was collated by the Central Office.

⁷⁵Ibid.

Recommendations for possible alternatives to suspensions were offered by the committee, some of which were:

1. Smaller class size.
2. More adjustment facilities, tutorial rooms, social adjustment rooms, special education rooms, freed assistant principals and more men teachers.
3. More specialized professional support for teachers.

The PTA Committee further recommended that there be a compilation of suspension data in each district to be forwarded to the Chicago Board of Education yearly, as well as increased cooperation among school, parents and community. Continued efforts to secure adequate financing for the Chicago Public Schools was the final recommendation.

Not until February, 1977, did the Chicago Region PTA become involved in another suspension study, despite the fact that many of their committee recommendations, such as compilation of suspension statistics, and the introduction of tutorial rooms, had not been implemented. The Chicago Region PTA acted as a subgroup of the Education Advisory Committee of the Chicago Commission on Human Relations. The Education Advisory Committee formed in 1976, worked for a period of one year on a special study entitled, "Suspensions and Expulsions in Chicago Public Schools."⁷⁶ The chairman of the committee, Mr. Demetri Konstantelos, Chicago Commissioner of Human Relations worked with representatives from the Chicago Police

⁷⁶Konstantelos, Demetri, Suspensions and Expulsions in Chicago Public Schools, Feb., 1977, pp. 1-19.

Department, Chicago Teachers Union, parent groups, PTA, Chicago Board of Education, the Anti-Defamation League and the Juvenile Court of Cook County.

The committee's decision to select suspensions and expulsions as a priority topic, was due to the extensive data received on the subject from the Office of Civil Rights Report of 1973-74. This report was alarming to the committee because it indicated that suspensions in Chicago Public Schools were not only high, but ranged from 0% to 125%. They felt that such statistics could be an indicator that possible inequities exist among schools in their approach to discipline, which result in suspension and expulsion.

From its research, the Committee isolated problems directly related to the present method of dealing with suspension and expulsion in the Chicago Public Schools:⁷⁷

1. The need for a definition of "gross misconduct."

Although students are suspended for "Gross Misconduct," the Board of Education has yet to define the term. This lack of definition leaves the term open to interpretation by school administrators. As a result of this lack of consistency, students in one school could be suspended for an offense that may not warrant suspension at another school.

2. Lack of consistent behavior policies in each school.

The committee made the following recommendations:

1. To include the following items in formulating the definition of gross misconduct:
 - a. Behavior which is injurious to persons and property; assault or battery of a student on school property.

⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 4-6.

- b. Behavior which disrupts the educational process or discipline in school. Such types of behavior should be detailed so that possible misunderstandings by students can be avoided.
 - c. Repeated minor incidents of misbehavior.
 - d. Gross disrespect, which includes recurring willful disobedience, repeated incidents of verbal disrespect, and open defiance to the authority of administrators, teachers, and other school personnel.
2. New policies and other information related to suspensions should be made available to the entire school community so that parents and students are properly informed about their rights. All suspension and expulsion material should be distributed annually and parents should sign a statement indicating receipt of a copy of the rules for suspension . . .
 3. Students should receive annual orientation regarding suspension and expulsion, including transfer students.

On May 28, 1975, the Chicago Board of Education revised its guidelines on suspension in order to conform with the Goss v. Lopez decision, rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court. In Goss v. Lopez, the Court ruled that at a minimum, students facing suspensions not exceeding ten days must be given oral or written notice of the specific offenses charged against them and/or rules alleged to have been violated. A hearing which allows students to elicit evidence and explain their side of the story must be held before a suspension can be imposed, except in those circumstances where a student's presence poses a continuing danger to persons or property. Although hearings for short term suspensions can be very informal, the Law Department of the Chicago Board of Education, commenting on the Goss vs. Lopez

decision in a letter to the Chicago Commission on Human Relations observed that with regard to short term suspensions:⁷⁸

There may be situations in which elaborate procedures will be required. Thus it appears that the decision of the Supreme Court not only mandates rudimentary hearings where none were required before, but also raises the possibility that more formalized procedures may be required in given situations.

The revised guidelines sent to all administrators of Chicago Public Schools were:⁷⁹

1. No student shall be suspended from school without using authorized procedures. Every suspension shall be reported immediately to the district superintendent using the appropriate forms and also reported to the parent or guardian of the pupil with a full statement of the reasons for the suspension.
2. A student facing suspension of ten days or less shall be given oral or written notice of the charges against him and an informal hearing arranged by the principal. At the hearing, the student will be given an explanation of the basis of the charges as well as an opportunity to present his version of the facts.
3. A student facing suspension may request that a third party, such as parent, school staff member of another student be present during the informal hearing.
4. In those cases where a student's presence poses a continuing danger to persons or property or is an ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process, the student may immediately be removed from school. In such cases the necessary notice and informal hearing should follow as soon as practicable.
5. Every effort should be made to ensure the student's receipt of class assignments for the period of suspension. The academic grade of a suspended student will not be affected when class assignments are completed satisfactorily in keeping with standards applicable to all students, set by the student's teacher. Teachers have the further option of testing pupils upon their return to class on the work submitted.

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹Ibid.

The Education Advisory Committee came to the conclusion that the practice of suspending students from school except in situations where they pose a physical danger or actual threat of disruption is in most instances, an inappropriate method of punishment. They felt that suspension from school precludes many students from keeping abreast in their academic subjects and encourages students to voluntarily withdraw from school. They also felt that alternative methods to suspension should be developed which allow students to remain in school, so that students may benefit academically and the loss of state aid revenues may be diminished.

The committee also noted that suspensions and expulsion are symptoms of other problems. They felt that the increased numbers of suspensions and expulsions are indicative of a system faced with a multitude of serious problems. It appears that many of Chicago's school children are members of families with many problems such as divorce, desertion, unemployment, illness, retardation and delinquency. Many students also lack opportunities, motivation and the capacity to cope with their problems.

In addition, they noted, many children do not necessarily understand or agree with certain "middle class" values. The Education Advisory Committee indicated that schools have not met that misunderstanding in a definitive manner nor have they provided adequate alternatives.

Some further recommendations made by the committee were:⁸⁰

⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 6-14.

1. The Board should endeavor to set up school security and behavior standards programs.
2. The Board of Education should direct its school principals to set up rules of conduct in a simple and codefied manner that correspond to the Board's ultimate definition of gross disobedience and misconduct.
3. The Board should utilize every method at its disposal to reduce overcrowded and congested conditions at each school.
4. The Board of Education should confirm through its school level inservice meetings that every staff member, both professional and non-professional, is familiar with and has access to the various services and agencies that can be utilized to provide the best possible service for pupil personnel problems.
5. The Board of Education (Chicago) should direct its administrators to assure that procedures and policies at the local school level are such that parents feel welcome. There should be an open and honest attempt by school officials to alert parent of particular problems regarding their child as well as eliciting their support in resolving them. This would help alleviate administrative and teacher fear that has been evident in many schools concerning the problem of suspension and expulsion and the fear of reprisal.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, as previously mentioned, using data submitted to their office by the Chicago Board of Education, reported that the Chicago Public Schools suspended over 28,000 students during the school year 1973-74, the highest number in the nation. The Children's Defense Fund, a national research and advocacy group concerned with children's rights, published a study, "School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?"⁸¹ This study not only listed Chicago as the first in school suspensions, but indicated that there is no city-wide conduct code.

⁸¹Children's Defense Fund, "School Suspensions, Are They Helping Children?", Washington Research Project, Sept., 1975, p. 12.

The study ascertained that without a common code, within the guidelines of the Constitution, the Board/Teachers Union Contract and the Rules of the Board of Education, Chicago principals are allowed discretionary power to decide the kinds of student conduct that merit suspension in their school.

The American Friends Service Committee published a newspaper entitled, "Chicago's Schools Suspension," in April, 1976.⁸² The entire paper was devoted to the status of suspensions in the Chicago Public Schools.

The editor of the paper, upon inspection of OCR data, revealed that in some city schools, students were suspended for chewing gum, for wearing tinted glasses and for being late for class, while in other schools students were suspended for more serious offenses, such as possession of weapons and assaults upon staff and students.

Upon perusal of the data, it was also noted that some schools suspend few or no students at all, while others suspend over 25% of their student body, yet schools that suspended large numbers of students did not seem to be more "orderly" than schools that suspended fewer students.

It is, therefore, obvious that there are differences among the many Chicago Public Schools in suspension rates, and that the courts have entered into the arena in order to protect the Due Process

⁸²American Friends Service Committee, "Chicago's Schools Suspension," April, 1976, p. 1.

rights of students, which in turn led to the revision of the suspension guidelines for Chicago Public School Administrators.

The Impact of Court and Legal
Decisions on School Personnel

Since 1975, the Supreme Court rendered four important decisions of concern to school personnel, Goss, Wood, Briscoe, and Ingraham, granting students due process prior to suspension, allowing school personnel to be sued as individuals and as a group for violating the civil rights of students, limiting monetary damages unless bodily harm has occurred, and permitting paddling without a hearing. All of these decisions were 5-4, reflecting the schizoid nature of the general populace, who believe in democracy, but want law and order both in society and in the schools. Despite the fact that these decisions could have important consequences for school personnel, it appears that school leaders are not very knowledgeable about the meaning of Supreme Court decisions affecting schools. Perry A. Zirkel, dean of the School of Education of Lehigh University, reported in the April, 1978 edition of the Kaplan that school leaders participating in a PDK survey, are abysmally ignorant on Supreme Court decisions affecting education. Mr. Zirkel stated in his article, "A Test on Supreme Court Decisions Affecting Education":⁸³

⁸³Zirkel, Perry A., "A Test on Supreme Court Decisions Affecting Education," Kaplan, April, 1978, Vol. 59, No. 8, pp. 521-522, 555.

. . . Are school leaders aware of the do's and don'ts of these decisions? Certainly they need to be, for none of us is excepted from the effect of the Court's rulings, and ignorance of the law is no excuse (Wood). Moreover, if school leaders have an accurate awareness of court decisions affecting them, we may eventually see a reduction in the role of the Supreme Court and lower courts now reluctantly play in school affairs.

A checklist containing twenty statements based on key Supreme Court decisions affecting education, was sent by mail to a random sample of four hundred Phi Delta Kappa members. There were 102 replies to the PDK survey. A review of the results revealed that school leaders are generally not knowledgeable about the operational dictates of Supreme Court decisions affecting education.

Prior to the rendering of the 1975 Goss and Wood decisions, Flygare, writing in the Kappan of December, 1974, predicted some measures that would have to be taken by school administrators in order to comply with due process rights of students should such decisions be decided in favor of them. Prophetically, he wrote:⁸⁴

1. Many school systems will be required to revise their suspension procedures substantially to conform to court decisions.
2. Schools will have to provide notice and a hearing after the removal of disruptive students.
3. Schools will have to provide notice and an impartial hearing prior to non-emergency suspensions.
4. School board hearings on student discipline could not be informal hearings at which the board interprets its own rules and intuitively determine if the spirit of those rules has been violated.
5. School board members have to be certain to exercise good faith in all student disciplinary actions. Failure to do so

⁸⁴Flygare, Thomas, "Two Suspension Cases the Supreme Court Must Decide," Kappan, Dece., 1974, pp. 257-258.

could result in personal money damages being levied against them.

A Legal Memorandum, published by the NASSP, in June, 1975, in discussing the Goss and Wood decisions, stated that most school systems had been providing some aspects of due process to their students for many years, but the Court's new holdings present the first actual requirements set down by the nation's highest court for handling discipline cases. The memorandum warned, "If principals are to avoid the very real spectre of monetary damages where their actions deprive the student of civil rights, it is important for them to be familiar with the requirements and to establish procedures that meet them." The publication also stated, "No educational administrator can be guaranteed that he will not be sued for some action he has taken. Administrators should attempt to obtain liability insurance through professional organizations if possible."⁸⁵

Also writing in the NASSP Bulletin of March, 1977, Von Brock wrote a pertinent article, "Coping with Suspension and the Supreme Court."⁸⁶

In the minds of many administrators, the Court not only set additional complications upon the process of suspension, but also provided for personal penalties if school officials were not experts in constitutional law.

In today's setting, where student discipline has become a major problem in an increasing number of schools, it is easy to understand why school officials may feel defensive at any attempt to

⁸⁵....., "A Legal Memorandum," NASSP, June, 1975, pp. 1-7.

⁸⁶Von Brock, Robert, "Coping with Suspension and the Supreme Court," NASSP Bulletin, March, 1977, Vol. 61, No. 407, pp. 68-76.

restrict their activities in regard to discipline. The conscientious school administrator who is attempting to do a good job, who wants to protect the rights of students, who wants to obey the law, and who has the responsibility of maintaining reasonable order, so that the educational process can take place, is apt to feel that he has no place to turn.

Von Brock gave heart to administrators when he cautioned that if they could read entire court decisions instead of abstracts, they would become aware of the implications of decisions, which clearly do give authority to school boards, school administrators, and teachers, in spite of the fact that students also have constitutional rights.

Von Brock maintained that authority can be abused, and to prevent the abuse of authority is a function of the judicial system. There are occasions where the interests of the educational enterprise dictate that some students be removed from school for periods of time. He indicated that the Supreme Court showed understanding of this need when it said, "Suspension is considered not only to be necessary to maintain order, but is a valuable educational device." Von Brock advised, "If suspension is to be effective, it must be used judiciously. Mass suspensions, suspensions for minor incidents, too frequent suspensions, tend to undermine the value of this tool as a device to maintain order. Students must realize why they are being disciplined and must feel the punishment is just."⁸⁷

School administrators now had a recipe in order to guarantee due process rights to students prior to suspension. For suspensions of ten days or less, administrators must:⁸⁸

⁸⁷Ibid.

⁸⁸Ibid.

1. Give the student oral or written notice of the charges against him.
2. If the student denies the charge, he is entitled to an explanation of the evidence the school has as a basis of the charge.
3. Students shall have an opportunity to tell their side of the story.
4. There need be no delay between the time notice is given and time of the hearing. In a majority of cases the principal may informally discuss the alleged misconduct with the students minutes after it has occurred.
5. Since the hearings may occur almost immediately following the misconduct, generally the notice and hearing should precede the suspension.
6. In cases where the presence of the student poses a continuing danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of disrupting the academic process, the student may immediately be removed from school. In such cases, the notice and hearing should follow as soon as practicable.

The U.S. Supreme Court indicated that in the case of suspensions of longer than ten days or in the case of expulsions, more formal procedures may be required. Von Brock maintained that the Court was aware of the concern of educators about the limitation it was placing upon their exercise of disciplinary authority, but believed it had exercised restraint:⁸⁹

In holding as we do, we do not believe that we have imposed procedures on school disciplinarians which are inappropriate in a classroom setting. Instead we have imposed requirements which are, if anything, less than a fair minded principal would impose upon himself in order to avoid unfair suspensions.

Within two months following the Goss decision, a Federal District Court was asked to decide whether or not the due process

⁸⁹Ibid.

requirement of Goss applied to extracurricular activities, especially, interscholastic athletics. The Court ruled that competing for a place on a high school athletic team was not a protected property right. In the words of the Court:⁹⁰

We do not read Goss as creating an avenue of judicial intervention into the basic, daily discretionary activities of the public schools, which Strickland v. Wood viewed as beyond the pale of section 1983.

The Fifth Circuit Court (Sweet v. Childs, 518 F. 2nd 320, 1975), according to Von Brock, upheld the suspension of students who left school to march to the superintendent's office and were suspended by radio announcement, without a pre-suspension hearing. The Court reasoned that there was no opportunity for a presuspension hearing since the students did not return to school. Since there was substantial disruption of the academic process, the principal held conferences with the students involved and their parents following the suspensions.⁹¹

Several lower court decisions following Goss showed that, absent abuse of discretion, fraud or collusion, a court will not interfere with a decision of the board of education in resolving a question within its discretion. Von Brock, again, outlined a case that took place in New Hampshire (Kelly v. Johnson, USDC. No. 75-91, Feb. 12, 1976), whereby a student was informed that his conduct was improper, but was not told that he might be suspended. Further, the

⁹⁰Ibid.

⁹¹Ibid.

specific reasons for the suspension were not given at any time prior to the suspension. A Federal District Court ruled that the student had been given minimal due process and the suspension was expunged from his record. However, since the suspension was not the result of arbitrary or capricious action on the part of the principal, no damages were awarded.⁹²

What if an administrator should make a mistake, fail to follow due process or otherwise violate a student's constitutional rights? According to Von Brock, the Wood decision stated:⁹³

Every person . . . who subjects or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States . . . to the deprivation of any rights, privileges or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for redress.

While this statement may have caused consternation among educators, Von Brock cited examples whereby the courts demonstrated support for school personnel within the framework of the Wood decision. He cited the following case:⁹⁴

In Sullivan v. Meade (No. 101, 530 R. 2d 799, 8th Cir., 1976) the Eighth Circuit Court, set forth a series of steps to determine good faith actions and held that immunity from personal liability is established by a school official showing good faith. The four steps cited were:

1. The action must be taken without malice or ill will.
2. The school must balance the interests of the individual against its own legitimate governmental interest.

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁴Ibid.

3. The basic rights of procedural and substantive due process must be followed.
4. The rights allegedly violated must be unquestioned constitutional rights.

Von Brock pointed out that most of the decisions trying to apply the Wood v. Strickland decision criteria were concerned with the question of whether or not school administrators and school board members have acted in accordance with settled, indisputable constitutional law. While school officials cannot be expected to foresee future interpretations of constitutional rights, they are expected to be aware of current legal requirements and to follow them. "While the conservative application of liability by the courts should help in alleviating some of the anxieties of school officials, it is important to note that the Wood decision has been applied to a wide range of situations other than that of student suspensions," stated Von Brock.⁹⁵

The Wood decision may also affect the rights of school personnel. Some suggestions made by the author in coping with the Goss and Wood decisions were:⁹⁶

1. Remember that every youngster has a right to an education. To deny this right is a serious matter.
2. School officials have a responsibility to maintain order and discipline in the school. Thus a principal may suspend a student up to 10 days, provided:
 - a. The student knows why he is being suspended.

⁹⁵Ibid.

⁹⁶Ibid.

- b. The student should reasonably have known that what he did was wrong.
 - c. The student has an opportunity to tell his side of the story.
 - d. The suspension is done without malice.
3. For suspensions longer than 10 days, the student will usually have a right to a hearing before the school board; and may have additional procedural rights, such as representation by counsel; and confrontation and cross-examination of witnesses. In all cases, the hearing must be conducted fairly, and must not be a ritual in which the decision has already been made.
 4. In the event of a clear and present danger to the order of the school, to the safety of the students involved, or to the safety of others in the school, students may be suspended without a prior hearing, provided they have an opportunity for a hearing as soon thereafter as is practical.
 5. School officials also have a responsibility to be informed of the constitutional rights of students. To violate established rights and law makes the official liable for damages.

In summary, Von Brock felt that the Supreme Court had not deprived the school principal of his authority regarding student discipline, but had tempered the actions of school officials. He contended that the Goss and Wood decisions and the decisions that followed since 1975, provide no evidence that a fair-minded, informed principal should be handicapped in the orderly operation of the school.

In cases where administrators do not use good judgment, the courts, however, will support the student. A case in point is that of Bebbie Lipp, of Mountain Lakes High School in Newark, New Jersey. On May 16, 1977, she was suspended because she sat while others saluted

the flag. She said her reason was that the phrase, "with liberty and justice for all," is a lie.⁹⁷

Consequently, a federal judge declared that the state law requiring students to stand during the Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional. On August 16, 1977, U.S. District Court Judge H. Curtis Meanor said a student could remain seated as long as he or she "doesn't whistle, drum, tapdance or otherwise be disruptive."⁹⁸

Ronald J. Anson, in his article, "The Educator's Response to Goss and Wood," also came to the conclusion that while the two decisions require that disciplinary action be fair and responsible, they do not necessarily mean that professional discretion is being eroded. Mr. Anson, in discussing the implications of these decisions for school administrators said:⁹⁹

The practical effect of Goss, from the educator's viewpoint, may be to make administrators more aware of the fairness of the procedures used in suspension cases . . . But as if to emphasize that educators were in fact bound to abide by these requirements as a matter of constitutional law, not just educational policy, the Court handed down its opinion in Wood v. Strickland, creating the possibility of money damages being levied against the school board, and arguably other administrators, for violating the right to those bare procedures enunciated in Goss. When Goss is understood as providing minimal procedures, a notice and a hearing, its oppressiveness disappears.

Anson further stated, that the incompetent educator now has a specific sanction against behavior which violates another person's

⁹⁷AP, "Students May Sit During Salute to Flag," Chicago Sun Times, Aug. 17, 1977, p. 48.

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 48.

⁹⁹Anson, Ronald, "The Educator's Response to Goss and Wood," Kappan, Sept. 1975, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 6-22.

basic rights. He maintained that the careful educator, intent on operating his schools without the shadow of liability, may undertake a cautious, complex course of action which allows him to avoid the Court's mandate without actually violating the law. "Benching" students is an example of avoiding the mandate legally. Such activity, he said, is inevitable as educators try to interpret and define the limits of the Court's mandate. He felt that as lower courts rule on such attempts, a body of law will emerge which will make these limits more specific.

Anson also suggested that educators can use suspension as an educational tool. Through increased communication, the role of procedures and the very idea of fairness can be exhibited in a way which could be most effective educationally.

DeCecco and Richards developed a model of negotiations to resolve conflicts that arise as students exercise new rights granted in the Tinker, Goss and Wood decisions. They also echoed the advice of other authorities in admonishing school officials and teachers to know about and practice the principles of democracy. The authors stated:¹⁰⁰

Inevitable conflicts continually arise from new operational definitions of these rights. . . . Higher suspension rates and lower reading scores for black students are offered as evidence by black parents of unequal educational opportunity for their children. As a contrasting example, allowing lower admission requirements for minority students is offered as evidence of

¹⁰⁰DeCecco, John and Richards, Arlene, "Using Negotiation for Teaching Civil Liberties and Avoiding Liability," Kappan, Sept. 1975, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 23-25.

unequal educational opportunities by parents of white students who must meet higher admission standards.

To resolve conflicts within the school which involve civil liberties issues, the authors developed a model of negotiation based upon the principles of democracy, and upon the cognitive developmental and motivational variables explained in their book, Growing Pains.¹⁰¹

The model contained three basic steps:¹⁰²

1. Each party to the conflict makes a statement of issues to the other parties with the appropriate expression of anger.
2. All parties agree to a common statement of what the issues are.
3. Bargain, with all sides making gains and concessions.

Inherent in this model, the authors contended, is the right of due process. For example, in Step 1, both "accuser" and "accused" can state their versions of the conflict, and the right of equality pertains to Step 3, in that gains and concessions must be equitably distributed among the parties.

Applying the negotiation model to school conflicts in order to teach civil liberties can be done both at the classroom and institutional levels.

The authors suggested practical procedures, complying with Supreme Court rulings such as Goss, that could be used in teaching students about democracy.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹Ibid.

¹⁰²Ibid., pp. 23-25.

¹⁰³Ibid., pp. 23-25.

The school officials who were defendants in Goss v. Lopez have laid down both the grounds and new procedures for suspension for the schools of Columbus, Ohio. The first step was to specify the grounds for suspension. They are violation of any ordinance or law or of school rules, activities that disrupt orderly school functioning, physical violence and vandalism, and failure to obey a direct order from a school official in times of school tension. Although the additional phrase, "any activity which is grounds for suspension," is vague, the officials have now made it possible to inform students somewhat more clearly about offenses that can lead to suspension.

In summary, the authors felt that negotiation could benefit school, society, and students. They also felt the school could become more democratic in its daily operations and could mean an environment more conducive to learning, as repressive environments could cause petty irritations, repeated disruptions, violence and vandalism.

William Hazard also had some comments about the implications of Goss and Wood for school practice. He quoted Justice Black's predictions in his dissenting opinion in Tinker:¹⁰⁴

One does not need to be a prophet to know that some students will be ready, able, and willing to defy their teachers on practically all orders. This is more unfortunate for the schools since groups of students all over the land are already running loose, conducting break-ins, sit-ins, lie-ins, and smash-ins . . . Students engaged in such activities are apparently confident that they know far more about how to operate public school systems than do their parents, teachers, and elected school officials . . . I for one, am not fully persuaded that school pupils are wise enough, even with this Court's expert help from Washington, to run the 23,390 public school systems in our 50 states.

Dr. Hazard felt that whether or not one agrees with Justice Black's views on school management, his prophesies about student demands, and management woes are not far fetched. He stated that Goss

¹⁰⁴Hazard, William R., "Goss vs. Lopez and Wood v. Strickland; Some Implications for School Practice," Journal of Law and Education, Vol. 4, No. 4, Oct., 1975, pp. 605-609.

and Wood raise certain practical questions worth exploring. Some of these concerns were:¹⁰⁵

1. School district policies for suspension should be examined, and if necessary, modified to reflect the holding in Goss. The policy and procedures should provide for explicit notice to the student of the substance of the charges on which the suspension decision is based. The school district regulations should be clear, direct, and unambiguous as to the behavior or conduct mandated or prohibited and the specific misconduct of the pupil related directly to the . . . adopted board regulations.
2. It would be wise for the disciplinarian (usually the building principal) to require direct evidence from the teacher or other school official to corroborate the oral or written account of the student's alleged misconduct . . . Prudence requires a clear, descriptive account of the incident promoting the suspension decision.
3. Unless the incident clearly requires immediate removal of the student from the school setting, it would be wise to conduct the informal hearing at a time which would allow corroboration of the event prior to or simultaneous with the hearing.
4. If the student denies the accusation . . . school officials must give the student both an explanation of the evidence the authorities have, and an opportunity to present his side of the story.

In following this procedure, Dr. Hazard maintained that the disciplinarian faces tough decisions because if he named his accuser, that person might be subject to retaliation. Dr. Hazard felt it was no longer safe for the disciplinarian to rely on district suspension policies, even those enunciated by the state legislature. Likewise, he stated, it seemed unwise to rely on one's judgment as to when circumstances require immediate suspension prior to a hearing, because Goss warned us, "the court's criteria for determining when student

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

behavior disrupts the educational process or warrants immediate suspension are not at all clear."¹⁰⁶

The author felt that the implications of Wood for school governance and management may be even more serious than Goss, because board members (and any school official substantively involved in a suspension process) will be accountable for knowing the constitutional rights of students with a foresight and prescience denied to most people. He found little reassurance that Board members qualify for immunity from liability even if the most elaborate procedural due process surrounds expulsion decisions.

Dr. Hazard warned that errors of fact and judgment, or even a misreading of the expulsion's impact on a student's clearly established constitutional rights open the doors to expensive litigation and ruinous judgments. Prudent board members, he advised, should make sure that their liability insurance is in force at all times, even after their service ends.

Dr. Hazard also recommended some additional steps school officials should take in addition to having liability insurance:¹⁰⁷

1. School people must be better informed about the constitutional rights of pupils. Pre-service and inservice training are the likely vehicles for dissemination of this important aspect of school operations. School boards and top level administrators must work to create a climate in schools supportive of a widespread respect for student rights.
2. Hasty, spur-of-the-moment suspensions clearly are vulnerable to legal action, so more thorough records of the suspension process should be made and maintained by school officials.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 605-609.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., pp. 605-609.

3. More sharply-defined policies and more clearly-focused procedures are needed. Policies and procedures should reflect perceived constitutional criteria first and educational criteria second.
4. The Goss and Wood decisions should stimulate renewed efforts to find legally acceptable alternatives to existing suspension and expulsion procedures . . . Except for the few students whose conduct seriously threatens the safety of others, suspensions and expulsions are little more than admissions of failure by the school and community.
5. Behavioral expectations for students should be reexamined . . . School people faced a decided uphill battle to preserve the status quo in school practices so contrary to the mores and practices in the "outside" world.

Authorities in the field of education appear to agree that school officials, in order to maintain safe learning environments do have the right to suspend students as long as due process procedures are followed, and that there is no substitute for good sense on the part of administrators. It is evident that school board policies and school rules and regulations must be re-examined to meet the contemporary mores and practices of society and that acceptable alternatives to suspension be found.

Alternatives to Suspension

If the educational environment is to promote learning, good discipline is essential. It is incumbent upon building administrators to guard the constitutional rights of students, be aware of important legal decisions affecting schools, use good judgment in making decisions, know educational psychology, and creatively seek alternatives to punitive measures in dealing with discipline.

In addition, Federal and State governments, are making demands upon boards of education and school personnel to keep suspension statistics. According to the Nation's Schools Report, in 1975, HEW's Office of Civil Rights issued a directive ordering school districts to keep detailed records on all student disciplinary actions.¹⁰⁸ Pressure at that time was building up from Washington, to make school officials "cool it" on student suspensions and expulsions.

Since that time, Chicago Public School principals, and District Offices have been required to send to HEW, not only data concerning the numbers of students suspended, but a breakdown by age, race and sex must be made. In addition, the State of Illinois beginning in September of 1978, imposed a similar requirement upon all public schools in the State of Illinois.

Keeping suspension statistics for governmental agencies was prompted by data showing that minority children were receiving a disproportionate amount of discipline. The HEW directive had subsequently generated piles of new paperwork for school officials. According to the newsletter, Nation's School Report, the directive from HEW required school officials to keep records on at least five kinds of disciplinary action: suspensions, expulsions, uses of

¹⁰⁸Hickman, A. et al., "Student Discipline Records; HEW Gets Tough," Nation's School Report, Sept. 29, 1975, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 2.

corporal punishment, referral of students to special classes or schools, and transfers to another class or school.¹⁰⁹

Each accounting must give, in addition to the race and sex of the student, a description of the offense, the title of the person reporting the offense, the title of the person imposing the discipline, a brief procedural history of the disciplinary action and an indication of what alternatives to the disciplinary action were considered.

Pressures, therefore, were being brought to bear upon school administrators to seek solutions in dealing with disruptive student behavior; by parents, by the courts, and by Federal and State governments, as well as by teachers and their organizations. Even the Congress of the United States had become involved in the problems of school discipline.

Senator Birch Bayh, who served as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, became involved in legislation enacted to deal with the problems of juvenile delinquency. His committee invited many educators, school personnel and students to testify before them, and in April of 1975, released a preliminary report, "Our Nation's Schools--Violence and Vandalism." The senator wrote an article in the Kappan, in January, 1978, making several recommendations:¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 2.

¹¹⁰Bayh, Birch, "Seeking Solutions to School Violence and Vandalism," Kappan, Jan., 1978, Vol. 59, No. 5, pp. 299-302.

1. Community education and optional alternative education programs.
2. Codes of rights and responsibilities. ~~~~~
3. Curricular reform.
4. Police-School-Community liaison arrangements.
5. Inservice and preservice teacher preparation programs.
6. School security programs.
7. Counseling and guidance strategies.
8. Architectural and design techniques.
9. Student and parental involvement programs.
10. Various alternatives to suspension.

Senator Bayh also indicated that a significant number of incidents of violence and vandalism, according to his studies, can be traced to young school-aged intruders who are not currently attending school because they are truant, suspended, or have dropped out. He contended that one way to reduce the intruder problem, in addition to programs to reduce truancy and dropouts, would be to insure that suspension policies are helping to provide proper discipline in school and are not detracting from it by needlessly creating potential school intruders.

He maintained that in some schools, violation of ordinary student rules against such behavior as smoking or tardiness is punished by suspension. Suspension, he indicated, should be reserved for more serious violations. Other alternatives, such as "cool-off rooms," behavior contracts and additional counseling strategies could be used to keep order at the same time we keep the kids in school.

A second report by the Children's Defense Fund, published in September of 1975, not only recommended alternatives that would both benefit the child and the school, but explored the various "faces of suspension." Some of their research findings were:¹¹¹

1. In 1972-73 over one million children were suspended in the United States.
2. The vast majority of school suspensions were for non-dangerous, nonviolent offenses which do not have a seriously disruptive effect on the educational process. Many students were suspended for truancy, tardiness, pregnancy, minor violations of dress codes or failure to purchase necessary equipment. Only 3% of the suspensions were for destruction of property, use of drugs or other criminal activity.
3. About one third of the suspensions were for fighting other students.
4. The use of suspensions, grounds, procedures, and lengths of suspensions vary widely between school districts and in schools in the same district. In many districts there is no written code.
5. Suspensions are often imposed arbitrarily.

The CDF came to the conclusion that suspension seldom benefits children because weak students who miss school might be motivated to drop out, students might be labeled, the root cause of the problem was not being sought, and might contribute to juvenile delinquency by putting unsupervised children and those problems, on the street.

The CDF survey indicated that a variety of responses to the suspension problem exist across the country, but that school officials must decide first that they want to use an alternative response to

¹¹¹Children's Defense Fund, "School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children," Sept., 1975, pp. 1-111.

suspension for a disruptive student, and then to determine which programs are most appropriate. School administrators and teachers, they stated, must make a positive, active commitment to a new approach to discipline.

Some alternatives to suspension recommended required added resources, but they contended that not all alternatives need be costly. Some specific programs recommended by the CDF were:¹¹²

1. Disciplinary Band-aids
 - a. After school detention. For high school students this can be a real deterrent . . . as students do not like to have their time infringed upon.
 - b. Sitting in the principal's office--The right tenant of the office will take the time to help resolve the conflict.
 - c. Transfers--A change of teacher or school may provide some students an opportunity to be rid of a "disruptive" reputation, and to relieve personality conflicts.
2. Behavior Contracts
3. Student Ombudsman
4. Peer Group Counseling
5. In-School Centers
6. Work-Study Alternatives
7. Career Study Centers
8. Outposts
9. City-Wide Alternative Programs

How successful have some of these alternatives to suspension been? Chicago administrators should be especially interested in view

¹¹²Ibid., p. 108.

of the fact that OCR statistics for school suspensions involving students at both the elementary and high school levels for the year 1972-73 indicated that the Chicago Public School system ranked first in the number of suspensions, 28,645 in all.¹¹³

Some successful alternative education programs used instead of suspension were described in detail in the CDF report. One such program was found in Philadelphia, a Peer-Group Counseling program called Shalom. This program reduced recorded suspensions from sixty-nine to four, for the following year, for the participating schools, which sent their suspended students to Shalom. A 12-15 week course, during which time students were taught skills in handling home and school problems, and decision making, was conducted for them.¹¹⁴

Another successful program, lauded by the CDF, was found in Dayton, Ohio. An in-school center called the Shop, was instrumental in positively affecting the number of suspensions over a four year period, from a high of 536 in 1970-71 to a low of 212 in 1973-74. The CDF cautioned however, that in school types of programs for students needing discipline, these programs may be inferior to regular classroom work and the schools may become islands of exclusion and stigma.

A third alternative described by CDF was a work program at Buena Vista's La Palma Junior High. After school jobs were provided students which included gardening, custodial work, and other chores. In the first year, the number of suspensions was reduced by 90%.

¹¹³Ibid., pp. 163-164.

¹¹⁴Ibid., pp. 163-164.

While the program required hiring teachers as monitors, for \$8.75 per hour, the cost was more than made up in state aid saved by keeping students in school. In fact, the program generated a net income of \$3,344.00.

An urban high school with a minority enrollment of over 70%, once noted for racial tension and high drop out and suspension rates, established the city's lowest rates in those three areas, largely to a conscious effort to change the "climate" of the school. Students and staff together reduced twenty-six school rules to a simple six: attend classes, no drugs or alcohol, no weapons, no gambling, no smoking, and treating everyone with respect.¹¹⁵

McClung, however, contended that some alternatives to suspension were more harmful than the exclusionary practices they replace.¹¹⁶ In his article, he stated that potentially harmful substitutes for suspension include isolation booths, behavior modifying drugs, and corporal punishment, all of which tend to treat symptoms while ignoring their causes.

McClung argued that to achieve a positive and effective response to behavior problems, "development of the least restrictive alternative" should be the guiding principle. The writer felt that alternative programs, should be judged in terms of whether they reduce

¹¹⁵Maynard, B., "Working with Disruptive Youth," Educational Leadership, Vol. 34, No. 6, March, 1977, pp. 417-421.

¹¹⁶McClung, Anna, "Alternatives to Disciplinary Exclusion from School," Inequality in Education, July, 1975, pp. 58-73.

the need for suspensions and promote academic progress and self discipline in students.

Alternatives to Suspension--
Legal Implications

What legal implications might be associated with alternatives to suspension? Neil researched this topic and found:¹¹⁷

1. The selection process should be documented. Admission criteria often include subjective judgments about achievement below ability level and disciplinary problems. Interviews with teachers and counselors which lead to a referral need to be recorded.
2. Parents should have an opportunity to challenge placement. Such a change of status should require a formal written procedure to insure that each student is dealt with similarly. Parents should be advised of their right to a hearing and access to records. The hearing may be informal, but a school official with no stake in the outcome should preside.
3. Each child should have on record an individual program with specific objectives and goals. Programs which deal with behavior problems but do not attempt to educate are in violation of individual student rights.
4. Care must be taken that records do not unduly stigmatize children.
5. Opportunities for challenging the transfer of students out of the program should be offered.
6. Written procedures for handling discipline help insure that unique, constructive and successful methods, can be uniformly applied.

The legal pressures upon school administrators concerning student rights issues peaked in 1975 with Goss v. Lopez. However,

¹¹⁷Neil, Shirley Boss, "Suspensions and Expulsions," National School Public Relations Association, 1976.

several doctoral dissertations that centered about the topic prior to that date indicate how the need for legal knowledge upon the part of school personnel has grown. Some of the studies perused, that were conducted prior to 1975 are summarized in the following discourse.

In 1969, Harry A. Monson Jr., undertook to examine the student suspension practices and policies in California secondary schools. Mr. Monson found:¹¹⁸

1. Student suspension is interpreted by court decisions as an approved consequence of failure to follow valid school board regulations.
2. Student suspension policies are almost universally in written form.
3. Usually, school suspension policies were developed by school and district administrative personnel.
4. A parent conference prior to readmission to school was a required and recommended administrative procedure at most schools.
5. School suspension policies usually included written specifications stating that certain violations of accepted behavior would result in automatic suspension from school.

Monson came to the following conclusions:¹¹⁹

1. Student suspension is a recognized form of dealing with student behavior and is an effective way of meeting behavior problems in the high school.
2. In the event the courts are called upon to render opinions regarding student suspension, it can be expected that they will uphold the actions of the school board, providing the board acted impartially and within the scope of its authority.

¹¹⁸Monson, Harry A., "An Analysis of Current Practices Regarding the Suspension of High School Students in California" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, 1969).

¹¹⁹Ibid.

3. A basic purpose for suspending a student is to effect a behavior change.
4. High schools and districts should maintain up-to-date written policies regarding student suspensions which are flexible.

Mr. Monson, back in 1969, made no mention of alternatives to suspension, accepting the suspension tool as the sole device in dealing with disruptive students, and presumed that courts would uphold school board policies within the scope of their authority.

Mr. Monson's ability as a prognosticator was on target only when he recommended that school districts maintain up-to-date written policies regarding student suspensions, for constant review of school policies, to keep in step with legal requirements as well as social evolution, would indeed safeguard school personnel from barratry. His failure to visualize alternatives to suspension or to predict that the U.S. Supreme Court would remove the mantle of immunity from school board decisions that violate civil rights (Wood), proved to be less than prophetic.

In 1970, John Voelz, examined the legal status of pupil suspension.¹²⁰ Mr. Voelz attempted to ascertain the legal status of suspension and expulsion of students from public elementary and secondary schools of the United States in light of judicial interpretations of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. The purpose of the study was to provide pupils, parents and school personnel with a timely description of the law of

¹²⁰Voelz, John, "The Legal Status of Pupil Suspension and Expulsion and Due Process" (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1970).

each of the fifty states and the law emerging in the federal courts in this area.

Voelz reached three major conclusions:¹²¹

1. Public school attendance carries with it certain rights which may not be disregarded by categorization of such attendance as a privilege.
2. The law in the vast majority of states concerning notice and some opportunity for a hearing prior to dismissal from the public schools is vague, incomplete, and productive of litigation.
3. The cases litigated thus far, resulting from the condition of the state law in this area, demonstrate increased judicial interpretations of the Fourteenth Amendment to require notice and some opportunity for a hearing for pupils facing possible dismissal from the public schools.

Mr. Voelz, apparently, accurately assessed the legal status of suspension practices in 1970, when he found that school attendance carries with it certain rights which may not be disregarded by categorization of such attendance as a privilege. The Goss decision confirmed this concept, and made it the law of the land, and the Chicago Board of Education, in 1975, altered its school policy to guarantee that students receive meaningful assignments while out on suspension. Again, alternatives to suspension were not mentioned by Mr. Voelz in his study of the fifty states, and the Chicago Board of Education did not include alternatives in its 1975 policy statement.

Another doctoral study by Lonnie Jones was conducted in the winter of 1973. Dr. Jones also concluded that suspension is a useful tool in maintaining order, and felt that big city schools probably

¹²¹Ibid.

should continue their use of suspension, because, according to his findings, suspension appeared to minimize in-school misbehavior.¹²²

It is the purpose of this study to investigate factors that might have a bearing on the rate of student suspensions in public schools, with the focus upon High Schools in the City of Chicago. Statistical trends in suspension rates in Chicago Public High schools from 1972-73 through 1976-77, encompassing a time span that includes the two years prior to and the two years following the Goss and Wood decisions will be presented and analyzed, to establish whether or not a trend has developed relating to the proportions of students suspended in that time period.

Suspension--Some Potentially Related Variables

Union pressures, court pressures, and pressures from parents and teachers resulted in recommendations for improving the school climate and reducing suspensions in the schools. Some of the recommendations centered around several variables which appeared to merit study, such as the institution of alternative education, curricular reform, adoption of school codes, staff inservice concerning discipline, and guidance and counseling.

¹²²Jones, Lonnie, "The Effectiveness of Suspension Practices in Deterring Student Misbehavior in Two Big City High Schools" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri, Kansas City, 1974).

The American Federation of Teachers, in their Summer 1978 publication, dedicated their entire issue to "School Violence and Discipline."¹²³ Teacher Unions began to fight back, according to John Ban.¹²⁴ With the alarming climb in the incidence of school violence, teacher organizations have pushed to make teacher security a crucial item in their list of priorities. Mr. Ban stated that in many school systems, teacher organizations have pushed to make teacher security a crucial item in their list of priorities. The Cleveland Teachers Union, for example negotiated a contract that provides for temporary relocation to a different school of those youngsters who attack a teacher. Similarly, contractual agreements in Pittsburgh require that students who assault teachers be transferred to another school or be dismissed permanently from school.

Mr. Ban stated that a large number of teacher groups have succeeded in negotiating teacher security clauses in their contracts. Covered in such clauses are procedures for teachers to follow in the event of an attack on them, provisions for legal assistance, and the assurance of monetary compensation for absences due to physical assault.

One may question whether or not negotiated teacher-board contractual demands mandating the ouster of students or their transfer

¹²³American Federation of Teachers, "School Violence and Discipline: An American Dilemma," American Educator, Vol. 2, No. 2, p. 4.

¹²⁴Ban, John, "Teacher Unions Fight Back," American Educator, Vol. 2, No. 2, Summer, 1978, pp. 11-12.

will stand applied constitutional tests, for the simple reason that Union-Board contracts are not concerned with student rights.

Racial and Socioeconomic Variables

Organizations such as the Children's Defense Fund, as well as State and Federal agencies are constantly monitoring school systems to test for compliance to the law. Prior to the 1975 Goss decision, the CDF, published a report called, Children Out of School in America.¹²⁵ This report indicated that among secondary school students, the suspension problem is particularly acute, and worse still is the impact of suspension on minority children. Among five selected states, Arkansas, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio and South Carolina, over 50% of the students suspended were minority though less than 40% of the total districts' enrollment was minority.¹²⁶

In 1974, the date of publication of the CDF report, the recommendation was made that HEW adopt guidelines for determining racial discrimination and correcting racial disproportion in the use of suspensions, guidelines that were ultimately adopted and put into effect in 1975.

Statistics, gathered by CDF, appeared to confirm the fact that minority children bore the brunt of suspensions. However, in school districts where there were few blacks, CDF found that it was

¹²⁵Children's Defense Fund, Children Out of School in America, Oct., 1974, pp. 125-135.

¹²⁶Ibid., pp. 125-135.

the lower income children who often bore the brunt of school officials' disciplinary action.¹²⁷ A youth adjustment counselor in New Bedford stated to the CDF interviewer that white and minority children who get suspended the most are from poor families.

Kingsley Wood, a reporter for the Chicago Sun Times, investigated the problem of double standards in disciplining students while doing some investigative reporting at Thornton Township High School in Harvey, Illinois in 1975.¹²⁸ He reported that a black student was suspended for ten days from the school, while a white girl was suspended for one day. The black student was suspended for spitting orange seeds on a cafeteria floor, while the white student stole money from another student's purse.

Fifteen black students from Thornton High in Harvey, Illinois, and their parents were interviewed by the reporter, at which time they expressed their concern that black students at the school were being punished excessively for trivial misdeeds, while white students received a "slap on the wrist." They also complained that school officials made no effort to interview persons who had witnessed the incidents that lead to suspensions.

The head Dean of Thornton, informed the reporter that school officials are too busy to conduct witness hunts. Furthermore he stated, deans probably would get biased reports from student witnesses

¹²⁷Ibid., pp. 125-135.

¹²⁸Wood, Kingsley, "Two Standards of Discipline at Thornton," Chicago Sun Times, May 19, 1975, pp. 3, 18.

because "black students side with blacks and white students side with whites."

The principal of Thornton at that time, was quoted by the reporter of the Chicago Sun Times as having said, "Blacks are more vociferous than whites, and get into more trouble because the whites know how to keep their mouths shut when a school official gives an order."¹²⁹

On September 4, 1975, HEW announced it was opening an investigation of possible violations of federal civil rights laws in a number of school systems because black and minority school children are "being meted more than their share of expulsions, suspensions and other disciplinary actions."¹³⁰ In spite of the fact that school systems have been required to keep records of disciplinary action since 1975, the same charge, that minority students bear the brunt of disciplinary action, was made by a Carter (President of the U.S.) administrative aide in 1977.

Mary F. Berry, then assistant secretary for education in HEW, was quoted by the Chicago Sun Times:¹³¹

Black students in integrated schools are suspended and disciplined disproportionately more than whites because of institutional racism. Either administrators are meting out punishments in a race-biased way, or black students are responding to an environment they see as hostile.

¹²⁹Ibid., p. 18.

¹³⁰UP, "Minority Pupils Bear Brunt of Discipline,- U.S." Chicago Tribune, Sept. 4, 1975, p. 11.

¹³¹AP, "Report Bias in Discipline of Integrated Black Students," Chicago Sun Times, Nov. 18, 1977, p. 38.

Ms. Berry stated that she had found cases where school districts with 30% black enrollments have had black suspension rates as high as 81%.

Behavior Codes

A Croft Nei report exploring the issue of policies and student codes of conduct appeared in their publication, "Vandalism and School Discipline in the 1970's."¹³²

This report indicated that most school boards had reworked their policies on discipline in recent years, but that many boards and administrators found that student compliance with rules and regulations was directly proportional to the amount of student participation and input into forming of those rules. They found that social pressure was still one of the most powerful of all forms of behavior control, and that when student councils are involved in the writing and carrying out of student codes of behavior, social pressures are enhanced in a positive direction.

School Handbooks

An interesting development in the area of teacher handbooks is that the American Federal of Teachers, in 1977, decided to develop

¹³²Administrators Service, "Policies and Student Codes of Conduct," Vandalism and School Discipline in the 1970's, 1976.

a handbook for teachers on a national basis.¹³³ The project, which was to be coordinated by the AFT's collective bargaining services department, involved the erection of a clearing house of information on school violence, to study various collective bargaining agreements, and to use the information to develop a practical handbook for teachers in dealing with both administrators and students on discipline problems.

Teacher Inservice

An article in the American School Board Journal indicated that the Springfield, Massachusetts Public School System in cooperation with the University of Massachusetts, had devised a teacher training program that explores the way students and teachers react to each other that may be causing behavior problems in classrooms that result in school suspensions.¹³⁴ This inservice training program for teachers was then integrated into the Springfield school system.

This project revealed that inservice sessions related to discipline had very little effect upon student suspensions, prior to the training, but had a positive effect when teachers were actively involved in the training.

¹³³Miller, Gail, "AFT Project to Investigate School Discipline and Violence," American Teacher, Jan., 1977, p. 4.

¹³⁴Editorial, "What Schools are Doing to Improve Suspension Procedures," American School Board Journal, March, 1976, p. 36.

The ineffectiveness of teacher inservice training related to discipline was also reported in a Croft Nei publication in 1977. The principal of Philadelphia's Bartlett Junior High Schools had a problem with discipline, and the student suspension rate was high despite sporadic exposure of the staff to inservice education programs on the topic of discipline. The principal decided that inservices that involve lecture or talking to staff were not as effective as helping the staff get involved in understanding students.¹³⁵

He devised an inservice program that is described below:

Once a week, for five consecutive weeks, a seminar would be held during the faculty meeting period . . . Each of the five sessions was conducted by a four-person team (three administrators and a social worker), and each focused on a different facet of the discipline problem.

Teacher evaluation of the inservice sessions revealed that active interaction and involvement proved to be an effective means of developing insights and techniques related to disciplining students.

Principal Leadership

In an article that appeared in the Chicago Principals Reporter, George W. Connelly discussed the role of the principal in providing due process for students. He stated that the principal has discretionary powers, and he therefore determines the suspension policies in his school. Mr. Connelly stated:¹³⁶

¹³⁵-----, Discipline and Control Update, Croft Nei Publication, Oct., 1977, pp. 7-8.

¹³⁶Connelly, George W., "Let's Hear It for the Principal," Chicago Principal Reporter, Spring, 1976, p. 19.

While no one may quarrel with the oft heard pronouncement that students do not give up their civil rights when they pass through the doors into a school, there can be no doubt that the discretionary leeway of the principals has been narrowed to a considerable degree by recent court decisions . . . For who better than a principal can appreciate the essential difference between the process of making a quick and required decision regarding student suspension in a riot torn lunchroom and the olympian procedures characteristic of the detached, bailiff protected courtroom?

The discretionary power of the principal to suspend or not suspend, if of course, a function of the philosophy of the individual principal, concerning suspension. According to Henry Lufler, U.S. Supreme Court rulings on student discipline may meet with formal compliance on the grassroots level, but they had not lead to fairer treatment of students.¹³⁷

Mr. Lufler, a University of Wisconsin professor, studied the effect of High Court decisions on administrators, students, and teachers as part of a three year investigation into school discipline funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Lufler outlined the rights the Supreme Court has accorded students who face suspension: written or oral notice of charges against them, an explanation of evidence if they deny the charges, and a right to a hearing.

Lufler found that most principals give students an opportunity to tell their side of the story in suspension procedures and are aware that the practice constitutes a "hearing" as required by the

¹³⁷Newsnotes, "The Dark Side of the Discipline Picture: New Laws Don't Change Unfairness," Kappan, Vol, 60, No. 6, Feb., 1979, p. 468.

High Court. Most principals apparently conducted such hearings even before the Court made it a constitutional right, he ascertained.

Lufler's study showed, however, that most hearings are perfunctory and result in suspension. Lufler concluded that the actual incidence of suspension is not much affected by Supreme Court rules on discipline. He found that students are sometimes suspended when the principal wants to "back a teacher."

"If fairness of the process is the central concern, our research suggests that the teacher's decision to send a student to the office is the key decision in the suspension process," Lufler said. He added that the hearing required by the Supreme Court comes at the end of the disciplinary process, whereas, "most unfairness occurred earlier." If increased justice in school discipline was the intent of the Court, he said, the decisions requiring a hearing were "largely beside the point."¹³⁸

Lufler's study intimated that school administrators are legally circumventing the law regarding due process suspension hearings, by allowing the hearings and then suspending students. If this allegation is correct, then suspension trends in the United States following the landmark due process decisions of Goss and Wood in 1975, should indicate no significant decline since 1975.

Hopefully this study of suspension trends in the Chicago Public School system, with the focus on secondary schools, will shed light on the issue.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 468.

In addition, analysis of the factors related to student suspensions will be analyzed so that conclusions can be drawn which will assist administrators not only in following the letter of the law, but the "spirit" of the law, so that students can truly benefit from due process rights, while administrators maintain a safe, peaceful and democratic learning environment.

Chapter III will present the data and statistical analysis of the data collected concerning the variables that might affect suspensions.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Using the procedure stated in Chapter I, data were collected for purposes of analysis. The data presented in Chapter III are presented in tabular as well as narrative form.

The presentation of data for each question to be answered, includes the statistical tests and procedures, as well as data derived from suspension statistics, the mailed questionnaire, FIRO-B psychological examination, and some of the results from the interviews. This chapter contains only statistical test results without analysis of data, which will be covered in Chapter IV.

Collection of Data

As stated in Chapter I, ten factors or variables were identified, after reviewing the related literature, that appeared to have a relationship to student suspension rates in public schools. The purpose of this study was to investigate whether these factors or variables were related to student suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools, during the five year time span between the school years 1972-73, when the Chicago Board of Education began keeping statistics, and 1976-77. This five year time span included the two years prior to the Goss and Wood decisions and two years following, in order to

establish whether or not a trend had developed in the suspension rate, following these landmark United States Supreme Court decisions.

The following steps were then taken:

- a. A letter was written to an official of the Chicago Board of Education requesting the cooperation of the Department of Administrative Research in securing the suspension data for Chicago Public High Schools over the five year period between 1972-73 and 1976-77.
- b. A letter was written to the American Friends Service Committee requesting cooperation in securing materials relating to the subject of suspensions. Some selected members of this organization were also interviewed.
- c. Other materials were obtained from the Chicago Board of Education and cooperating principals, such as copies of Board/Union contracts, teacher handbooks, student handbooks, curricular courses of study, and some copies of Chicago High School North Central Reports.
- d. Preliminary informal interviews were conducted with eight Chicago High School principals in order to ascertain principal knowledge and attitudes about suspension policies and procedures. The questions were then refined and incorporated into a questionnaire that appears in the appendix of this study.
- e. A packet containing an explanatory letter (see Appendix), a questionnaire and a FIRO-B test was mailed to each of fifty-seven Chicago High School principals, along with a large stamped, self address envelope.
- f. Post questionnaire interviews were held with seven of the Chicago Public High School Principals who had returned the written questionnaires, in order to establish content validity.
- g. Questionnaire, interview, FIRO-B test results and suspension data derived from the Administrative Research Department of the Chicago Board of Education were tabulated for transfer to key punch cards as a preliminary step to statistical analysis.

Statistical Treatment

As described in Chapter I, a factorial design utilizing analysis of variance (ANOVA) a subprogram of the SPSS, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, was used to analyze some of the data. The SPSS program for the T-Test and the Pearson Coefficient Correlation were used to test for significance of the other questions. Eleven questions included in this study were answered following the various tests for significance. Analysis of the statistical results appear in Chapter IV.

Statistical Analysis of Data

As stated in Chapter I, the purpose of the study was to investigate factors that might have a bearing on the rate of student suspensions in public schools, with the focus upon High Schools in the City of Chicago. The raw data gathered for statistical analysis concerned the following eleven questions:

1. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools since the change in Chicago Board of Education policy concerning suspensions was enacted in 1975?
2. Are there significant differences in the proportions of suspensions among schools where teachers are aware of the clause in the Union Contract relating to student discipline and in schools where the majority of teachers are not aware of the clauses?
3. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions among schools that have printed behavior codes and those which do not?

4. Are there significant differences in suspension rates between schools having school handbooks for staff and those that do not?
5. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools that have had in-service meetings concerning student discipline and those that had one or no meetings?
6. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools offering a variety of curricular alternatives and those with conventional offerings?
7. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing racial compositions?
8. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing socioeconomic status?
9. Are there significant differences in the proportion of students suspended among schools with principals who approve of suspensions and those who do not?
10. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools in relationship to the personality type of the principals measured by the FIRO-B psychological test?
11. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools exhibiting a combination of variables listed and those which do not?

Testing for Significance

As stated in Chapter I, the data were analyzed using SPSS, using the T-Test primarily, Analysis of Variance, and the Pearson Coefficient Correlation.

The variables examined in this study were keypunched on 57 cards, although full data were available for 41 of the 57 cards. Each

card represented one of the 57 Chicago Public High Schools included in this study.

Significance of the data fed into the computer was based on ANOVA, analysis of variance. T-Tests were employed in most of the runs because when the number of groups employed in an analysis is relatively small, T-Tests based on appropriate standard of error of difference formulae suffice in the determination of the significance of differences.

In this investigation the differences between possible effect, rather than the effects themselves, were studied. Therefore, groups were used as a means of comparison. The schools were grouped by treatment, or the basis on which they were differentiated according to variables, and the group means were used as a basis for comparison. T is the statistic used in calculating the probability associated with the testing of hypotheses, and is a statistic generally applicable to a normally distributed random variable where the mean is known and the population variance is estimated from a sample.

Significant and Non-Significant Results

Question 1: Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools since the change in Chicago Board of Education policy concerning suspensions was enacted in 1975?

The T-Test was applied whereby suspension rates for the five years were programmed as years 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 to correspond with the five school years from 1972-73 to 1976-77. Statistics for two of

the fifty-seven schools were not available for the school year 1972-73, because they were opened in 1973-74. The control program card was fed into the SPSS computer program, which was adjusted so that the proper number of schools with data would be used in each of the two-tailed comparisons.

Upon examining the means of suspension rates for the five years as indicated in the following chart, one can observe that the mean suspension rate dropped slightly over 2% in 1975-76, the first year following the Goss decision and the issuance of suspension guidelines by the Chicago Board of Education at the end of the school year 1974-75 on May 28, 1975:

| | <u>School Year</u> | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 72-73 | 73-74 | 74-75 | 75-76 | 76-77 |
| Means | .0837 | .0877 | .1123 | .0905 | .1155 |
| # of Schools | 55 | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |

Note: A table of the 57 schools with the vital statistics appears in the appendix of this paper. The schools are identified by number instead of by name to preserve anonymity.

Upon examining the table of schools in the appendix, it should be noted that a few schools had no suspensions during the first three years of the included in this study. Three schools had no suspensions in 1972-73, two schools in 1973-74, and one school in 1974-75. The SPSS program omitted the schools that had no suspensions, counting a school without data as "0". However, a discussion

with the statistical programmer indicated that the deletion of a few schools would have no significant impact upon the data.

One can observe from the chart of school means that the suspension rate mean varied from .0837 to .1155 during the first year period that data were gathered.

The important question, the question of statistical significance, cannot be determined by a mere examination of the mean rates of suspension over the five year period. Therefore, each of the statistics for each year was compared to every other year in order to determine whether a significant difference, a change that could be attributed above chance, could be discerned. Table 1, which follows, copied from the computer sheet, indicates that the differences are not statistically significant at the .05 level. These results indicate that there is a 15% probability that the suspension rate in the year 1974-75 is the same as the suspension rate in 1975-76. Conventionally, statisticians have agreed that 5% probability is the maximum allowable. Therefore, one can conclude that there were no significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools since the change in Chicago Board of Education policy concerning suspensions was enacted in 1975.

Question 2: Are there significant differences in the proportions of suspensions among schools where teachers are aware of the clause in the Union contract relating to student discipline and in schools where the majority of teachers are not aware of the clause?

An important document must be kept in mind when dealing with the suspension problem in Chicago, and that is the Board/Teachers

TABLE 1

T-TEST, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS FOR THE FIVE YEAR PERIOD, 1972-73 THROUGH 1976-77

| Variable | Year | # of Cases | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | Mean Dif. | T Value | Deg. of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
|----------|---------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|-----------|---------|-----------------|--------------|
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | 51 | .0837 | .106 | .015 | -.0063 | -.80 | 50 | .428 |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | | .0900 | .108 | .015 | | | | |
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | 52 | .0823 | .106 | .015 | -.0340 | -1.96 | 51 | .055 |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | .1164 | .143 | .020 | -.0340 | | | |
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | 52 | .0823 | .106 | .015 | -.0121 | -.71 | 51 | .481 |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | .0944 | .091 | .013 | -.0121 | | | |
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | 52 | .0823 | .106 | .015 | -.0367 | -1.41 | 51 | .164 |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | .1190 | .173 | .024 | | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | 55 | .0877 | .105 | .014 | -.0264 | -1.75 | 54 | .087 |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | .1141 | .140 | .019 | | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | 55 | .0877 | .105 | .014 | -.0053 | -.33 | 54 | .739 |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | .0931 | .089 | .012 | | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | 55 | .0877 | .105 | .014 | -.0312 | -1.33 | 54 | .188 |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | .1190 | .169 | .023 | | | | |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | 56 | .1123 | .139 | .019 | .0207 | 1.48 | 55 | .145 |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | .0916 | .089 | .012 | | | | |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | 56 | .1123 | .139 | .019 | -.0049 | -.41 | 55 | .686 |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | .1172 | .168 | .022 | | | | |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | 57 | .0905 | .088 | .012 | -.0250 | -1.48 | 56 | .144 |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | .1155 | .167 | .022 | | | | |

Union contract that gives teachers the right to remove disruptive students from class. Article 30, which is entitled, "Discipline," had six subsections in the year 1973. These subsections were adopted verbatim through all of the contracts through 1977, the year this study ended. Article 30 had a seventh subsection added in 1974, which was deleted in 1976, and an eighth subsection added, which became number seven in the 1976 contract.

The six subsections of Article 30 that remained constant during the five year period studied were:

1. A teacher, upon written notice to the principal or his designee, and upon receipt of written instruction of where the pupil is to be sent, which the principal . . . shall send immediately, may exclude from class a pupil who is causing serious disruption. Whenever a pupil is excluded from class the teacher will confer with the principal, or his designee, to provide the necessary information concerning the pupil and shall provide a complete written statement of the problem within 24 hours. Said written statement shall include a summary of any informational background or prior action taken by the teacher relative to the student's behavioral problems. The principal will only reinstate the pupil after a conference on classroom conduct and school rules which will be held on non-instructional time and must include the teacher.
The principal, or his designee, and the classroom teacher will initiate immediately, a diagnostic review with appropriate member of staff to attempt to determine the basic cause of the pupil's problem and corrective measures to be taken.
2. After three written referrals, the principal or his designee, shall have the child, parent and teacher attend a conference on classroom conduct and school rules . . .
3. If the pupil continues to cause serious disruption, the principal . . . shall suspend the pupil for a period not exceeding one month for each offense . . .
4. Principals shall notify the police in case of serious school related offenses including, but not limited to, extortion, possession of narcotics, possession of alcohol . . . vandalism, false reports of fire or bombs, possession or use of

weapons, assault on an employee and reported instances of trespassing . . .

5. A continuous record of discipline cases shall be maintained by the principal or his designee and shall be available in the school office . . .
6. In the event of a school related assault on an employee, the Law Department of the Board, when notified, shall inform the employee of his legal rights. Principals will immediately report all school related assaults by telephone . . . to their respective district superintendents . . .

It appears that the Board/Union Agreement failed to adjust to the Suspension guidelines issued in May of 1975 admonishing administrators to confine suspensions to a period of ten days or less. Article number 3 continued to remain one month for the period of maximum suspension time for each offense.

In 1974, teachers indicated their growing concern concerning the topic of discipline and insisted on a new clause in the contract in order to increase their involvement in the discipline process:

7. . . . a special study committee on classroom discipline and proper educational atmosphere in the schools shall be established, consisting of an equal number of members appointed by the General Superintendent of Schools and the Union, respectively.

The study committee shall formulate and recommend procedures for improving discipline in the schools, in the classroom, and on the school grounds.

Clause number 7 was deleted in the contract of 1976-77 after the committee had been formed and had accomplished their task of making general recommendations.

An eighth clause was also added in 1974, which ultimately became number 7 in succeeding contracts. This clause stated:

8. The Board, through its principals and other administrators, agrees to work with teachers and other members of the bargaining unit, parents, and appropriate agencies, in seeking solutions to school and classroom discipline problems within the applicable provisions of the School Code and the Rules of the Board of Education.

The Board/Union contracts over the years embodied the concern of teachers and administrators about discipline problems in the schools. Yet it appears that the suspension rate in Chicago Public High Schools during this period tended to rise or remain significantly unchanged. However, in studying the suspension trends among various schools in the sample of fifty-seven high schools in the study, it is apparent that some schools have a consistently lower suspension rate than others.

One might wonder if knowledge of and application of the principles embodied in the discipline clause might have a bearing upon the suspension rate in a particular school.

Since principals are deeply involved in setting the standards for discipline in a school and constantly interact with teachers, the participating principals in this study, were asked to indicate on the questionnaire whether or not their teachers appeared to be aware of Article 30.

The principals were not asked to make formal assessments concerning staff awareness of Article 30, concerning discipline, because during the five year period of this study, not only had many staff changes occurred, but some of the principals had not served the entire five years at their schools.

During oral interviews with some of the principals, however, it was ascertained that they could roughly gauge teacher awareness of the clause by their interactions with the staff by such indicators as the number of students barred by teachers who had cited the clause, types of grievances filed, and the concerns brought to the principal by the mandated Professional Problems Committee of teachers that meet monthly with the principal.

The written questionnaire found in the appendix of this paper, ascertained the number of years each principal had been at his school, an estimation of the proportion of staff aware of the Discipline clause and the effect the teacher knowledge has had on the numbers of students suspended at their schools.

Some of the comments made by the thirty-five principals who answered this portion of the questionnaire will be found in Chapter IV. Six principals who participated in this study indicated that for various reasons they could not accurately estimate staff knowledge of Article 30 of the Union contract. Question number two, therefore, involved 61% of the Chicago High Schools studied.

The thirty-five schools were divided into two groups. The first group of twenty-six schools were schools that the principals had indicated positive staff knowledge about Article 30, while the second group of nine schools were schools that had principals who perceived that their staffs were relatively unaware of the existence of Article 30.

Before the suspension data were analyzed for these two variables, it had to be determined whether or not there was a

significant difference in suspension rates between the high schools that were a part of the total study because of principal participation and those who were not because the principal had failed to return the packets of information sent to them.

Table 2 indicates that there were no significant differences between the forty schools that answered the questionnaire and the seventeen that did not. Data for the seventeen schools that did not answer the questionnaire, concerning the suspension rate for each school, was obtained from the Department of Administrative Research of the Chicago Board of Education.

All variables that could be tested were run through the computer. Of particular interest is the mean enrollment for year five (1976-77) of schools answering. The mean enrollment for participating schools was 2426, and for non-participating schools, 2232, while the poverty level of cooperating schools was 43% and 46% for cooperating schools.

When the suspension rates between schools included in the general study, whose principals had returned their surveys, were compared with the suspension rates of schools whose principals had not returned their surveys, it was ascertained that there was no significance difference in the suspension rates between the two categories of schools.

An examination of Table 2, however, offers some possibility that schools that answered the questionnaire has moved from more to fewer suspensions over the time period studied as compared to those schools which did not answer, where the movement appears to be from

TABLE 2

T-TEST, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS THAT ANSWERED THE MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE AND THOSE THAT FAILED TO ANSWER THE MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE

| Variable | Year | # of Cases | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | T Value | Deg. of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. | Mean Enr. |
|----------|---------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 36 | .0912 | .113 | .019 | .90 | 50 | .371 | 2502 |
| Group 2 | | 16 | .0625 | .089 | .022 | | | | 2290 |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 38 | .0975 | .114 | .018 | 1.03 | 53 | .309 | 2329 |
| Group 2 | | 17 | .0659 | .083 | .020 | | | | 2268 |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 39 | .1097 | .129 | .021 | -.22 | 54 | .825 | 2453 |
| Group 2 | | 17 | .1188 | .163 | .040 | | | | 2330 |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 40 | .0819 | .075 | .012 | -1.14 | 55 | .260 | 2456 |
| Group 2 | | 17 | .1109 | .114 | .028 | | | | 2224 |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 40 | .0974 | .118 | .019 | -1.27 | 55 | .209 | 2426 |
| Group 2 | | 17 | .1584 | .245 | .060 | | | | 2232 |

Group 1 - Schools that answered the questionnaire

Group 2 - Schools that did not answer the questionnaire

PCTS1 - Percent of suspensions in 1972-73

PCTS2 - Percent of suspensions in 1973-74

PCTS3 - Percent of suspensions in 1974-75

PCTS4 - Percent of suspensions in 1975-76

PCTS5 - Percent of suspensions in 1976-77

fewer to more suspensions. One principal, who refused to answer the survey, during an informal interview, stated, "I have too many suspensions and therefore cannot participate in this study because it would be too embarrassing." This principal was evidently unaware at the time, that HEW and the American Friends Association had all records of Chicago Public School suspensions which were in the public domain.

Table 3 indicates that the T-Test analysis showed no significant differences in the suspension rate between schools where the staffs were perceived to be aware of the Discipline clause and those who were perceived to be unaware. The confidence level or the probability of the event occurring by chance should be .05. The two tailed probability tests comparing the two groups over the five year span indicated scores of .75, .89, .41, .4., and .41. One can, therefore, conclude that the Board/Union contract, and its discipline clause, does not appear to be related to the suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.

Question 3: Are there significant differences in the proportion of student suspensions among schools that have printed student behavior codes and those which do not?

It is apparent that many educational study groups perceive that Student Conduct and Discipline Guidelines, which permit the student, parent, and staff of a school to understand the rights and responsibilities of each, and the due process procedures necessary, will contribute to the best possible educational climate of a school.

TABLE 3

T-TEST, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS WHERE TEACHERS WERE AWARE OF ARTICLE 30 IN THE BOARD/UNION CONTRACT

| Variable | Year | # of Cases | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | T Value | Deg. of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
|----------|---------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------------|--------------|
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 24 | .0897 | .104 | .021 | -.31 | 29 | .755 |
| Group 2 | | 7 | .1062 | .174 | .066 | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 24 | .1006 | .121 | .025 | -.13 | 31 | .899 |
| Group 2 | | 9 | .1067 | .127 | .042 | | | |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 25 | .1239 | .154 | .031 | .83 | 32 | .412 |
| Group 2 | | 9 | .0792 | .075 | .023 | | | |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 26 | .0890 | .077 | .015 | .82 | 33 | .416 |
| Group 2 | | 9 | .0639 | .085 | .028 | | | |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 26 | .1095 | .137 | .027 | .82 | 33 | .417 |
| Group 2 | | 9 | .0695 | .080 | .027 | | | |

Group 1 - Schools where teachers were perceived to be aware of Article 30

Group 2 - Schools where teachers were perceived to be unaware of Article 30

PCTS1 - Percent of suspensions in 1972-73

PCTS2 - Percent of suspensions in 1973-74

PCTS3 - Percent of suspensions in 1974-75

PCTS4 - Percent of suspensions in 1975-76

PCTS5 - Percent of suspensions in 1976-77

This study, therefore, attempted to determine whether the variable of a student behavior code had a bearing upon the suspension rate of a school; to discover whether there are significant differences in the mean suspension rates between schools having a code and those that do not.

Seventy percent, 40 principals, of the 57 Chicago Public High School principals, responded to this item on the survey. Among the 40 cooperating principals, 33, indicated that their schools had a student handbook or behavior code, while 7 principals indicated that they did not have a student handbook or behavior code. Twenty-four schools either sent copies of their codes, or had codes on file in the office of the American Friends Service Commission in Chicago.

Many of the student handbooks or codes were perused during the course of this study, in order to determine common elements.

It was ascertained that all of the student handbooks or codes studied, had general information, outlining: hall procedures, attendance procedures, lunchroom routines, procedures for obtaining identification cards, fire drill information, Honor Roll requirements, tardy procedures, etc.

Very few of the codes had specific sections devoted to the topic of suspension, although some of the codes indicated the number of days of suspension for a specific offense. Most of the handbooks mentioned suspension as a penalty for a particular offense, but did not state the number of days of suspension.

Each of the fifty-seven Chicago Public High Schools, included in this study, was assigned a random number, in order to assure

anonymity. (See appendix for chart of fifty-seven schools with random number assignments and suspension data.) School 29, a school with a suspension rate of only 5.4% in 1977, having dropped from a rate of 15.5% in 1974, suspended students for only very serious offenses such as assault, drug abuse, weapons, etc., their current code included an admonition to their students that criminal and civil action would be taken against them when warranted, and that their parents would be liable for damages.

School 27 was somewhat of an enigma because it had, at the time of the study, the reputation of being one of the finest high schools in the Chicago Metropolitan area. This school had been cited for its outstanding curriculum, select student body, and fine administration, as well as alternatives to suspension; as well as a student handbook. In spite of all the positive factors associated with the school, the suspension rates at the school were 17.2% in 1972 and 13.4% in 1977.

When the two groups of schools, those with and without behavior codes, were compared, using the T-Test, there was no significant difference between the suspension rates of schools that had behavior codes/student handbooks, and those that did not have them (see Table 4). The T-Test indicates two-tailed probabilities of .55, .66, .68, .79, and .53, for the five year time span studied, scores that are above the .05 level of significance.

Question 4: Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools having handbooks for staff and those that do not?

TABLE 4

T-TEST, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS
HAVING A STUDENT BEHAVIOR CODE AND THOSE THAT HAD NO CODE

| Variable | Year | # of Cases | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | T Value | Deg. of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
|----------|---------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------------|--------------|
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 29 | .0968 | .120 | .022 | .60 | 36 | .554 |
| Group 2 | | 7 | .0681 | .075 | .028 | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 31 | .1014 | .118 | .021 | .43 | 36 | .666 |
| Group 2 | | 7 | .0804 | .100 | .038 | | | |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 32 | .1134 | .136 | .024 | .40 | 37 | .689 |
| Group 2 | | 7 | .0914 | .100 | .038 | | | |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 33 | .0833 | .072 | .012 | .26 | 38 | .796 |
| Group 2 | | 7 | .0751 | .093 | .035 | | | |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 33 | .1028 | .126 | .022 | .63 | 38 | .533 |
| Group 2 | | 7 | .0716 | .076 | .029 | | | |

Group 1 - Schools having a student behavior code or handbook

Group 2 - Schools that do not have a student behavior code or handbook

PCTS1 - Percent of suspensions in 1972-73

PCTS2 - Percent of suspensions in 1973-74

PCTS3 - Percent of suspensions in 1974-75

PCTS4 - Percent of suspensions in 1975-76

PCTS5 - Percent of suspensions in 1976-77

Thirty-six of the participating schools indicated that they had handbooks for staff, while only four of the forty participating schools indicated that they did not have a teacher handbook. Those four schools reporting the lack of a handbook indicated that they issued daily bulletins with pertinent information. Only five principals, however, sent in an actual copy of their handbooks. Since staff handbooks are a rather common occurrence in most Chicago Public High Schools, one could predict that this variable would probably have a negligible effect on the rate of student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools.

A commonality appeared to exist among all of the handbooks perused. All of the teacher handbooks contained general school policies and information about the school itself such as maps designating the location of various classroom and common areas, record keeping, time schedules, student regulations and discipline procedures. All of the handbooks suggested that counselors assist teachers with students who have behavior problems, that serious problems, warranting possible suspensions, be sent to the Dean of students, usually the Assistant Principal who has been delegated suspension powers by the principal.

Table 5 indicates the data and the results determined by the T-Test. The probability scores of .25, .144, .31, .49, and .27 respectively, far exceed the .05 score that would indicate significance.

The assumption could, therefore, be made that the variable under study, the presence or absence of teacher handbooks, probably

TABLE 5

T-TEST, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS
HAVING A TEACHER HANDBOOK AND THOSE THAT HAD NO HANDBOOK

| Variable | Year | # of Cases | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | T Value | Deg. of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
|----------|---------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------------|--------------|
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 33 | .0977 | .115 | .020 | 1.15 | 36 | .257 |
| Group 2 | | 3 | .0198 | .022 | .013 | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 34 | .1024 | .118 | .020 | .77 | 36 | .448 |
| Group 2 | | 4 | .0560 | .068 | .034 | | | |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 35 | .1166 | .134 | .023 | 1.01 | 37 | .318 |
| Group 2 | | 4 | .0475 | .036 | .018 | | | |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 36 | .0846 | .077 | .013 | .69 | 38 | .492 |
| Group 2 | | 4 | .0572 | .050 | .025 | | | |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 36 | .1042 | .122 | .020 | 1.10 | 38 | .279 |
| Group 2 | | 4 | .0359 | .040 | .020 | | | |

Group 1 - Schools having a teacher handbook

Group 2 - Schools that do not have a teacher handbook

PCTS1 - Percent of suspensions in 1972-73

PCTS2 - Percent of suspensions in 1973-74

PCTS3 - Percent of suspensions in 1974-75

PCTS4 - Percent of suspensions in 1975-76

PCTS5 - Percent of suspensions in 1976-77

has little bearing on the rate of suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools.

Question 5: Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools that have had in-service meetings concerning student discipline and those that had one or no meetings?

Forty principals responded to the Inservice question on the questionnaire, representing 70% of all Chicago Public High School principals. The principals were asked to indicate whether or not they had conducted or had presented any faculty inservice meetings relating to student discipline, and if so, to indicate the approximate number they had had in each of the five years included in this study.

Physical evidence of the inservice meetings was not requested, as concrete materials are not universally used during these meetings, nor are careful records kept over a period of years. However, principals, for the most part, have a general knowledge about inservice meetings at the schools and usually are instrumental in planning them as well as attending them.

Nineteen of the principals indicated that two or more sessions per year had been devoted to the topic of discipline, while twenty-one principals indicated that one or no inservice sessions dealing with this topic, had been presented.

When the T-Test, two-tailed probability, was applied to the two groups of schools (see Table 6), a relationship of a positive nature became statistically apparent. Schools that had had two or more inservice sessions per year, related to discipline, also had the highest percentage of suspensions. Significant scores of .079, .053

TABLE 6

T-TEST, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS
HAVING FREQUENT INSERVICE SESSIONS RELATING TO DISCIPLINE
AND THOSE HAVING FEW INSERVICE SESSIONS

| Variable | Year | # of Cases | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | T Value | Deg. of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
|----------|---------|---------------|-------|--------------|---------------|---------|--------------------|-----------------|
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 19 | .1080 | .141 | .032 | .95 | 34 | .351 |
| Group 2 | | 17 | .0724 | .069 | .017 | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 19 | .1129 | .139 | .032 | .83 | 36 | .410 |
| Group 2 | | 19 | .0821 | .082 | .019 | | | |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 19 | .1468 | .165 | .038 | 1.81 | 37 | .079 |
| Group 2 | | 20 | .0740 | .071 | .016 | | | |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 19 | .1058 | .085 | .019 | 2.00 | 38 | .053 |
| Group 2 | | 21 | .0603 | .058 | .013 | | | |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 19 | .1331 | .152 | .035 | 1.88 | 38 | .068 |
| Group 2 | | 21 | .0650 | .064 | .014 | | | |

Group 1 - Schools having two or more inservice sessions related to discipline per year
Group 2 - Schools having one or no inservice sessions related to discipline per year

PCTS1 - Percent of suspensions in 1972-73
PCTS2 - Percent of suspensions in 1973-74
PCTS3 - Percent of suspensions in 1974-75
PCTS4 - Percent of suspensions in 1975-76
PCTS5 - Percent of suspensions in 1976-77

and .068, were computed for the school years 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77 respectively. The school year three (1974-75) indicates significance at the .05 level, while the years four (1975-76) and five (1976-77) indicate significance at the .10 level. Years one (1972-74) and two (1973-74) produced no significant scores. Perhaps the effect of the variable, is somewhat obscured in the earlier years of this five year study, because of changes in administrative staff or difficulty in remembering five years back.

These results indicate, therefore, that the schools with higher suspension rates had more inservice meetings per year concerning the topic of discipline.

Question 6: Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools offering a variety of curricular alternatives and those with conventional offerings?

Curriculum is a word that is defined in many ways. In this study, it will be used in reference to the school and all parts of schooling that function together to form the school environment. Elements of curriculum are specific content of courses themselves, the materials utilized in schools, the extracurricular activities, and most important, the people who operate the schools.

Thirty-nine of the forty participating principals answered the questions on the survey concerning curricular information. Additional information, concerning the curricula of the various Chicago Public High Schools, was gleaned by perusing newspaper articles describing the curricula of some of the schools in this

study, courses of study of several of the high schools, several North Central reports, and through interviews with selected principals.

On the basis of the information available, the schools were divided into three categories:

1. Schools with enriched curricula
2. Schools with moderately enriched curricula
3. Schools with basic curricula (Standard program)

The responses of the principals to the questions on the survey served as an initial screening device. The questions relating to curriculum on the mailed questionnaire were as follows:

1. What programs have you that meet the needs of students with special problems?
2. What alternatives to suspension are present in your school?
3. What alternatives to suspension would you institute if possible?
4. What unique programs are in the school, in addition to standard offerings?

Nine of the principals who responded to the curricular portion of the questionnaire, indicated that they had no additional programs other than the standard high school curriculum, and had no programs to meet the needs of students with special problems other than the standard EMH classes and the presence of counselors, who are universal to all of the Chicago Public High Schools. These nine schools were placed in group three, the category of schools having a basic curriculum. Sixteen of the principals described some special programs, such as Drop-out prevention, peer counseling, in-house suspension, special vocational programs, reading labs and special

tutoring. These schools were placed in category two, schools with moderately enriched curricula.

Fourteen of the schools were placed in category one, the top category, not only because each had several programs for many of their students with special needs, but because additional information substantiating their claims, was garnered through the perusal of newspaper articles written by education reporters, visits to some of the schools, persusal of some North Central reports, and interviews with several of the principals.

Detailed information concerning the categorization will be found in Chapter IV, Analysis of the Data.

The data were fed into the SPSS program, Analysis of Variance, a computer program that can deal with problems characterized by more than one causal variable.¹ It is customary to use the square of the standard deviation, or "Variance" rather than the standard deviation itself. The ratio between variances is called "F" and its interpretation is similar to that of T, in the T-Test. Given a significant F, modified T-Tests may be used to identify significant differences between the numerous pairs of group means.

As Table 7 indicates, when the means of the suspension rates for the year 1976-77 (PCTS5) were computed and then submitted to an analysis of variance, using curriculum as the variable, the F value was 2.771 and the significance of F was .076.

¹Engelhart, Max, Methods of Educational Research, Rand McNally, 1972, pp. 410-411.

TABLE 7

ANOVA, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS WITH ENRICHED, MODERATELY ENRICHED AND BASIC CURRICULA

A. Cell Means - PCTS5 by Curriculum

| | 1 Enriched | 2 Moderate | 3 Basil |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| <u>Means</u> | .04 | .10 | .16 |
| # of Schools | 14 | 16 | 9 |

B. Analysis of Variance - PCTS by Curriculum

| <u>Source of Variation</u> | <u>Sum of Sq.</u> | <u>Deg. F.</u> | <u>Mean Sq.</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>Sig. F</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|
| Curriculum | .072 | 2 | .036 | 2.77 | .076 |

While the curricular offerings are not related to the suspension rate in Chicago Public High Schools at the .05 level, the curriculum variable does have a significant relationship at the .10 level.

Question 7: Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing racial compositions?

Data for all fifty-seven Chicago Public High Schools relating to the Racial Mix and Suspension Rates were obtained from the Administrative Research Department of the Chicago Board of Education. The schools were then divided into five categories according to the racial composition of the school, in order to determine whether race is a significant variable that might have a bearing on suspension rates.

The five categories of schools studied were:

1. Caucasian Majority - 80% or more
2. Black Majority - 97% or more
3. Black Majority - Mixed Black, White and Latino
4. Caucasian Majority - Mixed White, Black and Latino
5. Latino Majority - Mixed Black, White and Latino

The number of schools that fell into each category were 12, 25, 9, 7 and 4 respectively. The data were submitted to the SPSS subprogram, Analysis of Variance, ANOVA. Table 8 indicates that there was no significant difference in the suspension rates of the five groups in year five, 1976-77. The F. score of 1.687 is above the .05 level of confidence necessary to establish significance.

TABLE 8

ANOVA, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC
HIGH SCHOOLS WITH MIXED RACIAL GROUPS

| A. <u>Cell Means</u> - PCTS5 by Racial Mix | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| <u>Groups</u> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <u>Means</u> | .07 | .12 | .23 | .07 | .05 |
| Number | 12 | 25 | 9 | 7 | 4 |

| B. <u>Analysis of Variance</u> - PCTS by Racial Mix | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|
| <u>Source of Variation</u> | <u>Sum of Sq.</u> | <u>Deg. F.</u> | <u>Mean Sq.</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>Sig. F</u> |
| Racial Mix | .178 | 4 | .045 | 1.687 | .167 |

When the five subgroups were regrouped, however, into two categories, comparing categories 2 and 3, Majority Black schools, with categories 1, 4 and 5, Majority White or Latino schools, the T scores were significant (see Table 9) for years 3, 4 and 5, years 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77 respectively. The scores .027 and .041 are significant at the .05 level for the years 1974-75 and 1975-76, and at the .10 level for the year 1976-77 where the T score was .071.

There, therefore, appears to be a relationship between belonging to the black race and susceptibility to suspension.

Question 8: Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing socioeconomic status?

Table 9 indicates that the variable of race appears to have a significant relationship to the suspension rate in Chicago Public High Schools. The Children's Defense claimed that there is also class discrimination in the area of suspension.²

In their publication, Children Out of School in America, they indicated, that in school districts where there were few blacks, Puerto Ricans or Chicanos, it was the lower-income children who bore the disproportionate brunt of suspensions.

The variable of poverty, therefore, might have a bearing upon the suspension rate of students. This variable was put to the test in order to ascertain whether poor students in the Chicago Public High Schools were suspended at a significantly greater rate than the more affluent students.

²Children's Defense Fund, Children Out of School in America, Oct., 1974, pp. 134-135.

TABLE 9

T-TEST, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS
WITH PREDOMINANTLY BLACK STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS WITH MIXED RACES

| Variable | Year | # of Cases | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | T Value | Deg. of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
|----------|---------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------------|--------------|
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 32 | .0980 | .126 | .022 | 1.36 | 50 | .18 |
| Group 2 | | 18 | .0573 | .054 | .012 | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 33 | .1055 | .127 | .022 | 1.55 | 53 | .128 |
| Group 2 | | 22 | .0612 | .053 | .011 | | | |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 34 | .1451 | .168 | .029 | 2.28 | 54 | .027 |
| Group 2 | | 22 | .0616 | .041 | .009 | | | |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 34 | .1101 | .105 | .018 | 2.09 | 55 | .041 |
| Group 2 | | 23 | .0617 | .043 | .009 | | | |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 34 | .1483 | .206 | .035 | 1.84 | 55 | .071 |
| Group 2 | | 23 | .0672 | .055 | .011 | | | |

Group 1 - Black and Predominantly Black Schools

Group 2 - Mixed Caucasian and Latino Schools with Minority Black

PCTS1 - Percent of suspensions in 1972-73

PCTS2 - Percent of suspensions in 1973-74

PCTS3 - Percent of suspensions in 1974-75

PCTS4 - Percent of suspensions in 1975-76

PCTS5 - Percent of suspensions in 1976-77

The poverty level or the percent of students from low income groups for each of the fifty-seven Chicago Public High Schools was obtained from the Chicago Public Schools publication, Selected School Characteristics, 1973-74 to 1977-78. The poverty levels reflect ADCF families as well as several other variables such as family income, obtained through federal surveys. Perusal of the poverty data for school years 1973-74 through 1976-77 revealed that Chicago Public High Schools with majority caucasian populations had lower levels of poverty than schools with minority populations. The poverty levels in the caucasian schools ranged from 3.4% to 19.2%, while minority school poverty ranged from 22.7% to 98.1%.

Over a four year span, the percentage of poverty varied little so in order to determine the relationship between the percent of poverty and the suspension rate in Chicago Public High Schools, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to calculate the relationship between the percent of poverty for the year 1976-77 and the rate of suspensions for that year.

The Pearson product-moment correlation summarizes the extent of relationship between two continuous variables.³ According to Engelhart, an abstract definition of the correlation coefficient states that it is an index which summarizes the extent to which scores vary from their respective means. Identical variations would yield a coefficient of +1.00, and a negative relationship, -1.00. An

³Engelhart, Max, Methods of Educational Research, Rand McNally, 1972, pp. 206-207.

assumption relative to the interpretation of the product-moment correlation coefficient is that it is linear.

A coefficient of correlation cannot be interpreted as a percent, although its square may be interpreted as an estimate of what proportion of the variance or standard deviation squared of one of the variables, can be attributed to variation in the other. To say that a coefficient is significant, is merely to indicate what the probability is that the association is positive or negative depending upon the sign.

While poverty may possibly be related to the suspension rate, according to the Children's Defense Fund, poverty did not appear to be significantly related to the suspension rate in Chicago Public High Schools. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient for this computer run was .1458 for the fifty-seven cases, or schools, and the P score representing significance was .14, a score which is definitely not significant.

Question 9: Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with principals who approve of suspensions and those who do not?

Forty-two Chicago Public High School principals out of fifty-seven returned the questionnaire with answers to the question concerning their philosophies concerning suspension of students as a disciplinary measure.

Question number four of the instrument (see appendix) was, "Briefly state your personal philosophy regarding student suspensions." Some of their detailed answers will be discussed in the

section of this study entitled, Analysis of Results of Interviews and Questionnaire Responses, found in Chapter IV.

The schools, on the basis of principal responses, were divided into two categories, in order to discover whether or not there were significant differences in the suspension rates of Chicago Public High Schools between schools where the principals expressed positive attitudes towards using suspension as a disciplinary measure and those who expressed negative attitudes.

Table 10 indicates that the T-Test results were strongly significant, for the years 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77, with respective two-tailed probabilities of .018, .002, and .003. Perusal of the principal inventory sheets indicated that all but four of the principals had been the leaders of their particular schools during the last three years of the survey, while different principals had been at the helm of various schools during the school years 1972-73 and 1973-74. During year one (1972-73) sixteen schools had different principals, while during year two (1973-74), fifteen schools had had different principals. In year five (1976-77), only two schools had sustained a change in leadership.

Considering the fact that the first two years of the survey included a large group of schools that had been headed by principals whose philosophies about suspension are unknown, one could conclude that a principal's philosophy concerning suspension as a disciplinary measure is strongly related to the suspension rate in Chicago Public High Schools.

TABLE 10

T-TEST, A COMPARISON OF MEAN SUSPENSION RATES BETWEEN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS WITH PRINCIPALS WHO APPROVE OF SUSPENSION AND THOSE WHO DISAPPROVE OF SUSPENSION

| Variable | Year | # of Cases | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | T Value | Deg. of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
|----------|---------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------------|--------------|
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 10 | .1163 | .058 | .018 | .84 | 36 | .408 |
| Group 2 | | 28 | .0820 | .124 | .124 | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 12 | .1214 | .066 | .019 | .82 | 38 | .417 |
| Group 2 | | 28 | .0898 | .125 | .024 | | | |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 12 | .2080 | .181 | .053 | 2.47 | 39 | .018 |
| Group 2 | | 29 | .0867 | .126 | .023 | | | |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 12 | .1534 | .115 | .033 | 3.33 | 40 | .002 |
| Group 2 | | 30 | .0625 | .060 | .011 | | | |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 12 | .2459 | .267 | .077 | 3.14 | 40 | .003 |
| Group 2 | | 30 | .0669 | .107 | .019 | | | |

Group 1 - Principals who approve of suspension as a disciplinary measure

Group 2 - Principals who disapprove of suspension as a disciplinary measure

PCTS1 - Percent of suspensions in 1972-73

PCTS2 - Percent of suspensions in 1973-74

PCTS3 - Percent of suspensions in 1974-75

PCTS4 - Percent of suspensions in 1975-76

PCTS5 - Percent of suspensions in 1976-77

Question 10: Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools in relationship to the personality type of the principals measured by the FIRO-B psychological test?

Researchers in the field of Educational Administration appear to support the theory that the leadership style of the principal has a bearing upon the educational climate of the school, therefore the variable was explored in this study. Although personality characteristics are only a part of total leadership style, the decision was made, to mail the 1977 edition of the FIRO-B to the fifty-seven Chicago Public High School principals in Chicago, in order to determine whether there is any relationship between the psychological make-up of the principal, as measured by the FIRO-B, ~~and the suspension rate~~ in the various schools.

Forty principals took the test and returned them by mail. The tests were then scored for three facets of personality, Inclusion, Control and Affection. The total scores, as well as partial scores, were keypunched on the computer cards, along with the suspension rates in each principal's school, over a five year period, the time span included in this study.

The data were then analyzed through the use of the Pearson Correlation Coefficients, and it was ascertained that the scores on the FIRO-B had no significant relationship to suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.

Table 11 illustrates the Pearson Correlation between the suspension rates for the school year 1976-77 when all forty

TABLE 11

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT, A COMPARISON OF FIRO-B SCORES
BETWEEN FORTY PRINCIPALS OF CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

| | <u>I Score</u> | <u>C Score</u> | <u>A Score</u> | <u>T Score</u> |
|--------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| PCTS5 | .0549 | -.0179 | .0800 | .1391 |
| Number | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| P | .368 | .456 | .312 | .196 |

principals, who participated in this survey, were at the helms of their schools.

The P scores were .368, .456, .312 and .196, for the Inclusion, Control, Affection, and Total scores, respectively, scores which are not significant (see Table 11).

None of the P scores is significant, therefore one could conclude that the disciplinary style of a principal and his score on a FIRO-B are not significantly related.

The scoring summary that came with the tests summarized the personality types represented by high or low scores on each facet of the examination. Scores for Inclusion, Control and Affection range from a possible low of 0 to a high of 9, while Total scores range from a low of 0 to a high of 54 including both wanted and expressed factors. The interpretations are as follows:

- I - High score means high desire for contact with people. Low score indicates preference for being alone.
- C - High score means a desire for high structure, a preference for giving and taking orders. Low score means low structure, a laissez-faire attitude with respect to authority, neither wanting to give nor to receive orders.
- A - High score indicates desire for a great deal of exchange of affection and warmth. Low score means a preference for more personal distance from people, more impersonal, business like relationships.
- T - High score means a preference for a great deal of interaction with people in all areas. Low score indicates a desire to have relatively little desire to initiate behavior toward people.

Educational administrators' mean scores in these four areas, according to the FIRO-Scales Manual are:

| | | |
|---------------------|---|------|
| Expressed Inclusion | - | 5.9 |
| Expressed Control | - | 4.7 |
| Expressed Affection | - | 4.4 |
| Total Score | - | 30.2 |

The forty Chicago Public High School Principals taking this test had the following average mean scores:

| | | |
|---------------------|---|------|
| Expressed Inclusion | - | 4.4 |
| Expressed Control | - | 4.8 |
| Expressed Affection | - | 3.1 |
| Total Score | - | 21.2 |

A comparison of the test scores of the Chicago Public School principals who took the test indicated that the closest agreement with Educational Administrators in general is the Control score. All the other scores are below the average. It could very well be that the traits necessary for promotion to a large urban high school differ the pool of administrators who are in the larger number of elementary school positions.

This particular variable might be worthy of further study. Would, for example, there be a relationship between a random group of principals throughout urban centers in the nation, including elementary school principals and the rates of suspension in their schools?

The forty schools in this particular study were also divided into two groups according to their total scores. Principals in the moderate to high category with scores ranging from 21-44 were placed

in Group 1, while principals with lower scores ranging from 10-20 were placed in Group 2. Eighteen principals fell into the first category, while twenty-two principals qualified for the second group. Table 12 shows the non significant results of the T-Test where the scores were .253, .461, .979, .095 and .203 respectively for each of the five years in the study.

Question 11: Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools exhibiting a combination of variables listed and those which do not?

Ten independent variables have thus far been examined, and four variables were found to be significant, either at the .01, .05 or .10 levels, while six of the variables were found to be not significant. One might wonder, however, whether or not a synergistic effect might occur when a combination of variables exists in a particular school. In other words would schools with enriched curricula and principals who do not approve of suspensions have lower suspensions rates than schools with basic curricula and principals who approve of suspension? Would various other combinations of variables point the way towards predicting which schools are candidates for high suspension rates and which schools would have low rates?

In order to determine whether or not there were significant differences in the suspension rates of schools exhibiting combinations of various variables, the data was submitted to ANOVA as well as Interaction Analysis of the SPSS subprogram. The first task of analysis of variance with factorial designs is to evaluate the overall

TABLE 12

T-TEST, A COMPARISON OF FIRO-B TOTAL SCORES BETWEEN PRINCIPALS WITH MODERATE SCORES AND PRINCIPALS WITH LOW SCORES

| Variable | Year | # of Cases | Mean | Std. Dev. | Std. Error | T Value | Deg. of Freedom | 2-Tail Prob. |
|----------|---------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------------|--------------|
| PCTS1 | 1972-73 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 17 | .0636 | .064 | .016 | -1.16 | 34 | .253 |
| Group 2 | | 19 | .0984 | .107 | .025 | | | |
| PCTS2 | 1973-74 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 17 | .0764 | .077 | .019 | -.75 | 36 | .461 |
| Group 2 | | 21 | .1011 | .118 | .026 | | | |
| PCTS3 | 1974-75 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 18 | .1084 | .120 | .028 | .03 | 37 | .979 |
| Group 2 | | 21 | .1073 | .139 | .030 | | | |
| PCTS4 | 1975-76 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 18 | .1047 | .089 | .021 | 1.71 | 38 | .095 |
| Group 2 | | 22 | .0654 | .054 | .012 | | | |
| PCTS5 | 1976-77 | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | | 18 | .1232 | .141 | .033 | 1.30 | 38 | .203 |
| Group 2 | | 22 | .0748 | .094 | .020 | | | |

Group 1 - Principals with moderate to high FIRO-B scores

Group 2 - Principals with low FIRO-B scores

PCTS1 - Percent of suspensions in 1972-73

PCTS2 - Percent of suspensions in 1973-74

PCTS3 - Percent of suspensions in 1974-75

PCTS4 - Percent of suspensions in 1975-76

PCTS5 - Percent of suspensions in 1976-77

effect and the interaction effect. Some of the steps in the interaction analysis are:

1. The first step in significance testing is to determine whether the two factors as a whole have a statistically significant effect. The main objective is to determine whether all the observed sums of squares, which are squared standard deviations of the means, due to the factors or variables involved are likely to have come from a population where no such effects exist. The ratio between the mean squares have an F distribution. The numerator and denominator of this ratio are known as mean squares. If the F ratio is significant at the specified level, the model as a whole is said to have some effect on the criterion variable, which in this case is the suspension rate.
2. The second task is to examine whether the interaction effect is significant. The F value, when significant, implies that the effect of one variable A varies from one category of B, the other variable to another. The ratio between variances is called F and its interpretation is similar to that of T. Obtaining equations for between-groups, within groups and other estimators of population variances involves partitioning of a measure of the total variance, a "total sum of squares" into separate sums of squares whose division by appropriate degrees of freedom yields the estimators. Where N is the number of observations in a sample, N-1 may be the number of degrees of freedom of values of the observations which are free to vary. For example, given the five scores of 12, 15, 19, 23, and 26, the mean is 19. The deviations from the mean are respectively -7, 4, 0, +4 and +7. If any four of these deviations are known, the fifth is determined, because the sum of the deviations from the mean must equal zero. Only four of the deviations or scores corresponding to them are free to vary, hence the number of degrees of freedom is 4.

This test is, however, often not performed, if the interaction effect is suspected to be nil. The non significant variables in this study, were therefore, not subjected to interaction analysis.

The six non-significant variables were:

- a. Board policy effected in 1975 setting down suspension guidelines.
- b. Teachers being aware or not aware of the discipline clause of the Board/Union agreement as perceived by the principal.

- c. The presence or absence of a student handbook or behavior code.
- d. The presence or absence of a teacher handbook.
- e. The poverty index or percent of poverty in a school.
- f. The personality type of the principal as measured by the FIRO-B.

The four significant variables were:

- a. The presence of absence of regular inservice meetings concerning discipline which was significant at the .10 level, and .05.
- b. The type of curriculum of the school. Curriculum was significant at the .10 level.
- c. The racial composition of a school. The grouping black and majority black versus all other racial groupings was significant at the .05 level for the years 1974-75 and 1975-76 and at the .10 level for 1976-77.
- d. The philosophy of the principal in regards to suspension, approval vs disapproval. Strongly significant scores of .018, .002, and .003 respectively were calculated for the last three years of the survey, and all are at the .01 level.

Interaction analysis was not performed for one variable, curriculum. A oneway analysis of variance was performed to determine whether the personality type of the principal is related to the type of curriculum found in a school. It must be pointed out, however, that personality type was measured by one examination, which may be only a single dimension of the principals leadership style. Prior to this analysis, a one way analysis was also performed to determine whether the poverty level of a school has a bearing on the type of curriculum, as the type of curriculum appears to be significantly related to the suspension rate.

Table 13 demonstrates the relationship between the category of curriculum and the poverty level. It will be noted that the mean percentage of poverty increases from 35.07 in category one with the most enriched curriculum, to 48.88 in curriculum category three which is a basic curriculum. However in this particular study, these differences are not statistically significant. The F level is .807 and probability is .454. The total personality score on the FIRO-B also failed to yield a significant score as is indicated in Table 14, where the F level is .210 and the probability is .812.

The following analyses only include those schools that responded to the questionnaire because they all deal with the significant variables of Inservice or Approval. When only these forty schools are considered, the strong differences in the percent of suspension between different racially mixed black schools disappear. In other words, the predominantly black schools that suspended the most students failed to answer the questionnaire.

Table 15 is a two way Interaction Analysis relating the two significant variables of Principal Approval or Disapproval of suspensions in the year 1976-77 to the frequent or sparse use of Inservice sessions on Discipline.

An analysis of Table 15 indicates that while the main effects of Approval and Inservice have a strongly significant relationship to the suspension rate in a school, their combined interaction effects are not significant, as the F value is .208.

It can be observed however that the thirteen schools that had principals who disapproved of suspension and had the least number of

TABLE 13

ANOVA, THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPE OF CURRICULUM AND
POVERTY LEVEL IN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

A. Cell Means - PCT.POV by Curriculum

| Type of Curr. | | | |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Groups | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Percent Pv. | 35.07 | 45.37 | 48.88 |
| # Cases | 14 | 16 | 8 |

B. Analysis of Variance - Percent Poverty by Curriculum

| <u>Source of Variation</u> | <u>Sum of Sq.</u> | <u>Deg. F.</u> | <u>Mean Sq.</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>Sig. F</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|
| Curriculum | 12228.657 | 2 | 614.328 | .807 | .454 |

TABLE 14

ANOVA, THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TOTAL SCORE EARNED BY CHICAGO
PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ON THE FIRO-B AND TYPE OF CURRICULUM

A. Cell Means - T Score by Curriculum

Type of Curr.

| | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Groups | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Total Score | 20.93 | 22.00 | 19.67 |
| # Cases | 14 | 15 | 9 |

B. Analysis of Variance - Total Score by Curriculum

| <u>Source of Variation</u> | <u>Sum of Sq.</u> | <u>Deg. F.</u> | <u>Mean Sq.</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>Sig. F</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|
| Curriculum | 30.9666 | 2 | 15.483 | .210 | .812 |

TABLE 15

INTERACTION ANALYSIS, A TWO WAY ANALYSIS BETWEEN PRINCIPAL APPROVAL AND INSERVICE TRAINING COMPARED TO SUSPENSION RATES IN CHICAGO PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

A. Cell Means - PCTS5 by Approval and Inservice

| Approval | Group 1 (Approves) | Group 2 (Disapproves) |
|--------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Mean % Susp. | .18 | .07 |
| # in Group | 11 | 29 |

| Inservice | Group 1 (Had Inser.) | Group 2 (Sparse Inser.) |
|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Mean % Susp. | .13 | .06 |
| # in Group | 19 | 21 |

| Inservice | Group 1 (Inservice) | Group 2 (Sparse Inser.) |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Approve Suspen. | .30 Suspensions 3 Schools | .13 Suspensions 8 Schools |
| Disapprove Suspen. | .10 Suspensions 16 Schools | .03 Suspensions 13 Schools |

B. Analysis of Variance - PCTS5 by Approval and Inservice

| <u>Source of Variation</u> | <u>Sum of Sq.</u> | <u>Deg. F.</u> | <u>Mean Sq.</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>Sig. F</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|
| Main Effects | .182 | 2 | .091 | 9.461 | .001 |
| Approval | .136 | 1 | .136 | 14.120 | .001 |
| Inservice | .090 | 1 | .090 | 9.359 | .004 |
| <u>2-Way Interaction</u> | | | | | |
| App by inser. | .016 | 1 | .016 | 1.643 | .208 |

inservice sessions had the lowest percent of suspensions, a rate of .03%, while the three schools that had principals who approved of suspensions and had the most inservice sessions had the highest percent of suspensions, a rate of .30%.

Table 16 is two way Interaction Analysis relating the variables of inservice and approval in predominantly black schools.

An analysis of Table 16 indicates that while the Main Effects of Approval and Inservice are highly significant variables by themselves with significant levels of .001 and .009 and are strongly related to suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools, the Black variable does not have a significant F. It must be remembered that the racial variable in the first analysis included all 57 schools, while only 40 of the 57 schools were included in the Interaction Analysis. If all 57 principals had answered the questionnaire, the results might have been different. This question however, deserves further study.

It can also be observed that none of the interactions had a significant score so that combined variables do not appear to have a significant effect upon suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.

The four way tables, however, indicate that the all Black schools have the highest suspension rates in schools where the principals approve of suspension and there is more frequent inservice, while the suspension rate is lowest in schools with other races than black, where the principals disapprove of suspension. The schools

INTERACTION ANALYSIS, A TWO WAY ANALYSIS RELATING THE VARIABLES
OF INSERVICE AND APPROVAL IN PREDOMINANTLY BLACK SCHOOLS

A. Cell Means - PCTS5 by Approval, Black, and Inservice

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Approval | Group 1 | Group 2 |
| Mean % Susp. | .18 | .07 |
| # of Schools | 11 | 29 |
| Black | Group 1 (Black) | Group 2 (All Others) |
| Mean % Susp. | .12 | .06 |
| # of Schools | 23 | 17 |
| Inservice | Group 1 | Group 1 |
| Mean % Susp. | .13 | .06 |
| # of Schools | 19 | 21 |

2-Way Interactions

| | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Group 1 (Black) | Group 2 (All Others) |
| Approve Suspen. | .19 Suspensions 7 Schools | .15 Suspensions 4 Schools |
| Disapprove Suspen. | .09 Suspensions 16 Schools | .03 Suspensions 13 Schools |
| | Group 1 (Inservice) | Group 2 (Sparse Inservice) |
| Approve Suspen. | .30 Suspensions 3 Schools | .13 Suspensions 8 Schools |
| Disapprove Suspen. | .10 Suspensions 16 Schools | .03 Suspensions 13 Schools |
| | Group 1 (Inservice) | Group 2 (Sparse Inservice) |
| Black | .17 Suspensions 13 Schools | .06 Suspensions 10 Schools |
| Other Races | .04 Suspensions 6 Schools | .07 Suspensions 11 Schools |

B. Analysis of Variance - PCTS5 by Approval, Black, and Inservice

| <u>Source of Variation</u> | <u>Sum of Sq.</u> | <u>Deg. F.</u> | <u>Mean Sq.</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>Sig. F</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|
| Main Effects | .192 | 3 | .064 | 6.831 | .001 |
| Approval | .124 | 1 | .124 | 13.124 | .001 |
| Black | .010 | 1 | .010 | 1.031 | .317 |
| Inservice | .072 | 1 | .072 | 7.691 | .009 |
| 2-Way Interactions | .044 | 3 | .015 | 1.566 | .216 |
| Approval by Black | .003 | 1 | .003 | .344 | .562 |
| Approval by Inservice | .009 | 1 | .009 | .971 | .332 |
| Black by Inservice | .015 | 1 | .015 | 1.629 | .211 |

having the least number of inservices with populations that are other than black have the lowest suspension rates.

Chapter IV of this study contains the results of the interviews with Chicago Public High School principals, and in-depth analyses of all of the data collected, as well as a comparison of two similar high schools in Chicago with differing suspension rates.

Chapter Summary

1. There were no significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools since the change in Chicago Board of Education policy concerning suspensions, was enacted in 1975.
2. There were no significant differences in the proportions of suspensions among schools where teachers were aware of the clause in the Board/Union contract, relating to discipline, and in schools where the majority of teachers, as perceived by the principal, were unaware of the clause.
3. There were no significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions among schools that had printed behavior codes and those that did not.
4. There were no significant differences in suspension rates between schools having school handbooks for staff and those that did not.
5. There was a significant difference between schools that had more frequent inservice meetings concerning discipline and those that had no or few inservice sessions concerning discipline. Schools that had fewer meetings had lower levels of suspension. The significance of this variable was at the .10 level for the years 1974-75 and 1976-77, and at the .05 level for the school year 1975-76.
6. There was a significant difference at the .10 level between schools that had enriched curricula and those that did not in their suspension rates.

7. There was a significant difference in the suspension rates between schools that had primarily black populations and schools that had mixtures of other races. The variable of race was significant at the .05 level for the school years 1974-75 and 1975-76, and at the .10 level for the school year, 1976-77.
8. There were no significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing socioeconomic status.
9. There was a significant difference, at the .01 level during the school years 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77, between schools that had principals that approved of suspensions and those who did not.
10. There were no significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools in relationship to the personality type of the principals as measured by the FIRO-B psychological test.
11. There were no significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools exhibiting a combination of variables encompassed in this study and those that did not. However, there were wide variations in the suspension rates of schools with combined variables, and while those variations were not statistically significant, it was found that majority black schools, where the principals approved of suspension, and where there were frequent inservice sessions devoted to discipline, had the highest suspension rates. The schools with the lowest suspension rates tended to have few inservice sessions devoted to discipline, school populations with majority races other than black, and principals who did not approve of suspension as a disciplinary measure.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Chapter III presented the data collected in tabular and narrative form and included statistical test results without in-depth analysis of the data. This chapter contains the interview and questionnaire results, and in-depth analysis of all of the data collected; and a comparison between two Chicago High Schools with similar characteristics, but with a difference in suspension rates.

Introduction

As mentioned in Chapter III, much of the information for this study was collected by interview and by a questionnaire mailed to Chicago Public High School principals. According to Engelhart, the statement and definition of a problem should guide the collection of data.¹ The data collected by interviews should be relevant to the problem and should be sufficiently representative to justify generalizations. In addition, the interview can be used to verify the validity of information obtained through surveys.

¹Engelhart, Max, Methods of Educational Research, Rand McNally, 1972, pp. 87-101.

Interviews are generally classified as either fixed alternative or open-ended, and sometimes both types are essential in data gathering. While fixed-alternative items are useful in promoting uniformity in the collection of data, the open-ended questions appear to be more appropriate when the objective is to not only discover the respondent's attitude towards some issue, but also to learn something about his level of information.

Engelhart also suggests that if interviewing is used to validate data collected by a mail questionnaire, the fixed-alternative questions must be identical.

The purpose for conducting interviews for the study was two-fold: (1) to verify validity of information obtained through the questionnaires; and (b) to provide an in-depth discussion of some selected topics dealing with variables that might have a relationship to the suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools. To this end, a preliminary interview was held with eight Chicago Public High School principals in order to test the sample questions that would be included in the questionnaire that would subsequently be mailed to the fifty-seven high schools included in this study.

Each of the eight principals was interviewed in an informal setting in such varied places as high schools used as inservice training sites for Chicago Public School principals and the Center for Urban Education during the summer and fall of 1977.

There were ~~fixed-alternative~~ as well as open-ended questions used in interviewing the principals. In addition, a survey was made in order to gather identifying personal information such as name,

institutional affiliation, length of time as a principal in the particular high school and other experience as an administrator.

Pilot Study

The preliminary interviews served as a pilot study to ascertain whether the formulated questions were clear and whether data elicited would shed light on the problem.

Twelve fixed-alternative type questions were presented to each principal:

1. Does your school have a printed student handbook or behavior code?
2. Does your school have a handbook of rules and regulations for staff?
3. Are regular inservice meetings relating to student discipline held for your staff? If so, how many have been held per year for the past five years, or for the length of time you have been a principal at your school?
4. Are there any unique programs in addition to standard curricular offerings in your school? If so, name some of these programs.
5. Are you aware of the clause in the Board/Union Contract relating to discipline? If so, what does this clause mean?
6. Roughly, what proportion of your teachers, do you believe, are aware of this clause?
7. Can you name some specific legal decisions by courts related to student suspensions?
8. Have legal decisions affected student suspensions in your school? In what way?
9. What programs have you that meet the needs of students with special problems?
10. Do you have alternatives to suspension in your school? If so, what are they?

11. What alternatives to suspension would you institute if possible?

Several open-ended questions were also asked: *five*

1. Briefly state your personal philosophy regarding student suspensions.
2. How have the number of students suspended in your school changed since 1975 when the Board of Education adopted a new policy?
3. To what extent has this policy either handicapped or helped with your decision making?
4. What effect has teacher awareness of the clauses in the contract had on the numbers of students suspended in your school?
5. Describe the effectiveness of inservice sessions related to discipline in your school.

Analysis of Pilot or Preliminary Interview

Identifying Information

An analysis of the identifying information revealed that the length of service of the eight principals in their current schools ranged from one to five years. Four of the principals with less than five years of service in their particular high schools were employed as administrators in Chicago, three as elementary school principals, and one in the Central office.

Fixed Alternative Analysis

Results of the fixed-alternative questions that could be answered either yes or no revealed the following breakdown:

| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 1. Presence of a student handbook or code. | 7 | 1 |
| 2. Presence of a teacher handbook. | 7 | 1 |
| 3. Frequent inservice on discipline. | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Unique curricular offerings. | 5 | 3 |
| 5. Aware of the Board/Union clause. | 8 | 0 |
| 6. Aware of legal decisions anent suspensions. | 0 | 8 |
| 7. Have legal decisions affected the number of suspensions in your school? | 4 | 4 |
| 8. Have alternatives to suspension. | 5 | 3 |

All of the principals interviewed understood the fixed-alternative questions, however, one principal asked for an explanation of the term, "unique programs." The interviewer explained that these programs would not generally be universally found in a high school curriculum, and were not a part of the basic required curriculum.

Open-Ended Questions--Analysis *(Here)*

An analysis of the open-ended questions revealed that the philosophies of the eight principals concerning suspension, were rather similar. Most of them felt that suspension should be used as a last resort; that suspension is only a temporary measure that fails to resolve the problem; and that alternatives to suspension should be made available to principals. Some of their comments were:

1. Suspension should be used as a last resort. Suspension policy must be understood by all, and when understood, must be applied justly and evenly.

2. I don't believe that suspensions resolve problems or change behavior.
3. Suspensions are the least desirable method of handling discipline problems. Suspensions really say, "we cannot handle this student or problem."
4. Suspension should be used as a means of modifying behavior when other steps have proven ineffective. Parental involvement is essential.
5. Students who disrupt the education of others should be removed from the group in order to enable the larger group to receive their education
6. I don't like to suspend children. However, very few alternatives are available. Teachers love suspension, and actually equate principal support by the number of students suspended.

The question relating to the number of students suspended at the eight schools since the implementation of the 1975 policy of the Board of Education, outlining due process procedures for student suspension, produced the following results:

The perceptions of the principals were compared with actual suspension results derived from tables secured from the Department of Administrative Research of the Chicago Board of Education. The schools are identified by the random number assigned to the school to guarantee anonymity (see Table 1 in the Appendix).

Perceived Suspensions Compared to Actual

| <u>School</u> | <u>1975 Rate</u> | <u>1976 Rate</u> | <u>1977 Rate</u> | <u>Trend</u> | <u>Prin. Resp.</u> |
|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 9.6% | 7.5% | 8.0% | Same | Same |
| 2 | 52.1% | 13.3% | 30.0 | Down | Up |
| 16 | 9.8% | 6.3% | 7.8% | Same | Unsure |
| 20 | 2.5% | .8% | 1.9% | Same | Same |
| 38 | 2.6% | 2.3% | 2.1% | Same | Same |
| 34 | 1.8% | 1.5% | .3% | Same | Same |
| 40 | 8.4% | 7.5% | 8.8% | Same | Same |
| 50 | 18.5% | 13.2 | 43.5% | Up | Down |

Five of the eight principals interviewed in the preliminary study, were on target in assessing the suspension trends in their schools since the implementation of Board policy in 1975, while two of the principals were off target. Principal 2 probably perceived that the suspension rate had gone up from the year 1976, but seemed unaware that the rate had dropped considerably from the whopping rate of almost 54% in 1975. Principal 50 was completely off target and seemed to be out of touch with the reality of his school situation. One year later (1977-78), this particular principal was demoted to an elementary school.

The third open-ended question asked whether the 1975 suspension policy, implemented by the Board of Education, was viewed as a handicap or help in the decision making process centered around student suspensions.

The principals' answers fell into three categories; helpful, harmful and neither. The results were as follows:

1. Three principals stated the policy was beneficial because it made them more aware of their students' rights, set guidelines for suspension, and improved their record keeping.
2. One principal said, "It has handicapped our decision making to the extent that long suspensions are no longer possible; there are too many captains guiding the ship."
3. Four principals stated that the policy neither helped nor hindered their decision making processes.

The fourth open-ended question asked was, "What effect has teacher awareness of Article 30 in the Union contract had on the numbers of students suspended in your school?" This question was designed to be a companion question to the fixed-alternative question

6, asking principals to roughly ascertain, the percent of teachers they perceived to be aware of Article 30 in the Board/Union Contract. This question gave insight into the rationale for the principals' answers. This question also gave insight into principal comprehension of the provisions of Article 30.

All eight principals stated that they were aware of the Discipline clause in the contract, however during the in-depth interview, only seven of the eight principal responses demonstrated actual knowledge of the clause. One principal, who was off target, confused the clause with Board suspension policy.

Article 30, as explained in Chapter III of this study, gives a teacher the right to bar a student from class for disruptive behavior after three referrals to the principal, and mandates a student, parent, teacher conference before the student can be returned to class. It also suggests that the principal suspend a student for up to one month if all else fails.

The seven principals who gave a correct interpretation of the clause were from schools numbered 1, 16, 20, 34, 38, 40 and 50. The principal of school number 2 confused the union clause with Board policy. Some of the correct responses concerning Article 30 were:

1. School 1--The clause states that a principal should suspend a student after three referrals by a teacher.
2. School 16--A principal must suspend a student after three referrals, but I don't.
3. School 20--Teachers' rights are defined and protected. Limits of authority are considered in the context of prompt attention being given to discipline problems.

4. School 34--A teacher has the right to send disruptive students to the office, and after three referrals does not have to take the student back unless a conference has been held.
5. School 38--This clause means that with proper notification of the classroom teacher, the principal or his designee is to deal with behavioral problems brought to his attention.
6. School 40--Classroom teachers can by contract, insist on administrative attention to legitimate classroom problems. Teachers cannot suspend or demand suspensions. This action is still the right of the principal.
7. School 50--The teacher must refer a disruptive student to the principal . . .

The seven principals who understood the essence of Article 30, were then asked to roughly estimate the percentage of teachers on their staffs who seemed to be aware of their rights to bar students from class, pending action by the principal. The answers of the seven principals fell into three categories; aware, not aware and not sure. Five principals stated that most of their staffs were aware of the clause, one that few were aware, and two were not sure of the percentage.

Some of the principals, when asked about the effect of Article 30 upon their suspension rates answered as follows:

1. School 1--This clause has very little effect upon the suspension rate in my school.
2. School 16--Most of my teachers appear to be aware of this clause, but it has little effect upon our suspensions.
3. School 20--All of my teachers are aware of this clause, but it has no effect on the numbers of students suspended.
4. School 34--I can't guess how many teachers are aware, however our suspension rate is very low, less than 1%, and the clause has no effect upon our suspensions.

5. School 38--Between 50% and 75% of my staff are aware of this clause, and as a result there has been a slight increase in the numbers of students being suspended. (The suspension rate at this school did not actually change.)
6. School 40--Few of my staff members appear to be aware of the clause, because I do not hear this clause being used by teachers to assert their rights, and it has had little influence upon me in determining whether or not a student should be suspended.
7. School 50--All of my teachers know about this clause. In the beginning, when I first was assigned to the school in 1967, some very militant teachers attempted to usurp the principal's right regarding suspension. After they lost several grievances, they settled down and allowed the principal to do his job as prescribed by Board of Education rules. I decide whether or not a student will be suspended.

It appeared that few of the principals interviewed were being pressured by teachers to suspend students on the basis of Article 30 of the Board/Union Contract, and that principals were aware of the clause.

The final open-ended question, "Describe the effectiveness of inservice sessions related to discipline in your school," was designed to secure in-depth information for the fixed-alternative question 3, asking principals about the frequency of inservice sessions related to discipline. The answers of the eight principals in the pilot study, concerning the effectiveness of their inservice sessions were:

1. School 1--We usually have one inservice a year relating to discipline, some of which have covered Reality Therapy, Role playing, and lectures about disciplinary causes and methods of coping, as well as discussion of our behavior code. I believe these sessions to be successful, and on a scale of 0-10, I would rate their effectiveness at about 6 or 7.
2. School 2--This principal stated that he always schedules two inservice sessions per year related to discipline, one at the beginning of the year and one in the middle. He felt that they were effective only in making teachers aware of rules and procedures.

3. School 16--I have been at my school for only one year, and have had only one session, therefore, I cannot be certain of the effectiveness of one 40 minute session we have had.
4. School 20--I have been principal of this school for three years, and we have had two inservices per year. All sessions have a relationship to discipline in terms of how it affects the instructional program . . .
5. School 34--No answer was recorded. The interviewer overlooked asking this particular question.
6. School 38--During the past five years, we have had only three inservice sessions centered around the topic of discipline, and have had no more than one per year. Actually our discussions about discipline are not general sessions for the entire staff, but discussions with my Professional Problems Committee and a separate discipline committee that is revising our behavior code. Students are also involved in the revision of our code . . .
7. School 40--We devote one inservice session to discipline per year, however, we had two sessions in 1974-75, and 1975-76. Some of our programs involved human relations in the classroom to avoid discipline problems, and methods of referring disruptive students to counselors. While I feel these sessions were needed, the teachers most in need were not at all helped by these programs.
8. School 50--We have numerous inservice sessions relating to discipline, between three and six per year. Some of the specific topics covered have been drug abuse, community relations, psychological makeup of adolescents, student truancy, student problems and possible solutions. I feel that the results have been positive because our suspension and drop out rates have decreased. (Statistical analysis for this school indicated that the suspension rate increased and that this principal was out of touch with the real situation of his school. The appendix of this paper contains the table with the data. This principal was involuntarily transferred from his post the year after this study was completed.)

Questions 4, 9, 10 and 11 were included in the fixed alternative section of the analysis, all relate to curriculum, and are somewhat open-ended because they require a listing if the answer is in the affirmative. This set of questions centered about unique programs in the school, programs meeting the needs of students with special

problems, and alternatives to suspension. They were not asked in consecutive order because independent answers were sought to each question and the interviewer did not want to establish a relationship between the questions in the minds of the principals being interviewed. Summaries of the results of the four curricular questions appear next:

1. School 1--We have four Advanced Placement classes and a film study class for our more able students. We also have special education classes for EMH, LD and a program for the emotionally disturbed. We have no alternatives to suspension, but if money were available I would like In-House-Suspension and a Work Detail.
2. School 2--I can't think of any unique programs we have, but we do have some programs to meet the needs of students with special problems such as special education classes and a guidance program called "Project Step-up." Our alternative to suspension is a limited program called "Peer Counseling," and our counselors also hold group guidance sessions. A program I would like to have is a demerit work program, whereby disruptive students would have to do work around the school.
3. School 16--Our curriculum is rather basic, except for a bilingual Spanish program and a Peer Culture Development Program, whereby students counsel each other. If there were more funds, I would like to expand the Peer Culture Development Program.
4. School 20--Our entire High School is unique because we are a magnet Career Development Center. We have a Transitional Center and special counselors that help guide students into various careers according to student academic ability and interests. Our suspension rate is very low and students with problems are counseled and sign behavior contracts. If funds permitted, I would like to have an alternative learning center, a cooling off room and a guidance clinic. (The percent of suspensions at this school ranged from .4% to 2.5% and in 1977 was 1.9%, which is low. This principal was on target.)
5. School 34--We have a special course in Data Processing, Home Management, Occupational experience and tutoring for slow students.

6. School 38--We have a wide range of unique programs at our school including multilingual education, Triad, which is an alternative program for potential drop-outs, a prep center to prepare in coming 8th graders for the High School experience whereby the students spend a few weeks at our school before graduating, an American Indian Center, special education classes, reading labs, and a GED program for overage students. We have no specific alternatives to suspension except parental conferences. There are no alternatives that I would institute because we have a variety of programs already and our suspension rate is low. (The principal was on target as the suspension rate for school 38 ranged from .5% to 2.6%.)
7. School 40--The principal indicated that he did not understand the definition of Unique Programs, because he did not feel any of the programs at his school were really out of normal range of a High School Curriculum. He was asked to describe the curriculum and he stated that his school has a regular high school program with special classes for EMH and socially maladjusted students, as well as shop classes and a work-study program. He also stated that there were no alternatives to suspension at the school, but that if it were possible he would have a special classroom to place students instead of suspending them.
8. School 50--Principal response to the set of four questions indicated that this school has a Youth Motivation Program, tutoring classes, a Youth guidance Program, using outside agencies, and group guidance for cutters and truants. Alternatives to suspension at this school involved a late period study room and working on a clean-up committee. This principal felt that suspensions could be cut down, if teachers could be hired for meaningful after school programs and programs during the day for students who break the rules.

Summary of Pilot Interviews

The fixed-alternative responses posed no problem in comprehension for the interviewees, and data pertinent to the problem was collected, while the open-ended questions revealed in-depth information that both explained why the respondents answered the questions as they did and supplied useful information necessary to the study.

One purpose of this pilot study was to see whether the questions generated the responses for which they were designed. The second purpose was to gain insight into the administration of the interview regarding length, notation, and interest in the subject. The purposes of the pilot study were fulfilled.

It was ascertained from the fixed-alternative responses that:

1. The majority of schools had a student handbook, 7-1.
2. The majority of schools had a teacher handbook, 7-1.
3. The frequency of inservice meetings produced two groups, those with many meetings and those with few, 3-4.
4. The majority of the schools had some unique curricular offerings, 5-3.
5. All but one of the principals understood Article 30 of the Board/Union Contract.
6. None of the respondents could name or summarize any Court Decisions centered around the topic of suspensions.
7. The group was divided in their opinions about whether legal decisions or Board Policy affected suspensions in their schools.
8. Five of the eight principals had some form of alternative to suspension.

The Open-Ended responses revealed that:

1. None of the principals interviewed strongly approved of suspending students. Most of them stated that it should be used as a last resort, and some felt that suspension is a temporary measure that does little to resolve the basic problem.
2. Board of Education Suspension Guidelines, adopted in 1975, appeared to have no effect upon the suspension rates in any of the eight schools. The majority of the principals stated that the guidelines did not affect their decision making processes concerning suspensions, except for modification of suspension procedures to ensure due process for students before suspending them. The statistics indicated (data obtained from Administrative Research) that six of the

schools experienced no changes of significance in their suspension rates following the issuance of the guidelines, that the suspensions rose in one school, and went down in only one school that had had one of the highest suspension rates in the city.

3. Principals viewed the Board of Education Guidelines in a rather benign matter. Some felt it help set up uniform procedures for suspending students, others that the policy did not help or hinder him, and one principal felt that the policy interfered with his control of the school because he could no longer suspend students for a month at a time.
4. The principals perceived that Article 30, the discipline clause in the contract, was familiar to their staffs in various degrees, but that teachers rarely use this clause to bar students from their classrooms or to pressure principals into suspending students.
5. Principals generally devoted at least one inservice per year centered about a topic related to discipline, and all but one felt that they had an impact upon their staffs.
6. The principals were in favor of special alternative programs in dealing with disruptive students rather than suspending students. One principal who could think of no alternatives already had a highly enriched varied curricular program and a low suspension rate.

Analysis of Data Derived from the Mailed Questionnaire,
FIRO-B Test and Other Sources

Since the data collected in the pilot study were relevant to the problem of this study, and the questions were clearly understood by the respondents, a written questionnaire was formulated, using both the fixed-alternative and open-ended questions used in the preliminary study.

A copy of the Questionnaire constructed and mailed to fifty-seven Chicago Public High School principals appears in the appendix of this study. Seventy-one percent of forty-one principals

had returned their packets containing questionnaires, FIRO-B tests and various codes and handbooks by the end of March, 1978. The original packets had been mailed to the principals the first week in January of 1978, however, follow-up letters and personal telephone appeals enhanced the initial response of the principals.

The following analysis of the results of the questionnaire includes the eight schools in the pilot group, as well as the seven schools in the post-questionnaire validating interview sessions.

Questionnaire Analysis

An analysis of the forty-one questionnaire responses to the fixed alternative questions revealed the following results:

1. The great majority of the principals, thirty-three in all, stated that they had a student behavior code, while seven stated they did not. One principal sent an incompleated questionnaire. Fourteen of the principals either sent copies of their code with the questionnaires or had a code on file at the American Friends Service Committee Office in Chicago.

Twenty-two of the thirty-three schools that had behavior codes indicated that the codes had been in effect for over five years, while the remainder were recently instituted.

2. Forty principals answered the question concerning teacher handbooks, and all but four indicated that they had handbooks. Five principals sent copies under separate cover.
3. Forty principals responded to the Inservice fixed-alternative question. Thirty-six principals answered yes, indicating that they have had inservice sessions relating to student discipline and four answered no. The four schools with no answers had extremely low suspension rates (see Table 1).

TABLE 17
SUSPENSION RATES OF SCHOOLS WITH NO INSERVICE SESSIONS
RELATING TO DISCIPLINE

| School | Sessions | | | | |
|--------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 1972-73 | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 |
| #19 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 8.0 | .5 |
| #34 | .7 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 | .3 |
| #21 | .0 | .0 | .0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |
| #24 | 13.9 | 13.0 | 12.4 | 7.1 | 3.3 |

Three of the four schools had had consistently low suspension rates over the five year period, while school 24 had low rates for the fifth year of the study.

4. The final fixed alternative question related to "unique programs in the school." All forty-one principals answered this question. It is interesting that only seven of the principals indicated that they had no unique programs.

The thirty-six principals who answered yes to this question listed the programs they considered unique. (See section entitled, "In-depth Analysis of Suspension Variables.")

Results of Open-Ended Responses

A summary of the open-ended questions appears below:

1. Briefly state your personal philosophy regarding student suspensions.

Forty principals wrote a short essay stating their personal philosophies regarding student suspensions. These essays had common threads. Most of the principals, twenty-six of them, clearly had misgivings about suspending students and used it as a last resort because few alternatives were available. Twelve principals appeared to support suspension as a disciplinary measure in order to maintain order in the classroom.

A statistical analysis (see Chapter III) indicated that the attitude or philosophy of the principal was highly significant in relationship to student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools. An in-depth analysis of this question appears in the review of the variables in this chapter, however, while it is impractical to quote all forty-one principals regarding their philosophies of suspension a sample answer for the pro and con positions appears below:

Pro-suspension--School 13

Suspension has a positive effect on the school and the program, even though it doesn't help the student.

Against suspension--School 10

Suspension should come only after all else has failed. The student should be counseled by the class teacher, counselor, social worker, truant officer, etc. Only after these means have been exhausted, should suspension be used.

The suspension rates of the above two schools were drastically different (see Appendix). The suspension rate for school 13, whose leader strongly approved of suspension as a tool, was 44% in 1976, compared to 1.7% for school 10, whose principal had strong reservations about using suspension to discipline students.

2. How have the number of students suspended in your school changed since 1975 when the Board of Education adopted a new policy? To what extent has this policy either handicapped or helped with your decision making?

Forty principals answered the first part of this question. The answers fell into three groups: no change, a decrease and an increase. The answers of the principals written on the questionnaires, were then compared to suspension data secured from the Department of Administrative Research of the Chicago Board of Education, in order to establish content validity. The table below illustrates the summary of principal responses compared to what actually happened to suspension rates at their schools.

| <u>No. of Principals</u> | <u>Principal Response</u> | <u>Suspension Trend</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 17 | Same | Same |
| 5 | Same | Down |
| 6 | Same | up |
| 3 | Down | Down |
| 3 | Down | Up |
| 1 | Down | Same |
| 2 | Up | Up |
| 1 | Up | Down |
| 2 | Not sure | Down |

Over half the principals, twenty-two of them, sensed the correct suspension trends in their schools, the majority of which were at a status quo. The statistical analysis of this question, which appears in Chapter III, corroborated the majority view of the principals that the 1975 suspension guidelines had no significant relationship to suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.

The second part of this question was designed to determine how the 1975 suspension guidelines issued by the Chicago Board of Education, may have affected the decision making process of the principal. The responses of the forty principals responding to this question fell into four categories:

- Category 1: Twenty-two principals stated that the new policy had no effect upon their decision making process, and that the suspension policy neither helped nor hindered them.
- Category 2: Four principals stated that the policy had very little effect upon their decision making process, except in minor ways, such as shortening suspension time, and taking more time for the hearing process.
- Category 3: Ten principals stated that they found the policy helpful for various reasons, some of which were: staff awareness of student rights, clarifying procedures, better record keeping, and less arbitrary decision making.
- Category 4: Four principals felt that the policy hindered them. Some of their comments were:
 - 1. Teacher morale dropped because they felt that the administration was not backing them.
 - 2. Long suspensions are no longer possible. There are too many captains guiding the ship.
 - 3. Too much time is taken up for hearings.
 - 4. This policy is too time consuming. There is too much paper work.

It appeared that the overwhelming majority of the respondents had a benign attitude about the new policy, and certainly did not feel that it handicapped their decision making process. It appeared that except for shortening suspension time and following guidelines for hearing procedures, Chicago Public High School principals had continued their previous pattern in suspending students, as the statistical analysis (see Chapter III) indicated that there had been no significant downturn in suspension rates following the implementation of the 1975 suspension guidelines.

3. Are you aware of the clause in the contract relation to discipline? (Board/Union contract) If so, what does the clause mean?

Forty principals answered this essay question. The responses seemed to fall into two groups, those whose answers indicated that they had knowledge about Article 30 (Discipline clause) and those who did not. Thirty-three of the principals exhibited enough knowledge to be placed in the aware category, while six were off target, and placed in the not aware group.

4. What proportion of your teachers are aware of the clause? What effect has teacher awareness of the clauses in the teacher contract had on the numbers of students suspended in your school?

Twenty-six of the principals indicated that they believed the majority of teachers in their schools were aware of the clause, while nine stated that the majority of teachers in their schools were not aware of the clause.

Thirty-six of the principals stated that the clause had no effect or little effect upon teacher behavior, while four of the principals felt some teacher pressure. Some of their comments were:

- a. Some grievances were filed, but were lost by the teachers.
- b. Teachers pressure me to suspend students, but are not very successful.

5. Have legal decisions by courts affected student suspension rates in your school? If so, in which way? Can you name some specific legal decisions affecting student suspensions?

Forty principals responded to these series of questions in the mailed questionnaire. Their answers were summarized and were:

Part A - Twenty-two principals indicated that legal decision had had no effect upon their suspension rates, while eighteen indicated that they had had an effect.

Part B - The eighteen principals who answered yes to the question regarding legal decisions, answered this question in similar ways. Some of their answers were as follows:

- a. Six principals mentioned Due Process hearings for students.
- b. Nine principals indicated that students have been given shorter suspensions, and that twenty day suspensions can no longer be freely used.
- c. One principal stated that he keeps more careful records.

Part C - Only eight of the forty principals could name any of the three Supreme Court decisions affecting suspensions, although many of the principals mentioned due process rights for students.

The three United States Supreme Court decisions related to Suspension, Goss, Wood and Briscoe, were known to seven, three, and two principals, respectively. Only one principal in the entire group of forty could name all three court decisions.

6. What programs have you that meet the needs of students with special problems? What alternatives to suspension are present in your school? What alternatives would you institute if possible?

Forty principals responded to the series of curricular questions. Their answers, plus additional sources of information such as courses of study, newspaper

articles, and some North Central Reports were used to classify the schools for the statistical analysis. (See section of this chapter, Chapter IV, entitled In-Depth Analysis of Suspension Variables.)

The majority of principals mentioned special education, classes for the socially maladjusted and work-study programs for meeting the needs of special students, had no alternatives to suspension except counseling, and would like cooling off rooms, in-house suspension and more work programs, if money were available.

7. Are students aware of the penalties exacted when the school behavior code is violated? If so, how?

Thirty-three principals indicated that they had student behavior codes at their schools. An analysis of the questionnaire responses to the second part of the question revealed that a majority of the principals perceived that their students were aware of the penalties exacted when the codes were violated because they had been given copies of the codes. Six of the principals stated that the codes had been discussed during division periods, and a few principals stated that they used daily bulletins to reinforce knowledge in the codes.

Summary of Questionnaire Responses

The open-ended questions on the mailed questionnaire, which were answered by forty principals of Chicago Public High Schools revealed that:

1. The attitude of philosophy of the principal appeared to be significantly related to the suspension rate in his school. Twelve principals felt that suspensions are necessary to maintain discipline in a school, while twenty-eight disapproved of suspension as a primary method of maintaining discipline, and used this tool as a last resort.
2. The Chicago Board of Education Policy implemented in 1975, mandating guidelines for the suspension and expulsion of students, did not alter the decision making process of the majority of Chicago High School principals.

3. Supreme Court decisions relating to student suspensions appear to have little effect upon the decision making process of Chicago Public High School principals. The overwhelming majority of these principals could not name any of the decisions or were they aware of the substance.
4. Alternatives to suspension are found in very few schools. There is also a rather basic curriculum in most of the high schools in the Chicago Public School system.
5. While thirty-three of the forty Chicago Public High Schools in this study were in the group of schools having behavior codes, only six schools involved students and teachers in the discussion of the codes.

Post-Questionnaire Interview Results

The purpose of the post-questionnaire interviews was to validate data collected by the ^{previously submitted} mailed questionnaire. ^{four} Eight principals ^{+ from growth} were interviewed in a pilot study, prior to the ^{submission} mailing of the questionnaires. (See section entitled "Pilot Study" of ^{the} this ^{introduction, procedure} chapter.) ^{paper} All ^{eight} principals interviewed had also returned the written questionnaires, and when their oral answers were compared to their written responses after a period of time of over one month, had elapsed, it was ascertained that their answers were basically the same. Two principals even wrote on their questionnaires, "same as before," to several of the open-ended questions.

In addition, seven more principals were interviewed, during various times, after their mailed questionnaires had been returned, in order to establish further content validity.

The post-questionnaire interviews involved only the open-ended questions of the questionnaire, as the identifying information

remained constant, and the fixed-alternative questions were integrated into the open-ended questions.

The seven school principals interviewed represented schools 8, 21, 32, 41, 42, 48 and 52 (see Appendix, Table 1). These principals had been selected because the principals had established a good rapport with the interviewer in prior interactions and were not inhibited.

A review of the identifying information and fixed-alternative responses appears below:

1. Four of the principals had been at their schools for five or more years. Two of the principals had headed their schools for four years, and one for three years.
2. All seven schools had been reported as having a behavior code, and two had sent samples.
3. Six of the schools had reported having teacher handbooks, while one had no teacher handbook.
4. Five of the schools had either no inservice concerning discipline, or one per year, while two had more frequent inservice sessions concerning this topic.
5. All seven schools were reported as having unique programs, however, school 48 was not classified in the top category, because it failed to meet the criteria established for the top category, described in this chapter.

The open-ended questions asked were exactly the same as asked on the written questionnaire (see Appendix) ~~✗~~

A summary of the answers of the seven principals interviewed following receipt of their written questionnaires appears below:

1. Personal philosophy of the principals concerning suspension:

Five of the principals interviewed had strong reservations about using suspensions as a disciplinary measure, while one principal had some doubts about using suspensions unless a student's behavior could be modified. ✓

One principal approved of suspending students for clearly stated infractions.

A comparison of the actual suspension rates in these seven schools in the school year 1976-77, when all of the seven principals were at the helms of the schools being studied, revealed that the schools led by principals opposing suspension had very low suspension rates, while the school led by the principal who suspended students for violating a list of given rules, had an abnormally high rate of suspensions. This result appears to confirm the statistical analysis of the data that indicated that the attitude of the principal concerning suspensions is strongly related to the suspension rate in a school, at the .05 level.

Some typical comments made by the principals were:

- a. "I use suspensions only if absolutely necessary, and only after a student understands about prohibited behavior."
- b. "Only students who are a threat to safety should be suspended. It seldom is a deterrent to the offender."
- c. "Suspension should be used only as a last resort. It is not my policy to suspend."

The actual suspension rates for the seven schools involved in this survey for the school year 1976-77, and the philosophy of the principal appears below:

| <u>School</u> | <u>Suspension Rate for 1976-77</u> | <u>Philosophy</u> |
|---------------|--|-------------------|
| 8 | .2% | Disapproves |
| 21 | 2.2% | Disapproves |
| 32 | 3.5% | Disapproves |
| 41 | <u>17.0%</u> | Approves |
| 42 | .4% | Disapproves |
| 48 | 1.9% | Disapproves |
| 52 | .3% | Disapproves |

2. How have the number of students suspended in your school changed since 1975 when the Board of Education adopted a new policy?

Six of the principals, all who disapproved of suspension, stated that there was no great change in the suspension rates of their schools, while the principal, whose rate had risen, stated that the rate in his school had gone up.

3. To what extent has this policy either handicapped or helped with your decision making?

The six principals with low suspension rates stated that the policy had no effect upon their decision making process concerning suspension, while the principal with the high rates stated that the policy helped, because it clarified procedures.

4. What does the clause in the Board/Union Contract relating to discipline mean to you?

The principals were all aware of the clause and while their answers varied they all understood that there are procedures to be followed when a teacher refers to a principal for disciplinary actions. Some of the answers, while not exact quotations are summaries of statements made, and are related as follows:

- a. The clause states that if a teacher is unsuccessful in controlling a student, then he has the right to send the child to the office for discipline.
- b. This clause conflicts with Board policy because it suggests that a principal may suspend a student for a month, while Board policy now limits the number of days a student may be suspended.
- c. Students and teachers are entitled to work in a safe, orderly environment, and it is the job of the principal to deal with students who disrupt the educational program.
- d. This clause means that there are specific steps to be taken when a student's behavior is unsatisfactory. The steps include action on the part of teachers, administration, as well as student.

5. What proportion of your teachers, do you perceive, to be aware of this clause, and what effect has teacher consciousness of this clause have upon your decision making process concerning suspensions?

Five of the principals stated that most of their teachers were aware of the clause, but that it has little effect upon their decision making process concerning suspensions.

One principal said that few were aware, and one said that most were aware and that there was some effect.

Some of the answers were:

- a. All of my teachers are aware of this clause because the Professional Problems Committee (PPC) distributes this article to all of the staff every September.
 - b. It couldn't have much effect, because there is little discussion about this matter by teachers during meetings.
 - c. Sometimes teachers mention that they have the right to bar a student from class and request that a student be suspended, but I don't automatically suspend a teacher because a teacher says so.
6. Can you name some specific legal decisions concerning student suspension?

None of the seven principals could answer this or could name a single legal decision concerning suspension.

One principal stated that he could not name the decision, but he was sure it concerned something about due process rights for students.

7. Question 7 concerned effects of legal decisions upon their behavior was skipped since none of the principals knew about legal decisions other than Board Policy.
8. What programs have you that meet the needs of students with special problems?

A summary of the seven schools follows:

- a. School 8--This school has an outpost or alternative school, Drop-out Prevention and Work-study programs.

- b. School 21--This school has classes for the gifted, Polish bilingual, special education and In-House-Suspension.
- c. School 42--This is considered to be one of the most outstanding high schools in Chicago. The curriculum is college level and there is Children's Theater that rivals professional companies,
- d. School 52--This school has the most unique program found in any technical High School. There is a program that trains students in conjunction with the unions and students have had experiences in building houses, masonry, electrical wiring, etc. Yet the majority of the students are college bound and must be up to grade level before entering the school.
- e. School 32--This principal is proud of his Career Development Center.
- f. School 41--This school has special courses for the gifted, and TRIAD, a special program for drop-outs.
- g. School 48--This principal had just retired. He stated that his school had a Drop-out prevention program and bilingual education, but was not sure if the programs were the same, since he had left at the end of the 1976-77 school year.

9. What alternatives to suspension are present in your school?

All of the principals mentioned counseling, but since counseling services are mandated in all High Schools in Chicago, this was not counted as an alternative program. Two principals stated that they had in-school-suspension.

10. What alternatives would you institute if possible?

Very few of the principals could think of a creative alternative, which led the researcher to believe that they have not been deeply concerned about suspensions in their schools. The suspension rates in all but one of the schools have been very low.

All of the principals mentioned more counseling, and two mentioned in-school-suspension.

11. If you have a behavior code, how are students made aware of the penalties when the code is violated?

Some of the answers to this question were:

- a. Penalties are stated at grade level meetings with the disciplinarian.
- b. We just give them a copy of the code.
- c. Our code is not current and we have stopped giving them out because it needs revision.
- d. Our students hear bulletins during division periods, and sometimes at assemblies.

None of the principals mentioned that the codes were discussed with the students during division periods so that student participation and understanding could be reinforced.

12. If you have had inservice sessions concerning discipline, describe their effectiveness.

Some of the answers to this question were:

- a. We only have about one inservice a year, and I believe it is necessary to make teachers aware that their own behaviors often elicit poor behavior on the parts of students.
- b. Discipline has never been the topic of a general inservice at our school. We mention it casually during the meeting when school opens in September and have a special orientation for new teachers only.
- c. Discipline is mentioned at most of our meetings, but, in my opinion, it doesn't make much difference.
- d. We devote a half a day, once a year to a topic related to discipline, but the conduit for teacher reaction comes to me through the PPC. If this committee is allowed to ventilate feelings, discipline issues become diffused.
- e. We talk about discipline the first day of school, and this is beneficial in that everyone is aware of problems and proposed solutions.

- f. Teachers become more aware of alternatives and thus get away from the less effective kinds of disciplinary measures.

The answers to the open-alternative questions provided by the seven principals during their post-questionnaire interviews did not contradict answers provided by them in their mailed questionnaires, and appeared to support the statistical results of significance obtained by the study as a whole (see Chapter III). Therefore the assumption that content validity of the questionnaire has been established can be ascertained.

In-Depth Analysis of Suspension Variables

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors or variables that might have a bearing on the rate of student suspensions in public schools, with the focus upon high schools in the city of Chicago. The specific research task sought to answer eleven questions. A detailed analysis of each question will be discussed in the subsections that follow:

Question 1: Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools since the change in Chicago Board of Education policy concerning suspensions was enacted in 1975?

As Stated in Chapter III, there were no significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions in Chicago Public High

Schools since the change in Chicago Board of Education policy concerning suspensions, was enacted in 1975.

The T-Test analysis of the fifty-seven schools involved was not significant at either the .05 or .10 level of significance.

However, it must be remembered, that forty of the fifty-seven principals returned the mailed questionnaire that gave some insight into the impact of the 1975 suspension guidelines upon the decision making process of principals in relation to the suspension of students.

As revealed in Chapter III, there were no significant differences in suspension rates between schools whose principals returned the questionnaire and those that did not. Comparisons between these two groups of schools could be made because suspension data for all fifty-seven schools was made available by the Department of Administrative Research of the Chicago Board of Education.

However, upon examining the data, there appeared to be some possibility that schools that answered the questionnaire had moved from greater to fewer suspensions over the time period studied, while the trend for non-cooperating schools seemed to go from fewer to more suspensions. In other words, principals who felt some progress had been made at their schools in reducing the number of suspensions appeared more likely to answer the questionnaires than those whose rate had not been improving.

An analysis of the responses of the forty cooperating principals, concerning the impact of the 1975 suspension guidelines implemented by the Chicago Board of Education, revealed that twenty-two principals felt that the policy had no effect upon their decision

making, related to the suspension of students, while ten principals found the policy helpful in clarifying guidelines. Only four principals had found the new policy a deterrent to the suspension of students.

Closely related to the impact of the 1975 policy upon the decision making process of the principal, was their knowledge of the Supreme Court decisions relating to suspensions, upon which the 1975 policy of the Chicago Board of Education, was based. While knowledge about the provisions of the 1975 guidelines was apparently, almost universal among the group of forty cooperating principals, validated through interview and questionnaire results, knowledge about the legal decisions themselves was practically nonexistent among the group of respondents. Only one principal out of forty, could name all three U.S. Supreme Court decisions (Goss, Wood and Briscoe), while five others could name one or two of the decisions.

It was apparent, from the suspension data, that no significant changes in the high suspension rate in Chicago Public High Schools had occurred in the two years following the implementation of suspension guidelines by the Chicago Board of Education, and the rendering of the Goss and Wood decisions in 1975. While principals continued to suspend students according to their individual philosophies concerning discipline, they were apparently oblivious of their loss of the immunity mantle for wrongful suspension, and their vulnerability to the payment of monetary damages for violating the constitutional due process rights of a student.

These results ascertained by statistical analysis as well as by other methods of validation such as interview results, suspension data from agencies, and informal talks with principals, appear to be congruent with results published in the Phi Delta Kappan in 1978.² Perry A. Zirkel found that school leaders are not very knowledgeable about the meaning of the Supreme Court decisions affecting schools. He lamented that "they are abysmally ignorant."³

Ronald J. Anson, writing in the Kappan of 1975, advised educators, intent on operating their schools without the shadow of a liability suit, to become knowledgeable about court decisions and rather than ignore them or work around them, comply with them at least at a minimal level.⁴

Since ignorance of the law does not protect a school administrator or school board member, Mr. Anson recommended a network to disseminate information about court decisions, because ignorance of the law is probably the greatest obstacle to implementation.

"Newsnotes," in the February, 1979 Kappan, further corroborated the findings in this study, that new laws do not seem to have much of an impact upon methods of disciplining students.⁵

²Zirkel, Perry A., "A Test on Supreme Court Decisions Affecting Education," Kappan, April, 1978, p. 521.

³Ibid., p. 521.

⁴Anson, Ronald J., "The Educator's Response to Goss and Wood," Kappan, Sept., 1975, p. 16.

⁵Newsnotes, "The Dark Side of the Discipline Picture: New Laws Don't Change Unfairness," Kappan, Feb., 1979, p. 468.

Henry Lufler (see Chapter II) studied the effect of High Court decisions on administrators, students, and teachers as part of a three year investigation into school discipline, that was funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Lufler outlined the rights the Supreme Court had accorded students who face suspension, and found that most principals give students an opportunity to tell their side of the story in suspension procedures, but that most principals, apparently conducted such hearings even before the Court made it a constitutional right.

Lufler's study showed, however, that most hearings are perfunctory, and result in suspension. He also concluded that the actual incidence of suspension is not much affected by Supreme Court rules on discipline.

The principals of Chicago Public High Schools are apparently typical in either ignoring decisions of courts, or following the due process procedures and then suspending students. One could speculate that the overwhelming majority of the respondents in this study had a benign attitude about the Chicago Board of Education Suspension Guidelines, implemented in 1975, and used the new policy to streamline and systematize suspension procedures in their schools, rather than concerning themselves with the substantive issues such as the reasons for suspension, or whether or not the justification of individual cases of suspension could be corroborated.

Principals seemed to indicate during their interviews and in their written questionnaires that aside from improved record keeping, strict adherence of procedural due process was their main concern.

Some principals in this study rued the fact that suspensions of twenty days were no longer feasible, and others felt that the suspension chain began in the classroom, and failure to support teacher demands for suspension might show a lack of support and a lower morale among staff members. Examples of such attitudes were expressed by the principal of School 13, who said, "Suspension has a positive effect on the school and the program, even though it doesn't help the student," and the principal of School 1, who stated, "Teachers seem to love suspension, and equate principal support by the number of suspensions."

The scope of this study did not explore the reasons for student suspensions, therefore principals were not questioned about specific reasons for student suspensions in their schools. However, twenty-two of the principals responding to the question concerning their philosophy about suspending students indicated that suspension should be used as a last resort and students should be suspended for acts of violence or extreme misconduct.

It is doubtful that the suspension of 28,000 Chicago Public High School students reflects extreme misconduct upon the part of students each and every year between the period of 1972-73 and 1976-77. It is more likely, that Chicago Public High School principals, who run large institutions ranging in size from 2,000 to 5,000 students, carry out board policy in relationship to suspensions, in a mechanical way in the hope that following correct procedure will prevent major problems.

Fear of the law did not appear to be a deterrent in the suspension of Chicago Public High School students, as is evidenced by

the fact that only one principal knew about all of the United States Supreme Court decisions, and not one principal mentioned personal liability for wrongful suspensions.

In summary, it appeared that the overwhelming majority of principals in this study felt that the 1975 School Board Guidelines for Suspension had very little effect upon their decision making process, except in minor ways, such as streamlining suspension procedures, shortening suspension time, and assuring students of due process hearings. Since suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools did not drop significantly following the introduction of the guidelines for suspension, one can assume that the actual incidence of suspension in Chicago Public Schools has not been much affected by Supreme Court rules on discipline or by School Board Guidelines implemented in Chicago in 1975.

Question 2: Are there significant differences in the proportions of suspensions among schools where teachers are aware of the clause in the Union Contract relating to student discipline and in schools where the majority of teachers are not aware of the clause?

It was found that there were no significant differences in the proportions of suspensions among schools where teachers, according to the perception of the principals, were aware of Article 30 in the Board/Union Contract, relating to discipline, and those where teachers were perceived not to be aware of the clause.

Thirty-five of the principals estimated whether the majority of their staffs were aware of the clause, using such criteria as

teacher pressure to suspend students, based upon invocation of the clause, union grievances filed, and verbal interaction with staff during Professional Problems Committee meetings.

The T-Test statistical analysis performed (see Chapter III) yielded scores of .75, .89, .41 and .41 for each of the five years of the study, and were far above the .05 or .10 level of confidence necessary to establish this variable of awareness of Article 30 of the Board/Union contract, as significant.

This study did not include an actual survey of knowledge about Article 30 in the union contract. It is not known whether the majority of Chicago Teachers are actually aware of their rights to bar students from class by following procedures laid down in the contract. However casual conversations with teachers might reveal that few read their contracts thoroughly and they may be unaware of their legal power to remove disruptive students for short periods of time.

Teachers have been usually concerned with salaries and fringe benefits during contract negotiations with school boards. It appears, however, that teachers have developed an interest in obtaining support from administrators in the area of discipline and have been demanding that their unions include the right to bar disruptive students from classrooms, into their contracts.

The Chicago Teachers Union, not only insisted upon Article 30, the clause related to discipline, in every contract negotiated since 1972, but set up a joint board/union discipline committee in 1975, in order to obtain teacher input into the school board policy of the Chicago Board of Education.

According to the discipline policy set down jointly by Chicago school board personnel and representatives of the Chicago Teachers Union, principals were to publish school rules, review procedures for adequate security, devote at least one in-service session solely to pupil discipline, reassign students who assault teachers, inservice staff on rules and regulations, and discuss discipline during union professional problems committee meetings.

In 1978, Chicago Teachers Union officials charged, after taking a survey, that Board of Education policies were being ignored.⁶ The purpose of the survey was to determine how effectively board policies on discipline and security were being implemented. Three hundred union delegates responded to the survey and indicated that over half the schools in the system were out of compliance.

Robert M. Healty, was quoted, "Even when a policy is established downtown, it isn't always implemented at the local level."⁷

This study indicated that the Board/Union contract had no significant effect upon the suspension rate in Chicago Public High Schools. Principals in the survey did not appear to be pressured by their staff members to implement procedures in Article 30. The survey conducted by the Chicago Teachers Union, as previously indicated, also revealed that the majority of Chicago Principals were not adhering to

⁶Banas, Casey, "Student Discipline is Ignored: Union," Chicago Tribune, Feb. 10, 1978, Section 1, p. 3.

⁷Ibid.

discipline guidelines set down by Board of Education and the Chicago Teachers Union. It therefore, appears that Board/Union policies have had very little impact upon the decision making process of Chicago Public School principals in the area of discipline. One reason might be that the principals themselves were not involved in the making of discipline policy, and were not inserviced in a proper manner.

John Kotsakis, a CTU official wrote in the Chicago Union Teacher:⁸

. . . the Board has not provided the proper guidance to its school administrators by defining what it considers "gross misconduct," the basis for any suspension action. Second, the Board has failed to require of local principals that they establish rules of conduct in concert with faculty, student and parental input.

The chief line of communication in Chicago Public Schools is the General Superintendent's Bulletin that is issued weekly. The 1975 suspension guidelines, as well as the Board/Union policy were sent to each school, but there was no discussion or inservice. Had Article 30, discipline policy and the 1975 suspension guidelines been thoroughly discussed with school administrators, had principal input been solicited, perhaps these varied policies would have been implemented with greater insight and vigor. One could surmise, that policies imposed from above would be less exactly enforced than policies embracing principal input and understanding.

While this study did not study the role of the teacher in the suspension process, it is clear that unions are fighting for teacher

⁸Kotsakis, John, Chicago Union Teacher, March, 1978, p. 131.

input in this area, and that teachers, along with administrators may one day be held legally liable for conducting due process hearings before barring students.

This study did indicate, however, that teacher pressures upon Chicago Public High School principals, via Article 30 in the Board/Union Contract have had little impact upon the suspension rates in the high schools. This problem bears further study, as teachers may eventually demand that principals suspend students for given infractions and enforce these demands in their contracts. Thus far, Chicago principals have had discretionary powers to suspend, and appear to regard lightly Board/Union policies in the area of discipline.

Question 3: Are there significant differences in the proportion of student suspensions among schools that have printed behavior codes and those which do not?

It was found that there were no significant differences in the suspension rates between schools that have student handbooks or behavior codes, and those that do not have them (see Chapter III).

Forty principals, out of fifty-seven, responded to this item on the questionnaire, which represented 70% of Chicago Public High School principals. Thirty-three principals indicated that their schools had either student handbooks or behavior codes, while seven principals indicated they did not have handbooks or codes. Twelve principals sent copies of their codes or handbooks, and an additional twelve schools had copies of their codes on file in the office of the

American Friends Service Committee, an organization that had been conducting a study concerning this issue.

The T-Test statistical analysis yielded scores of .55, .68, .79, and .53 respectively, for the five year period studied, and were not significant scores.

An analysis of the questionnaire responses, revealed however, that while school codes or student handbooks are common in Chicago Public High Schools, they are seldom discussed, so that knowledge about school rules and regulations can be reinforced. Only six of the principals indicated that the codes were discussed with students on a regular basis. The rest of the principals indicated on their questionnaires, that codes were given to the students.

This study did not investigate whether the codes were developed with student and faculty input, however twenty-two schools indicated that their code had been in effect for over five years, and since administrators are shuffled through schools on a regular basis, one could speculate that many administrators inherited their codes.

Only one principal, the principal of School 53 indicated that the code had been updated during her jurisdiction. Perusal of school codes from the twelve schools who sent their codes indicated that there were common elements containing such information as tardy procedures, cut procedures, hall procedures, lunchroom routines, procedures for obtaining identification cards, fire drill procedures, Honor Roll requirements, etc. The schools that submitted codes or handbooks were numbers 3, 13, 14, 19, 27, 29, 32, 40, 41, 46, 55, and 57. Only three of the handbooks submitted dealt with suspension,

directly relating suspension to violation of the behavior code. Schools numbered 27, 29 and 40 listed offenses that would result in suspension, indicating the exact penalty.

Both the Chicago Region PTA, and the Chicago Teachers Union had advocated the creation of common and uniform discipline policies in Chicago Public Schools, yet these recommendations failed to be carried out. A survey conducted by the Chicago Teachers Union in 1977, revealed that over half of the schools in Chicago, including elementary schools had no published school rules that were given to parents and students.⁹

The variable of the presence of a school code did not prove to be significant in this study, however further research into this matter may very well reveal a relationship between the suspension rates of schools, where a code had been developed with student, parent and faculty input and implementation, and schools that either have no codes or have outdated codes that are distributed without discussion or other forms of reinforcement.

Question 4: Are there significant differences in suspension rates between schools having school handbooks for staff and those that do not?

It was found that there were no significant differences in suspension rates between schools having school handbooks for staff and those that did not.

⁹Ibid.

Thirty-six of the forty principals who responded to this item on the questionnaire, indicated that they had staff handbooks, while only four stated that they did not have teacher handbooks, but communicated with staff through bulletins and meetings. Five principals sent copies of their handbooks, numbers 14, 47, 55, 15 and one new high school not included in the survey.

All five of the teacher handbooks contained general school policies and information about the school itself, such as location of classrooms and common areas, time schedules, student regulations and discipline procedures. All of the handbooks suggested that counselors assist teachers with students who have behavior problems, but that serious problems be sent to the assistant principal in charge of discipline if suspension were a possibility.

The presence or absence of a teacher handbook was a fixed-alternative question requiring the answer of a yes or no on the questionnaire. No in depth questions concerning the age of the handbooks, methods of development, amount of faculty input or methods of teacher orientation were included in this study. It seems apparent, however, that Chicago Public School principals who headed high schools placed great importance upon teacher handbooks as a method of disseminating information, as only four of the forty schools surveyed had no handbook (schools 26, 29, 34 and 52), and school 34 indicated that they were in the process of developing a handbook.

The T-Test (see Chapter III) for the variable of the presence or absence of a teacher handbook, produced probability scores of .25, .44, .31, .49, and .27 respectively for each of the five years of the

study, scores which were not significant. While the presence of a teacher handbook did not prove to be significantly related to the rates of suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools, administrators evidently feel that handbooks are valuable organizational artifacts, and use them as a means of communication with staff members.

Further research into this variable might be worthwhile, in order to ascertain how handbooks are used in public schools. If administrators develop handbooks with minimal faculty input, and fail to update them on a regular basis, their impact upon the school organization may be minimal, especially in the area of discipline.

All five handbooks submitted by the Chicago High School Principals referred teachers having severe problems with discipline to the Assistant Principal in charge of discipline, but gave no concrete suggestions about dealing with discipline problems directly. Since most Chicago Public High Schools have two thousand students or more, it is apparent that principals must rely upon counselors and assistant principals to carry out policies and procedures related to student discipline and suspension. Handbooks, therefore, as well as student codes of conduct, in the Chicago Public High Schools, universally refer to counselors and assistant principals as the personnel in charge of school discipline.

Counselors and assistant principals, however, usually meet with their principals on a regular basis, and in most cases have been appointed to their positions in the school by the principals. One might assume, therefore, that these personnel reflect the philosophy

of the principal in dealing with student suspension. Teacher hand-books in Chicago Public Schools, appear to be merely a method of referring teachers to personnel in charge of discipline, rather than as aids to the teachers in personally dealing with discipline problems.

Question 5: Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools that have had inservice meetings concerning student discipline and those that had few or no meetings?

It was found that there was a significant difference in the suspension rates between Chicago Public High Schools that had two or more inservices per year about discipline and those that had one or no inservices per year. Schools having few or no meetings had lower rates of suspension than schools having two or more inservice meetings per year on the topic of discipline. The T-Test analysis (see Chapter III) produced probability levels of .35, .41, .07, .05 and .06, respectively for the five year span encompassed in this study. The inservice variable proved to be significant at the .10 level for the school years 1974-75 and 1976-77, and at the .05 level for the school year 1975-76.

Forty principals responded to the Inservice question, representing 70% of Chicago Public High School principals. The principals were asked to indicate whether or not they had conducted or had presented any faculty inservice meetings relating to student discipline and to indicate the approximate number they had had in each of the five years.

Nineteen of the cooperating principals indicated that two or more sessions had been devoted to the topic per year, while twenty-one principals indicated that only one or no inservice meetings had occurred per given year.

The results indicated that schools having few or no inservices related to the topic of discipline, had significantly lower suspension rates. It appeared that the schools with higher suspension rates were lead by principals who might have perceived that discipline inservices were necessary in order to combat the greater number of discipline problems present in their schools. This study indicated that the presence of inservice sessions concerning discipline failed to lower suspension rates in the schools utilizing them with frequency.

One might surmise that the inservice sessions themselves were not effective. These results appear to be congruent with other studies which revealed that administrators from other parts of the country have found discipline inservice sessions to be ineffective, just as Chicago principals had. An article in the American School Board Journal indicated that school administrators have been seeking methods to improve discipline inservice sessions.¹⁰ A Croft-Nei report indicated that the suspension rate in the Bartlett Junior High School in Philadelphia was high, despite sporadic exposure of the staff to inservice education programs on the topic of discipline.¹¹

10-----, "What Schools are Doing to Improve Disciplinary and Suspension Procedures," American School Board Journal, March, 1976, p. 31.

11Croft-Nei-Poll, Discipline and Control Update, Oct., 1977, p. 8.

However, after an inservice program was devised that involved teacher interaction, involvement and evaluation, the suspension rate went down.

This study did not include the methods in which inservice sessions were developed in Chicago Public High Schools, but several principals mentioned that they felt that the sessions were not helpful to the teachers who were most in need of assistance.

School 12 - Too many teachers are subject oriented and are unwilling to become student oriented despite attempts to orient them during inservice sessions.

School 40 - The teachers most in need of inservice are not helped.

School 10 - Inservice sessions, in my opinion, are not effective because there is excessive staff turnover.

Six principals described their inservice sessions related to discipline as general sessions during which rules and regulations were reviewed. While the remarks about inservice sessions were generally descriptive and often of a negative nature, only three principals made positive comments about their inservice sessions, schools 13, 23 and 50. All three principals indicated that their inservice sessions had a positive effect upon their schools' environment. The suspension rates of two of these schools, however, during the 1976-77 school year were 45% for school number 13 and 44% for school number 50, while school 23 had a suspension rate of 3%.

It would appear, therefore, that Chicago Public High School principals do not view inservice sessions as an effective means to improve school discipline, and that frequent occurrence of inservice sessions have had no marked effect in lowering student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools. Further study of this variable would be

valuable if a relationship could be established between suspension rates and inservice sessions that have been developed with teacher input and training.

Question 6: Are there significant differences in the proportion of student suspensions between schools offering a variety of curricular alternatives and those with conventional offerings?

It was found that there was a significant difference at the .10 level between schools included in this study, that had enriched curricula and those that did not, in relationship to suspension rates.

Thirty-nine of the respondents answered the curricular questions on the questionnaire. Additional information about this variable was obtained from a variety of sources including principal interview, perusal of newspaper articles, courses of study sent by principals, and perusal of North Central reports.

On the basis of the information available, the thirty-nine schools were divided into three categories; schools with enriched curricula, schools with moderately enriched curricula, and schools with basic curricula.

The SPSS program, ANOVA (see Chapter III) was used in order to establish the significance of this variable in relationship to the suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.

The F value of the analysis was 2.771 and the significance of F was .076. Curriculum, therefore was significantly related to the suspension rate at the .10 level.

The schools classified in the enriched curricular category had such varied programs as advanced placement courses, a variety of foreign language course offerings, vocational education, guidance programs such as TRIAD and Peer Culture, and alternatives to suspension such as outposts or in-school suspension. Fourteen of the thirty-nine schools studied were assigned to the top or enriched category.

Sixteen schools had moderately enriched curricula, while nine schools with basic high school offerings were assigned to the third or last category.

The majority of principals involved in this study lamented the fact that there were few alternatives to suspension, and indicated during their interviews and on their questionnaires, that if alternatives to suspension were available, they would suspend fewer students.

The fourteen schools in the enriched category were schools numbered 8, 20, 23, 25, 21, 24, 27, 32, 38, 41, 42, 47, 49, and 52.

Four of the principals included in the top curricular category indicated on their questionnaires that they had no desire for alternatives to suspensions in their schools. The principals of schools numbered 24, 27, 42 and 52 answered question no IV-C, "What alternatives to suspension would you institute if possible?" with the answer, "None." However, upon analyzing the suspension rates for the year 1976-77, it was ascertained that three of the schools had extremely low suspension rates, while one had a moderately high rate as indicated:

| <u>School</u> | <u>Suspension Rate - 1976-77</u> |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| #24 | 3.3% |
| #27 | 13.4% |
| #42 | .4% |
| #52 | .3% |

School 27 was somewhat of an enigma because it had, at the time of the study, the reputation of being one of the finest high schools in the Chicago Metropolitan area. This school had been cited in the press upon several occasions for its outstanding curriculum, select student body (there were entrance requirements), and fine administration. School 27 not only had a student handbook spelling out penalties for rule infractions, but a fine administrative staff which provided alternatives to suspension such as in-school detention. In spite of all the positive factors associated with this school, the suspension rates for the five year period of this study were 17.2, 12.4, 9.8, 9.0 and 13.4 percents respectively. One could surmise that students at this school have been kept under tight rein, and that highly motivated academic type students might regard suspension more of a penalty than the academically frustrated student. Therefore, the administration of this school, which is very orderly during most of the day, probably regard their rules as inviolate and expect military like obedience when suspendable infractions occur.

Schools numbered 24, 42 and 52 had very low suspension rates, and highly enriched curricula such as Radio broadcasting studio, tailoring, peer counseling, theater, film study, masonry, etc. The racial makeup of these three schools also varied from majority

caucasian to majority black. School 42 was 98.8% white in 1976-77, while school 24 was 26.4% white, 66.7% black and 2.8% latino. At the other end of the spectrum, was school 52, which was 99.5% black in 1976-77.

While there was a significant relationship between the black race and suspension rates at the .05 level for the school years 1974-75 and 1975-76, and at the .10 level for the school year 1976-77, one might speculate that an enriched curriculum and strong administrative leadership could possibly overcome the high suspension rates found in the majority of black high schools in the city of Chicago.

Analysis of the ten remaining schools in the enriched category also indicated that the racial makeup varied from majority white to majority black as indicated below:

| <u>School Number</u> | <u>Racial Composition</u> | | | <u>Suspensions - 1976-77</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| | <u>White</u> | <u>Latino</u> | <u>Black</u> | |
| 21 | 78.1 | 21.1 | .1 | 2.2% |
| 23 | 89.0 | 2.3 | 8.6 | 3.4% |
| 41 | 73.4 | 8.8 | 8.2 | 17.0% |
| 47 | 93.3 | 6.5 | -- | 3.8% |
| 38 | 44.0 | 24.3 | 15.3 | 2.1% |
| 32 | 35.8 | .2 | 63.5 | 3.5% |
| 8 | -- | -- | 100.0 | .2% |
| 20 | -- | .3 | 99.7 | 1.9% |
| 25 | -- | -- | 100.0 | 4.0% |
| 49 | -- | .5 | 99.5 | 7.0% |

Only one of the ten remaining schools in the enriched category for curriculum had a relatively high suspension rate in the

school year 1976-77, school number 41, with a majority white population. During the course of this study, a personal visit was made to this school as Chairman of the Curriculum Committee during a North Central evaluation session. A new principal had been assigned to this school, who had delegated suspension powers to the assistant principal in charge of discipline.

After interviewing the principal of school 41, the assistant principal in charge of discipline was also interviewed. It was ascertained that the suspension rate had risen dramatically during the school year 1976-77 from 6.4% in 1975-76 to 17.0% in 1976-77. The five year trend in this school from 1972-73 to 1976-77 was 0, 2.4, 5.7, 6.4 and 17.0 percent respectively. This school had been under the leadership of three principals during the five year time span. When the suspension rate was zero, a woman principal who did not believe in suspensions and made it clear to her staff, was at the helm of the school. When she retired, a new principal was selected, who had a moderate view about suspensions, and in 1976, in order to achieve racial integration, a black principal was transferred to the school, who during his orientation time allowed his assistant principal to act independently.

The assistant principal in charge of discipline indicated during his interview, that many of the suspended students were black students who had come into this basically white school on permissive transfers in order to enhance student integration. He complained that these students were more volatile than many of the white students and many were involved in theft and lunchroom misconduct.

The suspension rates, therefore, at twelve of the schools in the enriched curricula category, were relatively low, whether the student body was majority white or black. It would appear, therefore, that the curriculum of a school has a strong relationship to suspension rates, according to this study. However, the philosophy of the leader, the principal, and the stability of the racial makeup of the student body, might have a bearing on the stability of the suspension rate.

Casey Banas, education writer for the Chicago Tribune, described ten of the best Chicago Public High Schools in a series of articles at various times during the time this study was being conducted. His reports were given some weight in the selection of the fourteen schools with enriched curricula. A brief discussion of the top category schools follows:

1. School 8--This school had a unique program called Outpost, an alternative school for students in a storefront not physically attached to the main building. In addition in-house suspension was available in the main building in addition to regular counseling services. The outpost program is a well known program, available at very few schools and was easily verified by the researcher.
2. School 20--This school is a well known Career Academy Magnet High School that was developed jointly by Board of Education Personnel and the leaders of the community. This principal was interviewed and literature relating to the Career Academy is readily available. Students have a general curriculum as freshman, technical and vocational courses as sophomores, and enter the Career Development Centers as Juniors. Seniors actually work in industry in their Senior year, while attending school.
3. School 21--The principal of this school sent a course of study with his questionnaire. This school not only had courses for gifted students, bilingual education, work study and special education classes, but an in-school suspension program. There were no regular suspensions at this school

for the first three years of this study and very few, the last two years.

4. School 23--This school was selected because of the presence of reading labs for slow students; and because of the enriched extra-curricular curriculum consisting of sixty-five different activities for students. There is also a well structured attendance program involving parent participation and awards for good attendance.
5. School 25--This school has a well known Radio-T.V. Performing Arts Program. The investigator has seen some of their performances on Channels 9 and 11 on Chicago television during the Christmas holidays. In addition they have a pilot program called Push for Excellence, involving parents in the education of their children.
6. School 24--This school was selected by Casey Banas, Chicago Tribune reporter, as one of the ten outstanding High Schools in Chicago. In addition, the principal sent a course of study.

Mr. Banas labeled this school as an "academic powerhouse." The curriculum includes Mandarin Chinese, computer architecture, cultural anthropology, cell physiology, women's studies, statistics, genetics and embryology, very much like part of a university curriculum. In addition there are courses for the less talented such as a course in beginning math.

7. School 27--Many newspaper articles have been written about this school which produces many merit scholars. It is a school with select enrollment and draws students from the entire north side of the city.

Every student admitted to this school must be up to grade level in reading and math and must have behavior recommendations from the sending school. An article by Carol Greenberg, reporter for the Tribune indicated that this school, "is the premier Chicago high school for the training of future physicists and engineers. She was impressed with the stern discipline, smart kids and a no-nonsense curriculum. The researcher has also visited this school many times and concurs with the report.

8. School 32--Casey Banas of the Chicago Tribune lauded this school as an institution that is integrated peacefully in a setting of quality education. This school, according to the reporter, has one of the best physics programs in the city, as well as six other Advanced Placement Courses.

Both Russian and Latin are offered, and there is a special program for incoming eighth graders.

9. School 38--This school was selected for several unique programs such as an American Indian Center, TRIAD, a work study program for potential drop outs, a prep center for 8th graders, who spend two weeks in the school, prior to graduation, and a strong multi-lingual program for the many ethnic groups, such as Asians, that are in attendance.
10. School 41--The researcher headed a Curriculum Evaluation Team for the North Central Committee for this school. The curriculum includes several opportunities for the gifted weith Advanced Placement courses, film study and team-teaching in the Humanities. In addition there is TRIAD, a course to prevent dropping out, work study, and special education. A professor from the City College teaches a college course in psychology and sociology for advanced students who want to earn college credits.
11. School 42--Casey Banas selected this school as another outstanding high school in Chicago. The researcher also visited this school in years past. Mr. Banas dubbed this school, "the suburban high school in the City."

It has a sophisticated learning resource center, new courses in horticulture, human physiology, and early involvement in algebra for eighth graders. There are Advanced Placement courses for the talented, mini-courses and Children's Theatre.

12. School 47--This school also had Advanced Placement courses and early involvement, but was chosen because of a rather unique suspension program. Most students eligible for suspension are kept in in-school isolation rooms while doing their school work.
13. School 49--Casey Banas selected this school as one of his outstanding ten. This school was selected for an in-depth analysis and will be discussed in detail in the section of this chapter, entitled, "A Comparison of Two Schools."
14. School 52--Casey Banas also selected this school as one of the outstanding ten. This is an outstanding technical school that has a selection criterion for incoming students. The curriculum includes brick masonry, painting, plumbing and many other occupational skills. In addition there is an enriched academic curriculum including pre-engineering.

The sixteen schools with moderately enriched curricula and their suspension rates for the 1976-77 school year appear below:

| <u>School Number</u> | <u>Racial Composition</u> | | | <u>Suspensions - 1976-77</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| | <u>White</u> | <u>Latino</u> | <u>Black</u> | |
| 1 | 80.1 | 13.2 | .4 | 8.0 |
| 3 | 97.4 | 1.7 | -- | 16.3 |
| 12 | 95.2 | 4.0 | .2 | 1.8 |
| 19 | 93.4 | 4.2 | -- | .5 |
| 44 | 63.2 | 18.4 | 7.4 | 2.2 |
| 55 | 73.2 | 14.1 | 10.8 | 1.8 |
| 16 | 5.0 | 52.0 | 42.0 | 7.8 |
| 48 | 16.3 | 49.5 | 23.7 | 1.9 |
| 4 | 3.6 | 37.8 | 58.6 | 6.9 |
| 14 | .5 | .5 | 99.0 | 37.0 |
| 34 | -- | -- | 100.0 | .3 |
| 35 | -- | .1 | 99.9 | 1.3 |
| 39 | .1 | .2 | 99.7 | 8.4 |
| 46 | 9.1 | 17.4 | 72.3 | 26.8 |
| 50 | -- | .2 | 99.8 | 43.5 |
| 51 | -- | -- | 100.0 | 2.2 |

Upon analyzing the suspension rates in the group classified as number two, moderately enriched curricula, one can readily observe that schools numbered 3, 14, 46 and 50 had very high suspension rates in comparison with the other thirteen schools in the category. School number 3 had a primarily white student body, while the other three schools with high suspension rates were primarily black.

An examination of the questionnaires of these four atypical schools indicated that the principal of school 3 with a white population of over 97% and a poverty level of 4.5%, felt that suspension was "a necessary evil" because no alternatives to suspension were available at the school. The principals of the other three schools with

high suspension rates all used detention as a form of punishment, but expressed a desire for a type of in-school suspension if funds were available. All three schools had a few projects for a selected number of students such as work-study, reading labs, crime prevention and special education, but seemed to be lacking in strong curricula for the more able student such as advanced placement, humanities, film study, exotic shop work, and theater available at the schools in category one.

School 1, with a white population of 80.1% and a poverty level of 15% or working class population was the only school in this category with some advanced placement classes. However, the principal, during his interview lamented the fact that there were few alternatives to suspension, and that teachers equate principal support by the number of suspensions meted out.

Some of the alternatives to suspension mentioned by the principals in category two were parental conferences, duty in the cafeteria, detention periods, work squad, peer culture counseling, drop out prevention, and Focus, a drug abuse program.

The most frequently desired alternative to suspension, if funds were available, mentioned by the majority of principals was in-house suspension with qualified freed personnel to offer assistance and guidance to disruptive students.

The nine schools in category three, with basic high school curricula were as follows:

| <u>School Number</u> | Racial Composition | | | <u>Suspensions - 1976-77</u> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| | <u>White</u> | <u>Latino</u> | <u>Black</u> | |
| 2 | -- | .3 | 99.7 | 30.0 |
| 10 | 1.5 | 15.1 | 83.4 | 2.7 |
| 13 | 42.1 | 11.3 | 46.0 | 44.8 |
| 15 | .5 | .5 | 99.9 | 3.0 |
| 17 | -- | .3 | 99.6 | 20.1 |
| 29 | .1 | -- | 99.9 | 5.4 |
| 37 | 75.3 | 21.4 | 1.6 | 14.8 |
| 40 | 90.9 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 8.8 |
| 57 | -- | -- | 100.0 | 12.1 |

An analysis of the nine schools assigned to category three, schools with a basic curriculum revealed that seven of the schools were primarily black and two were primarily white. Only three of the schools in the third category had relatively low suspension rates, schools number 10, 15 and 29. An examination of the questionnaires submitted by these three principals indicated that while all three had very basic curricula, principals of schools numbered 10 and 15 felt that suspensions should be used as a last resort and that alternatives to suspension would be most desirable. The principal of school 10, whose school had the lowest suspension rate, 2.7%, was also very much aware of legal decisions concerning student suspension and mentioned the rights of students to due process.

The principal of school 29, did not express a desire for alternatives to suspension, and felt that suspension should be used to maintain discipline. This school had a very rigid student discipline code that not only mentioned the exact penalties for various offenses, but included arrest by police for illegal activities such as smoking

pot. This school had a moderately low suspension rate of 5.4%. Apparently, this principal viewed suspension and rigid rules in a positive light, and the strength of his leadership and military philosophy seemed to keep suspensions down, possibly because students were aware of the consequences of untoward behavior, which could include police action. Parents were also made aware of the consequences of poor behavior at this school, which might also have been a factor in keeping suspensions at a relatively low level.

Four of the remaining six principals in category three expressed support of suspension. The principals of schools 13, 17, 37 and 57 felt that they had no other choice but to suspend students, and all four of their schools had relatively high rates of suspension.

The principal of school 2, while expression doubts about suspending students, during his interview, revealed that his assistant principal in charge of discipline was given his power of attorney. An interview with the disciplinarian at this school revealed that the assistant principal was automatically suspending students for specific numbers of days according to the offense in a robot like manner.

The principal of school 40, a school with a 90.9% white population, with a low poverty rate of 6.4%, but located in a working class population, felt that suspension should be used as a last resort, but that alternatives to suspension were essential. He expressed a desire for in-school suspension during his interview.

It should be noted that seven of the schools with basic no frills curricula were located in black neighborhoods, while the two

primarily white schools with basic curricula were located in working class neighborhoods with few professional people.

This study indicated that there was a significant relationship between curriculum and the suspension rate in Chicago Public High Schools. The Superintendent of Chicago Public Schools in 1975, also felt that there was a relationship between curriculum and student misbehavior, when testifying before the United States Senate Judiciary subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency:¹²

Violence and vandalism in Chicago public schools have created a "climate of fear" that disrupts the education of the system's school children. Much harm is done to educational programs when classroom windows are shattered, teaching materials destroyed or stolen and schools damaged.

The Superintendent requested more federal money for local school districts to develop comprehensive instructional programs for disruptive students and to expand their investigations of the reasons for delinquent behavior in schools.

In summary, this study indicated that there was a significant relationship between the presence of enriched curricula and lower suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools. It is possible, that creative programs can make a difference in dealing with troubled youth and that alternatives to suspension can cut down on high school suspension rates.

Further research should be conducted in order to determine whether over a period of time, the number of suspensions can be

¹²Gruenberg, Robert, Chicago Daily News, April 16, 1975, p. 1.

reduced through the use of alternative programs or whether changes in curriculum to reflect the needs of students can alter undesirable student behavior.

Question 7: Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing racial compositions?

It was found that there was a significant difference in the suspension rates between schools that had primarily black populations and schools that had mixtures of other races. The levels of significance obtained through the use of the T-Test when black and majority black schools were compared to mixed caucasian and latino populations (see Chapter III) were .18, .12, .027, .04, and .07. The variable of race was significant at the .05 level for the school years 1974-75 and 1975-76, and at the .10 level for the school year 1976-77.

Data for all fifty-seven Chicago Public High Schools relating to the racial composition and suspension rates, as mentioned in Chapter III, was obtained from the Administrative Research Department of the Chicago Board of Education. The schools were then divided into five categories according to the racial mix of the school; Black, Majority Black, White, Majority White, Majority Latino. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) subprogram of the SPSS was used, and results indicated an F value of 1.68 and a significant F of .167, indicating that there was no significant difference in suspension rates between the five categories.

When the categories were reassembled, comparing Black and Majority Black, to a combination of the other categories, it was apparent that race, or being black, was a significant variable in predicating whether or not the suspension rate in Chicago Public Schools would be high or low.

The results of this study appear to be congruent with the results of other studies related to the relationship between race and suspension. Donald Osborne, in his article, "Race, Sex, Achievement and Suspension," cited Cottle who noted that black children are suspended three times as much as white children.¹³

The report issued by the Children's Defense Fund, published in 1975, also charged racial discrimination in the use of suspension.¹⁴ This report, in a chapter entitled, "Racial Discrimination in the Use of Suspension," stated that black youngsters were suspended more than any other group of children. In analyzing OCR data, it was determined that for the 1972-73 school year, twenty-nine states suspended over 5% of their total black enrollment, while only four states suspended 5% of their white students. Six states suspended 10% or more of their black students; no stated suspended white students at this rate.

The disproportion at the secondary level was striking as one in every eight black children was suspended in the 1972-73 school year

¹³Osborne, Donald, "Race, Sex, Achievement and Suspension," Urban Education, Vol. 3, No. 3, Oct., 1977, pp. 345-347.

¹⁴Children's Defense Fund, School Suspensions, Are They Helping Children? Wash. Research Project, Sept., 1975, pp. 63-75.

compared to one in every sixteen white children. The report also stated:¹⁵

Many will say that higher black suspension rates simply reflect greater misbehavior on the part of black students and not discrimination by school officials. We disagree. Not only have black parents and school children long charged racially discriminatory suspension practices, civil rights groups and other advocates are increasingly documenting, and courts are making findings of racial discrimination in suits challenging suspension of minority children.

The study also claimed that some school officials are overtly hostile to black youngsters, while others are insensitive to or ignorant about their needs. The CDF found that offenses which pertain to all children sometimes are applied unequally against black children. For example, a black child may be suspended for fighting, while the white combatant receives no punishment or a lesser punishment.

Of the 2,862 school districts represented in the OCR study, 67.9% of them showed higher black than white suspension rates. Although 32.1% of all the districts showed equal or lower suspension rates for black students, some of these districts simply had no black students.

It was also discerned that some districts with substantial black enrollment do not suspend relatively large proportions of their black students. Some cities had both low overall suspension rates and lower rates for black than whites. Louisville, Kentucky and St. Louis, Missouri were two such cities.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 68-69.

If characteristics of black children were truly responsible for high black suspension rates, the report concludes, one would not find such districts where blacks are not suspended disproportionately.

Administrative attitudes toward minority students might be a factor in the high black suspension rate in the United States. A case in point (see Chapter II) occurred in Thornton Township High School in Harvey, Illinois, where a black student was suspended for ten days for spitting orange seeds on a cafeteria table, while a white girl at the school was suspended one day for stealing \$18.00 from another student's purse.¹⁶ When questioned about the apparent inequity, the principal was quoted as saying, "Blacks are more vociferous and get into more trouble than white students because whites know how to keep their mouths shut when a school official gives an order."¹⁷

Osborne not only found a relationship between being black and a susceptibility to suspension, but cited a study conducted in the junior high schools of Kalamazoo, Michigan conducted in 1974-75, that indicated that students who received suspensions could be identified as a group by their low achievement.¹⁸

According to Mr. Osborne, the group receiving suspensions was compared with post-test achievement scores using race and sex as the main effects. The main effect of race, showed higher mean scores for

¹⁶Wood, Kingsley, Chicago Sun Times, Nov. 18, 1977, p. 38.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Osborne, Donald, "Race, Sex, Achievement, and Suspension," Urban Education, Vol. 12, No. 3, Oct., 1977, pp. 345-347.

white students at the .0001 level of significance, and .0000 for the subtest of science. No difference was found between the mean scores for the main effect of sex, except for nonwhite seventh grade females. The researcher felt these findings indicated the possibility that race as well as under achievement may have been related to suspension.¹⁹

While race, belonging to the black race, was a significant variable in Osborne's study, as well as this study, underachievement was beyond the scope of this study. The variable of underachievement should be considered for further research as this factor appeared to be related to suspension rates.

Question 8: Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing socioeconomic status?

It was found that there was no significant difference in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing socioeconomic status (see Chapter III).

The poverty level or the percent of students from low income groups was obtained from the Chicago Public Schools publication, Selected School Characteristics, 1973-1978. Perusal of the poverty data (see Appendix for chart) revealed that High Schools in Chicago with majority caucasian populations had lower levels of poverty than schools with minority populations. The poverty levels in the

¹⁹Ibid.

caucasian schools ranged from 3.0 to 19.0 percent, while minority schools ranged from 22.0 to 98.0 percent poverty.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to calculate whether there was a relationship between the percent of poverty for the year 1976-77 and the rate of suspensions for that year (Chapter III). These poverty levels represented numbers of ADCF students, as well as several other variables such as family income. Over the five year span, the percentage of poverty varied little, so in order to determine whether or not a relationship between suspensions and poverty existed in a statistical sense, it was feasible to use the poverty levels for one year, 1976-77.

The Pearson Correlation coefficient for the variable of poverty was .1458 for the fifty-seven cases (fifty-seven high schools) and the P score representing the level of significance was .14, a score which is not significant.

In their publication, Children Out of School in America, the CDF, however, indicated that in school districts where there were few blacks, Puerto Ricans or Chicanos, it was the lower-income children who were suspended in disproportionate numbers.²⁰

In their survey, they found that children were more likely to be suspended if their families were poor or lived in female-headed families. Thirty-one percent of all families surveyed with school-age

²⁰Children's Defense Fund, School Suspensions, Are They Helping Children? Wash. Research Project, Sept., 1975, pp. 63-75.

children received AFDC or other public assistance, but 46% of school-age children suspended lived in families receiving public assistance.

While the CDF intimated that poor children were more likely to be suspended than more affluent children, this study found the variable of poverty not significant. Further research would be warranted in order to test the variable of poverty, as race and underachievement might be interwoven with poverty as a combined variable in predicting students who would have the greatest chance of being suspended, a problem which was outside the purview of this study.

Question 9: Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with principals who approve of suspensions and those who do not?

It was found that there was a significant difference at the .01 level between schools that had principals that approved of suspensions and those who did not.

Forty-two principals (see Chapter III) of Chicago Public High Schools expressed their philosophies concerning suspension through various means such as informal interview, mailed questionnaire and formal interviews. The answers fell into two main categories, those who felt suspensions were necessary in running a safe and orderly school, and those who expressed strong doubts about using suspension.

These two groups were then statistically compared by using a T-Test. Twelve of the forty-two principals were placed in the group that approved of suspension as a disciplinary tool, while thirty were

assigned to the group that has strong reservations about suspending students. The results of the analysis were .408, .417, .018, .002 and .003. The variable of principal attitude concerning the use of suspension was related to the suspension rates of their schools at the .01 level during the school years, 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77.

It must be remembered that the majority of principals surveyed, had been at their particular schools for only the last three of the five year period encompassed in this study. Therefore, the non-significant scores for the first two years apparently reflected the fact that the same principals were not running the same schools during the first two years of the study.

The T scores for the variable of principal philosophy were the most strongly significant and the only scores that were significant at the .01 level in the entire study. One might assume, therefore, that the most important variable in predicting the suspension rate of a school is the attitude of the principal concerning suspension.

A member of the Chicago Board of Education, Mrs. Carey Preston, in her address to Chicago Public School principals during the Chicago Principal Association Conference in March of 1977, stated, "The principal is the most important person in the school, knows best the policies to reach his goals, and has the leeway to establish what happens day-to-day."²¹

²¹Preston, Carey, "The Role of the Principal in Establishing Policy," Chicago Principals Reporter, Fall, 1977, p. 17.

Hayes Mizell, in an American Friends Service Committee publication also intimated that if the value of the administrator is "worship of authority," students will be more subject to disciplinary action such as suspension.²²

If a principal believes that discipline is synonymous with obedience and that defiance warrants punishment, would suspension rates in his school be higher than average? On the other hand, if a principal believes discipline means self-control and a method of governing conduct that can be nurtured and developed in a democratic setting, would suspension rates in his school be significantly lower than average?

This study established a very powerful relationship between principal attitude or philosophy about suspension and suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.

Twelve principals, of forty-two who stated their philosophies concerning suspension, expressed positive attitudes about suspending students. The twelve schools and their suspension rates in 1976-77 were:

²²Mizell, Hayes, "Discipline," AFSC, March, 1976.

| <u>School Number</u> | Racial Composition | | | <u>Suspensions - 1976-77</u> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| | <u>White</u> | <u>Latino</u> | <u>Black</u> | |
| 3 | 97.4 | 1.4 | -- | 16.3 |
| 27 | 75.0 | 8.3 | 7.8 | 13.4 |
| 37 | 75.3 | 21.4 | 1.6 | 14.8 |
| 41 | 73.4 | 8.8 | 8.2 | 17.0 |
| 13 | 42.1 | 11.3 | 46.0 | 44.8 |
| 17 | -- | .3 | 99.6 | 20.1 |
| 24 | 26.4 | 2.8 | 66.7 | 3.3 |
| 29 | .1 | -- | 99.9 | 5.4 |
| 33 | 3.7 | 16.5 | 79.7 | 102.3 |
| 46 | 9.1 | 17.4 | 72.3 | 26.8 |
| 53 | -- | -- | 100.0 | 18.7 |
| 57 | -- | -- | 100.0 | 12.1 |

Suspension rates below 5% were relatively low rates in Chicago Public High Schools, while rates between 5% and 10% were moderately high. Suspension rates above 10% were considered to be high rates of suspension in this study. One can observe from the table that three schools varied widely in their suspension rates among the group whose principals expressed favorable views about suspending students. Schools numbered 24 and 39, had relatively low suspension rates of 3.3% and 5.4%, while school number 33 had an abnormally high rate of suspensions.

The two schools with low suspension rates, numbers 24 and 29, had at their helms very strong leadership. School 24, for example, was selected by Casey Banas as one of the top ten Chicago Public High Schools. This school was selected because of its outstanding curriculum, high powered courses such as exotic languages, a radio station,

and peer group counseling. This school also had a well developed in-school suspension program at the time of the study, which may account for the low suspension rate. In addition many of the students at this school came from solid middle class families, many from homes with professional parents. The principal of school number 24, stated on her questionnaire that she approved of short term suspensions because this technique is effective in modifying student behavior if properly exercised. Evidently there was little need at this school to suspend many students, for the total environment in and around the school was excellent.

School number 29, however, was located in a poor black area with a poverty rate of 82.7%. The principal of this school, not only stated on his questionnaire that suspensions should be used to maintain discipline, but sent his school's discipline code along with his questionnaire, a code which contained the types of rule infractions and the number of days suspension for each infraction. Illegal activities by students were referred to the police, and parental notification and involvement in the discipline policy were very much in evidence when reading the discipline code. While the curriculum of this school was quite basic, it could very well be that the communication system between students, teachers and parents was such that everyone knew the limits of behavior and tried to maintain behavior that would avoid trouble.

The principal of school number 33 failed to send in his questionnaire. He was informally interviewed at an inservice meeting

for principals. This principal apologized for his failure to cooperate and stated that he had an embarrassingly high suspension rate. He maintained that suspension of students was absolutely necessary, and that many of his students had been suspended many times in order to protect the school from troublemakers. This principal was not aware that suspension rates of Chicago Public Schools were in the public domain. School 33 had a rate of 102.3%, which means that the rate exceeded 100%. The figure of 102.3% does not mean that every student in the school had been suspended, but that many students had been suspended on a continuous basis. This aberrant figure was discussed with the Department of Administrative Research in order to ascertain whether or not the number had been an error. However, in checking the original document, it was ascertained that the figure was indeed correct and had been submitted by the principal himself.

Some other opinions expressed by principals in the category that favored suspension as a disciplinary tool were:

- School 57 - Suspensions do not always help, but there are few alternatives.
- School 53 - In some cases, suspensions are effective. If certain students are continuously suspended, alternatives should be found.
- School 46 - Suspension must be used in extreme cases such as violence. In-school suspension would be better, but it is not available.
- School 13 - Suspension has a positive effect on the school and the educational program, even if it doesn't help the students at all times.
- School 41 - Suspensions are fine for clearly stated infractions.
- School 27 - Students must obey the rules or suffer the consequences.

School 3 - Suspension is a necessary evil to maintain student control.

It is apparent that the suspension rates of all the schools in the category of principals who expressed approval of suspension as a tool for maintaining discipline had relatively high to very high suspension rates with the exception of schools numbered 24 and 29. Principal attitudes about suspension were the most significant variable related to suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools. One might surmise that workshops for principals in order to effect a change in attitude about the use of suspensions in maintaining discipline might be the most important method of reducing suspension rates in Chicago Public Schools.

The thirty principals in group one, the group of principals that expressed negative feelings about suspending students, expressed similar philosophies. Most of them felt that suspension should be used as a last resort, that students did not benefit from the procedure, that students rights should be observed, and that alternatives to suspension should be used whenever possible.

The suspension rates of the thirty schools in group one were:

| <u>School Number</u> | <u>Racial Composition</u> | | | <u>Suspensions - 1976-77</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| | <u>White</u> | <u>Latino</u> | <u>Black</u> | |
| 1 | 80.1 | 13.2 | .4 | 8.0 |
| 2 | -- | .3 | 99.7 | 30.0 |
| 4 | 3.6 | 37.8 | 58.6 | 6.9 |
| 8 | -- | -- | 100.0 | .2 |
| 10 | 1.5 | 15.1 | 83.4 | 2.7 |
| 12 | 95.2 | 4.0 | .2 | 1.8 |
| 14 | .5 | .5 | 99.9 | 37.0 |
| 15 | .5 | .5 | 99.9 | 3.0 |
| 16 | 5.0 | 52.0 | 42.0 | 7.8 |
| 19 | 93.4 | 4.2 | -- | .5 |
| 20 | -- | .3 | 99.7 | 1.9 |
| 21 | 78.1 | 21.2 | .1 | 2.2 |
| 23 | 89.0 | 2.3 | 8.6 | 3.4 |
| 25 | -- | -- | 100.0 | 4.0 |
| 26 | 43.6 | 47.1 | 3.3 | 4.1 |
| 32 | 35.8 | .2 | 63.5 | 3.5 |
| 34 | -- | -- | 100.0 | .3 |
| 35 | -- | .1 | 99.9 | 1.3 |
| 38 | 44.0 | 24.3 | 15.3 | 2.1 |
| 39 | .1 | .2 | 99.7 | 8.4 |
| 40 | 90.9 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 8.8 |
| 42 | 98.8 | .6 | -- | .4 |
| 44 | 63.2 | 18.4 | 7.4 | 2.2 |
| 47 | 93.3 | 6.5 | -- | 3.8 |
| 48 | 16.3 | 59.5 | 23.7 | 1.9 |
| 49 | .5 | .4 | 99.1 | 7.0 |
| 50 | -- | .2 | 99.8 | 43.5 |
| 51 | -- | -- | 100.0 | 2.2 |
| 52 | -- | .4 | 99.5 | .3 |
| 55 | 73.2 | 14.1 | 10.8 | 1.8 |

One can readily observe that among the thirty schools whose principals expressed negative attitudes about suspending students, schools numbered 2, 14 and 50 had abnormally high suspension rates. The principals of schools numbered 2 and 50 not only sent in a written questionnaire, but participated in personal interviews. All three principals with high suspension rates in this category, felt that suspensions were counterproductive. Their statements concerning suspension were:

School 2 - Suspension is the least desirable method of handling discipline problems.

School 14 - Suspension does not aid a child.

School 50 - Suspension should be used as a last resort. Students must understand why they are being suspended, but the number of days of suspension should be reduced if desired behavioral change is to occur.

Since the philosophies of the other twenty-seven principals in category one were congruent with their rates of suspension, that is that their negative feelings about suspension seemed to correspond with relatively low suspension rates at their schools, the three schools that were out of harmony will be discussed.

The principal of school 2 appeared to be an easy going man, who allowed his assistant principals to run his school. While this principal felt that suspensions were the least desirable method of handling discipline, the school code listed various suspendable offenses and students at this school were almost always automatically suspended by the assistant principal in charge of discipline, almost in robot fashion. This school was known to be in a constant state of

chaos, and the principal was in an adversary relationship with the community and with his district superintendent.

The principal of school 2 was also the least knowledgeable of all the principals interviewed. He could not describe the discipline policy in the Board/Union contract, and was not aware of any of the legal decisions involving student suspensions. It is interesting to note that the population of this school was almost entirely black, and the principal was also black. This school is compared with an almost similar school with low suspension rates in the next session of this analysis. Principal 2 was demoted to an elementary school, the year after this study was completed.

The principal of school 50 was an easy going white man, who also was relieved of his high school the year following the completion of this study. While he felt that suspension should be used only as a last resort, and desired the staff to institute an in-house suspension program, his suspension rate was a whopping 43.5%. Since the assistant principal of this school was not available for interview, one might guess that his philosophy about suspensions failed to come across to the assistant principal in charge of discipline. School 50 was torn down, and a modern vocational school was built in the area, under the leadership of a different principal.

The principal of school number 14 was not interviewed, but his questionnaire stated that "suspension does not aid a child." Some curricular offerings at this school were Project Insight, an alternative to suspension, and Focus, a drug abuse program. This principal could not name any legal decisions concerning suspension, but was

aware of students' rights to due process and a hearing before suspension. It is difficult to explain the lack of congruence in this particular case, but again, some principals allow their assistant principals leeway in running the discipline office. This might have been the case for school number 14, because the principal stated on his questionnaire that he believed the suspension rate at his school had dropped, while the actual suspension figures revealed that the rate at this school had risen 13% between 1975-76 and 1976-77. This lack of knowledge about his school might cause one to speculate that this principal did not deal much with the discipline at this school, but had delegated this duty without instilling his personal philosophy.

The relationship between principal attitudes about suspension were significant at the .01 level of confidence. One might guess that this variable might prove to be a universal. For example, a principal of the Long Island High School in Queens, New York fought governmental agencies to uphold his right to suspend students.²³ Howard Hurwitz, the principal involved, in 1976, suspended a teenager girl, known as a chronic troublemaker, for abusing a school secretary. A local anti-poverty agency decided the girls' rights had been violated and hired a lawyer. As a result, the City Board of Education, ordered Dr. Hurwitz to reinstate her, and suspended the principal when he refused to take the girl back.

²³AP, "Hard-nosed Principal Wins Test," Chicago Sun Times, March 26, 1976, p. 5.

To everyone's surprise, the three thousand member student body boycotted classes to protest his suspension; and teachers and parents paraded around the school in support of the principal. After three days, the Board of Education caved in, and a compromise was reached. The principal was reinstated, and the girl was allowed to return to school under the strict supervision of an adult guardian.

The variable of the philosophy of the principal, therefore, appears the most promising factor in determining whether or not students will be suspended. Further research is recommended to determine whether this factor is of universal importance in the United States.

Question 10: Are there significant differences in the proportion of students suspended among schools in relationship to the personality type of the principals as measured by the FIRO-B psychological test?

The FIRO-B test was sent to each of the fifty-seven principals in Chicago Public High Schools. Thirty-nine principals responded and returned a completed test, which measured three dimensions of a person's characteristic behavior in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. According to the psychologist who constructed this instrument, Dr. William C. Schutz, author of the best-seller Joy, typical occupational groups have rather similar test scores; and high overall scores, indicating heightened interaction with people, are usually scored by school administrators.

The test scores for the various dimensions were analyzed through the use of the Pearson Correlation Coefficient (see Chapter III) and it was ascertained that the scores on the FIRO-B had no significant relationship to suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.

The P scores were .368 for inclusion, .456 for control, .080 for affection and .196 for a total score.

A comparison of the test scores of the principals who took this test with the norms established for administrators indicated that this particular group had below average scores, except for the score in control. It could be that the traits necessary for promotion to a large city high school might be different from traits necessary to run smaller schools such as elementary schools, and suburban and rural schools.

The FIRO scales consist of tests that not only measure individual characteristics, but also assess relationships between people. FIRO-B stands for Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior. The title represents the trait being measured.

The author of the FIRO scales of measurement wrote a book, Profound Simplicity, published in 1979, that relates his series of tests measuring individual insights and group interaction to educational institutions:²⁴

An educational institution would concentrate in two areas; creating conditions most conducive to learning and allowing students maximum responsibility for their own learning.

²⁴Schutz, Will, Profound Simplicity, Bantum Books, June, 1979, p. 192.

A common observation is that schools vary considerably in their organizational climates. Andrew W. Halpin, in his study, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," emphasized that an essential determinant of a school's effectiveness as an organization is the principal's ability or lack of it, to create a "climate" in which he, and other group members can initiate and consummate acts of leadership.²⁵

Marcia McVey, in her article, stated:²⁶

Administrators experiencing major crises; violence student, teacher or parent confrontations, have generally pinpointed a lack of structured provisions for communication between all sectors . . . The continuum which ends in school violence generally begins with a climate where all sectors are functioning . . . then communication breaks down, and a negative climate develops.

The author, McVey, contended that major research related to the study of conflict indicates that the crucial factor in the prevention of conflict is attitude, role, ability and leadership style of the administrator.

While this study did not establish a significant relationship between scores on the FIRO-B test and the suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools, further research might establish a link between the leadership styles of persons in charge of schools; as measured by psychological tests, and suspension rates in schools. However,

²⁵Halpin, Andrew W., "The Organizational Climate of Schools," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 11, March, 1963, University of Chicago.

²⁶McVey, Marcia, "School Climate: The Administrator Makes the Difference," Thrust for Educational Leadership, Vol. 5, No. 4, March, 1976, p. 14.

additional variables to measure leadership style, would give an added dimension to the scores alone, which may not give the complete picture of a person as a leader.

Bernard Krasnow, for example, in his dissertation, described in the Kaplan, investigated the type of principal leadership teachers desire, and discovered that there was a significant relationship between a school's percentage of students from low income families and the teachers' desire to have a principal who is a highly structured, organized leader.²⁷

Teacher expectations for the less personal, bureaucratic, efficient principal were also related to a school's percentage of students from low income families. Mr. Krasnow interpreted his results to mean that teachers in schools with low income minority students feel the need for security and strength in the principal's office.

These results appear to confirm the findings in this study, that indicated that most of the high school principals taking the FIRO-B had lower than average scores in interactions with people (inclusion and affection), but higher scores for control, representing structured, efficient people who keep their distance from people.

²⁷Krasnow, Bernard, "What Kind of Principal Do Teachers Want," Kaplan, Oct., 1978, p. 137.

Question 11: Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools exhibiting a combination of variables listed and those which do not?

Ten independent variables were examined in this study, and four of the ten factors were found to be significant, either at the .01, .05, or .10 level.

It was then decided to determine whether or not a combination of independent variables might in concert be significantly related to the suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools (see Chapter III). In order to determine whether suspension rates differed significantly in schools exhibiting a combination of factors, the data was submitted to Analysis of Variance with factorial designs, or interaction analysis.

The six non-significant factors were discarded, because the SPSS program suggested using combinations of significant variables.

The non-significant variables were:

1. Board policy effected in 1975, setting down suspension guidelines.
2. Teacher awareness of Article 30 in the Board/Union contract, as perceived by the principal.
3. The presence or absence of a student handbook or behavior code.
4. The presence or absence of a teacher handbook.
5. The poverty index or percent of poverty in a school.
6. The personality type of the principal as measured by the FIRO-B.

The four independent significant variables were:

1. The presence of absence of frequent inservice training sessions related to discipline.
2. The type of curricular offerings in a school.
3. The racial composition of a school.
4. The philosophy of the principal regarding suspension.

The interaction analyses included only those schools whose principals answered the questionnaire. It was determined that most of the principals who failed to answer the questionnaire, appeared to have a majority of black students, and were in an upward suspension trend. Since the interaction analyses did not include all fifty-seven schools, there was a negative impact upon the results, as none of them turned out to be significant.

While the results did not appear to link combinations of factors related to the suspension rates of the schools, it was determined that there was a relationship between the percent of poverty and the curriculum, as the mean percentage of poverty increased from 35.07 in category one with the most enriched curricula to 48.88 in curriculum category three, the most basic curriculum.

The analysis also revealed that the schools who were headed by principals who disapproved of suspension, and who had very infrequent inservice sessions, had the lowest suspension rates.

While the interaction analysis of related variables did not establish a statistical relationship to suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools, it was decided that an in-depth comparison between two Chicago High Schools having in common a similar student

body, similar poverty level, and similar size, but with a marked difference in suspension rates, might provide some insights that statistics alone could not provide.

A Comparison of Two High Schools with Similar Characteristics but Differing Suspension Rates

The two Chicago Public High Schools selected for an in-depth comparison were schools 2 and 49, because they were similar in size, socioeconomic group, racial composition and other variables, but differed significantly in their suspension rates.

Information for this in-depth study was obtained through procedures such as interview, mailed questionnaire, newspaper articles, and a perusal of North Central reports for each of the schools.

Since many of the variables were almost exactly alike, only the variables that differed are included in this discussion. A chart indicating the variables that are similar appears below:

School Comparison Chart

| <u>School</u> | <u>Size</u> | <u>Race</u> | <u>Poverty Level</u> | <u>Teacher Code</u> | <u>Student Code</u> |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 2 | 4476 | 99%B | 41% | Yes | Yes |
| 49 | 4125 | 99%B | 40% | Yes | Yes |

We can see from the chart that both schools have over four thousand students, have poor students who are primarily black, and have both teacher handbooks and student behavior codes.

The suspension rates for the last three years of the study, 1974-75 through 1976-77 were used because the principal of school 2

assumed leadership in 1974. A comparison of the two schools indicates that school 2 had an extremely high rate of suspensions while school 49 had a moderate rate of suspensions:

| <u>School</u> | <u>1974-75 Rate</u> | <u>1975-76 Rate</u> | <u>1976-77 Rate</u> |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 2 | 53.1% | 13.3% | 30.0% |
| 49 | 11.6% | 6.9% | 7.0% |

The variables that differed between the two schools and which will be discussed in-depth were the curriculum, the frequency of inservice concerning discipline, the personality of the principal, and knowledge about court decisions.

The School Environments

Both schools have been described in similar terms over the years. In an interview with Mr. Thomas Sullivan, a researcher for the American Friends Service Committee, Mr. Sullivan stated:

When one thinks of _____ [School 2] people think of crime, prostitution, drugs, gambling, etc., and in light of this is the school being realistic when they toss all these kids out? Are they actually trying to alleviate the problem, or are they insuring that the problem perpetuates itself?

Casey Banas of the Chicago Tribune, in an article that appeared in his Ten Best High School Series, wrote about school 49:

In some quarters during the 1960's _____ [School 49] meant "crime, violence, and sex." Veteran teachers recall students roaming unchallenged through the halls, an attempt to burn the building housing the school's incomparable aviation program, and such other disruptions as a fire extinguisher crashing through the window of a classroom door.

Both schools are located in poor, black communities and have similar poverty indexes that hover around 40%, and are in high crime areas.

The Principals

The principals of schools 2 and 49, at the time of the study were both black men, who differed in leadership and personality, as well as knowledge about school law.

According to information gathered through the mailed questionnaire, the following comparisons were made for the variables of principal philosophy, personality factors, perception, and knowledge of policy and procedures:

1. Philosophy concerning suspensions--

- a. School 2 - Suspensions are the least desirable method of handling discipline problems. Suspensions really say, "we cannot handle this student or student problem, and we are sending him home because we cannot handle him or he is a threat.
- b. School 49 - Students and parents should be made aware of responsibilities, and how to meet the standards set by the school. Suggested methods of remediation are published at our school, and if standards are not met, then and only then should suspension be invoked.

Both principals felt that a suspension should be used sparingly, and while the suspension rate at school 2 was a whopping 30% in 1976-77, this principal had brought down the rate from 53% which he had inherited when he took charge of the school.

An interview with the Assistant Principal of school 2, who was in charge of discipline, revealed however, that students are suspended automatically for specified infractions such as smoking, truancy, etc., and that the principal does not object to this system.

A researcher for the American Friends Service Committee, who permitted the author of this study to quote him said, "I believe their disciplinary policy is responsible for the high suspension rate and for the fact that the school [#2] lost 752 students to the streets, while managing to graduate only 369 in 1977-78."

2. FIRO-B Analysis of Principal Personalities

Both principals returned the FIRO-B psychological tests with their mailed questionnaires. While there was no statistically significant relationship between test scores and suspension rates, the psychological makeup of a principal may have a relationship with his leadership style, and perhaps further study by researchers may establish a relationship that would bring insight into the problem.

As explained in Chapter III of this study, the FIRO-B, measures three dimensions of personality, Inclusion, Control and Affection. A comparison of the test scores of the two principals appears below:

| <u>School</u> | <u>Inclusion</u> | <u>Control</u> | <u>Affection</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 49 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 11 |

The scoring on the test ranges from 0 to 9, which is the highest individual test score, while a maximum expressed total score would be twenty-seven.

It is apparent that both principals had very similar scores in Inclusion and Affection, but differed drastically in the control dimension.

The low scores in Inclusion and Affection reveal that both principals are personally distant, and probably do not interact with their staffs on a personal level.

A high score in Control indicates that the person has a desire for high structure, and a preference for giving orders, while a low score in this dimension is indicative of a laissez-faire attitude with respect to authority, neither wanting to give or receive orders. It is apparent, therefore, that the principal of school 49, is more of a take charge type of person, than the principal of school 2, who allows a school disciplinary policy that he inherited, to determine the number of suspensions in his school, rather than actively interacting with his staff to implement his own personal philosophy of disapproval for suspending students.

Principal 49, in strongly divergent behavior from 2, took charge of his school in 1970 and turned his school around, according to Casey Banas, who wrote an article about the school as one of the ten best Chicago High Schools. The principal, in this article, is described as follows:

He is easily the most flamboyant, wheeling-dealing, unorthodox principal in the city school system. With the help of veteran teachers, he turned this school around to what it is today.

During an interview with Mr. Banas, the principal stated:

When I came here, it was war games. In the lunchroom, plates beame flying saucers. But there was a nucleus of a good staff. al they needed was support.

The Tribune reporter spent a day with the principal of this school and further described his style:

Watching him in action, he rarely stays in his office but constantly patrols the vast school. He is a sight to behold. Handsome, impeccably dressed, athletic, the 43 year old principal walks through the cafeteria and the eyes of young girls are immediately riveted on him . . . In the corridors, _____ [name of principal] stops to pick up every scrap of paper, closes every locker door left open, challenges every student who appears to be out of class without excuse, greets and is greeted by scores of teachers and students.

3. Attitudes About Inservice Concerning Discipline

The principal of school 2 informed the interviewer that he has about two inservices per year concerning discipline that stress rules and regulations; while the principal of school 49 had no inservice concerning discipline in the school year 1976-77, and saw little need for such sessions.

In this study, the frequency of inservice concerning discipline was significantly related at the .10 level; that is schools having more frequent inservices concerning this topic, had significantly higher suspension rates.

An educated guess about this matter, would lead one to assume that principals, who plan and implement inservice sessions for their staffs, schedule frequent sessions around topics that are of concern to the leader and the school. Since discipline was no longer a great problem at school 49, no inservices had been scheduled about discipline in the final year of this study, a finding which conforms with statistical results.

The Curriculum

Another variable of statistical significance at the .10 level was curriculum. The comparison of the curricula of the two schools is based upon three sources, Interview, Questionnaire, and North Central Evaluation Reports of the schools.

A profile of School 2:

The principal of school number 2 stated during his interview that his school had no "unique programs," in his school. The questionnaire revealed that there are special education classes at the school, and a program called Youth Guidance, whereby a small number of students are provided counseling help by a community agency that is funded by the Crusade of Mercy.

A perusal of the 1975 North Central Report indicated that the team made several recommendations in curricular areas. An introductory remark about school 2 said:

_____ [Name of school) is an inner-city Chicago High School that has recently undergone a major racial population change. The area served by the school is predominantly black. The change in racial population has been coupled with other sociological changes. Many quickly constructed multiple-family dwellings have been built . . . Some of the properties have been allowed to deteriorate. Concomitant with these changes, has been an increasing crime rate.

. . . The student enrollment increased . . . Not only was there a sizable enrollment change, but also the deficiency in academic preparedness for high school among matriculates sky-rocketed.

The students of this particular high school then, in the early 1970s had changed from primarily middle class, achieving, caucasian white students to poor, academically deficient black students.

General observations made about the curriculum of this school by the North Central Committee were:

1. Course offerings serve different ability levels and needs.
2. The curricular offerings are varied and comprehensive.
3. The curricular offerings are periodically examined and modified.

The weaknesses ascertained by the team were:

1. The curriculum guide developed for the entire school district does not take into consideration the special needs of the individual school.
2. In some instances course content and materials in advanced classes could not be distinguished from that used in regular classes.
3. Some teachers were ill-prepared for the classes observed.
4. Curriculum development procedures do not follow the suggestions of North Central.
5. Facility deficiencies hamper the full implementation of curricular offerings, such as shop, art and home economics.

The curriculum of school 2, it appears was fashioned for a middle class clientele which moved away, and did not fully serve the needs of the academically deficient poor black student who moved in.

A profile of school 49:

School 49 was, as stated previously, visited by the Chicago Tribune reporter, Casey Banas, in the Fall of 1979. The principal had taken over the leadership of the school in 1970, and had "turned the school around." Mr. Banas described the curriculum at this school as follows:

This is a school of high academic standards and intense student and faculty pride, putting to good use the state's finest high school vocational education facility.

Everywhere are shops--auto, sheet metal, electronics, computer maintenance, machine repair, arc and gas welding, cast metals, commercial art, tailoring, architectural and machine drafting and more.

The crowning jewel is the airplane hangar, the most incredible sight in a Chicago school. This school was used by the Navy during World War II to train airplane mechanics, and the school still teaches aviation mechanics.

The principal of the school explained to the reporter that not all of the equipment has come from the Chicago Board of Education. "We beg a lot," the principal told Mr. Banas. "When we need something, I go to people . . . " As a result the school has \$100,000 worth of equipment donated by industry.

The article also indicated that all students take six vocational courses as freshmen, and when they become sophomores, juniors and seniors they begin to specialize. Music is considered a vocation, and the band performs at various functions such as halftime shows for the Chicago Bears.

The questionnaire revealed that this school also has in-house suspension as an alternative to suspension, and that copies of the school behavior code are sent home, along with special letters to parents.

The North Central Report for this school, published in 1974, further revealed:

Curricular strengths were described as follows:

1. . . . the administration has actively sought the assistance of community people and groups to complement its educational program.
2. The Industrial Council and Advisory Council are used to identify problems of a business and industrial nature. However, the administration determines the direction of the educational program.
3. An open door administrative policy exists among staff, students, and other personnel.
4. The principal is an effective and firm leader and has the respect and confidence of the administrative team. He has a very definite educational philosophy which is supported by his co-workers.

5. The school rules and regulations are clearly stated for faculty members in an adequate handbook.
6. The curriculum of the school is impressive; the teachers are qualified and exhibit a high degree of professionalism.
7. A decline in the drop out rate is noted which seems to indicate that the curriculum is meeting the needs of the student population.
8. The administration's support for initiative ideas is an encouraging note.

Some curricular weaknesses were described as follows:

1. Teachers are not relieved of other assignments to participate in curriculum development.
2. Possible interdisciplinary approaches are not being attempted at this time.
3. Classroom procedures do not permit students to share in the planning, and evaluation of their learning experiences.

School 49 and 2 appeared to be on opposite ends of the curricular spectrum. School 2, however, had a decided handicap, and that handicap is that general high schools do not have a standard for admittance to their schools. In Chicago, vocational schools require students to be at grade level or close to grade level before being admitted, therefore, there is a select population.

However, school 50 is also a vocational high school in Chicago, with the same selection advantage, and this school had a suspension rate of 43.5% in the school year 1976-77; while school 10, a general high school with a majority black, poor, population (see appendix for charts) had a suspension rate of only 2.7% in 1976-77.

A generalization could therefore be made, that there is a strong relationship between the style of leadership of the principal,

the curriculum of the school, and the suspension rates. This assumption certainly merits further study.

Another facet deserving investigation is the general knowledge of the principal concerning policy, rules and regulations, and the law as related to the topic of suspension.

A comparison of the two principals indicated that principal 49, was more knowledgeable in these areas, as indicated by their answers in the mailed questionnaires. These answers are summarized below:

Principal 2--

Board policy implemented in 1975--The principal was aware of this policy. His answer to this question was, "It is assumed that this policy has to do with the rights of students to a conference on suspension. This means that a suspension cannot be instituted unless and until a student and his parent have been informed of the charges against him and have had a chance to answer."

Article 30--Union Contract--The principal was not aware of the contents of this clause.

Legal Decisions Concerning Suspensions--The principal could not name any legal decisions, and had no idea about any of the mandated provisions of Goss, Strickland or Briscoe.

Principal 49--

Board policy implemented in 1975--The principal was aware of this policy change and mentioned that the maximum number of suspension days had been lowered to ten.

Article 30--Union Contract--The principal was aware of this clause and stated correctly, "Disruptive students are to be removed, temporarily, from the classroom upon teacher request, and followed up by the administration."

Legal Decisions Concerning Suspensions--This principal knew about the Briscoe case, primarily because the school was a part of the original court case. The principal then initiated a publication of new rules and procedures for the entire school.

An interesting footnote concerns the fate of the two principals studied. In 1978-79, the principal of school 2 was demoted to an elementary school, and the principal of school 49, was nominated by the Democratic Party of the State of Illinois to run for a seat in Congress.

Chapter Summary

1. The pilot study, whereby eight principals were interviewed, revealed that both the fixed-alternative questions and open-ended questions posed no problems in comprehension for the interviewees.
2. The pilot study supplied useful information that was relevant to the problem about variables that might have relationships to suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.
3. The fixed alternative and open-ended questions incorporated in the written questionnaire provided content validity, as the written responses of the pilot group were essentially the same as their interview responses.
4. The analysis of the questionnaire responses revealed that:
 - a. The attitude or philosophy of the principal was significantly related to the suspension rate in his school. Twelve principals approved of suspension as a disciplinary measure, while twenty-eight did not.
 - b. The Chicago Board of Education Policy, implemented in 1975, mandating guidelines for the suspension of students, did not alter the decision making process of the majority of the principals.) *START*
 - c. The Supreme Court decisions relating to student suspensions appear to have little impact upon the decision making process of Chicago Public High School principals. The overwhelming majority not only could not name any of the three pertinent decisions, but were not aware of their substance. ✓
 - d. Alternatives to suspensions are found in very few high schools in the Chicago public schools. ✓

- e. The Chicago Public High Schools with the most enriched curricula have significantly lower suspension rates.
 - f. School codes or handbooks for students are very common in Chicago high schools, however a very small minority involve students and teachers in revision of codes and discussion of them for reinforcement of knowledge about the codes. ✓
5. The post-questionnaire interviews of principals established further content validity, in that their answers not only did not vary from their written answers, but were congruent with responses and results of the total survey.
6. An analysis of two Chicago Public High Schools with similar size, socioeconomic group, race and other variables such as handbooks for teachers and student behavior codes, but differing in the significant variables of principal leadership style and curricula revealed that:
- a. The suspension rate in the school with a strong principal, enriched curriculum, and few inservice sessions concerning curriculum was much lower than the sister school being compared. The suspension rates were 30% for the school with weak leadership, inappropriate curriculum, and more frequent inservice sessions concerning discipline, and 7% for the comparable school.)
 - b. Principal knowledge and attitude about policy, rules and the law could possibly be related to the suspension rate. The principal of the school with the lower suspension rates was knowledgeable in all of these areas, which the principal with the higher rates had scanty knowledge.
7. The attitude and knowledge of the principal about suspension appears to be the most strongly significant factor in prediction of suspension rates in a given school. ✓
- 8/92

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem

The use of suspensions in public schools has reached astronomical proportions. According to the Children's Defense Fund, over 28,000 children were suspended from Chicago Public Schools in the school year 1972-73, while 927,729 students were suspended in a total of twenty-four school districts studied.¹

From an educational standpoint, the time lost due to suspensions is troubling, not only in academic time lost for students, but in sorely needed financial aid to schools who are not paid for days that students do not attend school.

The Office of Civil Rights data, collected by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, also indicated that suspension rates were highest among secondary schools, where students were suspended at a rate nine times that of elementary school students. In addition, the data indicated that black secondary school students were suspended at twice the rate of white students.

As a result of the published data, civil rights and child advocacy groups began to exert pressure upon HEW, until the agency

¹Children's Defense Fund, "School Suspensions, Are They Helping Children?", Washington Research Project, 1975, pp. 9, 55, 63.

issued a memorandum to all school districts in the nation, requesting them to compile comprehensive data on disciplinary actions.

Additional pressures were brought to bear upon school administrators by the Supreme Court of the United States, when in 1975 they made the Goss and Wood decisions the law of the land. The Goss decision mandated due process rights for students before suspensions could be invoked, while school board members lost their immunity from liability if a student's constitutional rights were violated (Wood decision).

In March of 1978, the Supreme Court further ruled in the Briscoe decision, that students can collect monetary damages for illegal suspensions if they could prove actual harm.

These court rulings, as well as pressure from governmental agencies at the federal and state level for accurate data concerning disciplinary actions against students, has made it apparent that public school administrators must find methods of maintaining discipline in the schools without violating the constitutional rights of students.

There is therefore, a need for school superintendents, principals, and other school personnel to acquire knowledge about school law in relation to the topic of suspension and to reexamine current school policies, rules and practices concerning suspensions in order to modify procedures to conform to the law.

It was with this view in mind, that the study was undertaken.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate factors or variables that might have a bearing on the rate of student suspensions public schools, with the focus upon High Schools in the City of Chicago.

The specific research task sought answers to the following questions:

1. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools since the change in Chicago Board of Education policy concerning suspensions was enacted in 1975?
2. Are there significant differences in the proportions of suspensions among schools where teachers are aware of the clause in the Union Contract relating to student discipline and in schools where the majority of teachers are not aware of the clause?
3. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions among schools that have printed behavior codes and those which do not?
4. Are there significant differences in suspension rates between schools having school handbooks for staff and those that do not?
5. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools that have had frequent inservice meetings concerning student discipline and those that have few or no meetings?
6. Are there significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions between schools offering a variety of curricular alternatives and those with conventional offerings?
7. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing racial compositions?
8. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with principals who approve of suspensions and those who do not?

9. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing socioeconomic status?
10. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools in relationship to the personality type of the principals, measured by the FIRO-B psychological test?
11. Are there significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools exhibiting a combination of variables listed and those which do not?

The Procedure

The study consisted of five phases: (1) a review of pertinent literature; (2) designing the study, developing an instrument, validating the instrument and conducting a survey to obtain primary data; (3) interviews for a pilot study to establish content validity and interviews to establish congruence with the mailed questionnaire; (4) analysis of the data utilizing analysis of variance (ANOVA), the T-Test and the Pearson Coefficient Correlation, including analysis of simple main effects and interaction effects; and (5) drawing up conclusions and recommendations.

Preliminary interviews were held with eight Chicago Public High School principals in order to test the sample questions that would be included in the questionnaire. The preliminary interviews served as a pilot study to ascertain whether the formulated questions were clear and whether data elicited would shed light on the problem.

Since the data collected in the pilot study were relevant to the problem of this study, and the questions were clearly understood by the respondents, a written questionnaire was formulated, using both

fixed-alternative and open-ended questions used in the preliminary study. A copy of the questionnaire constructed was mailed to fifty-seven Chicago Public High School principals, representing all Chicago Public High Schools except social adjustment schools, and newly constructed high schools where longitudinal data for a four or five year period was not available.

Forty-one or 71% of the principals returned their questionnaires, along with answers to the FIRO-B psychological test of personality. Two principals failed to take the FIRO-B test, but answered the questions on the mailed questionnaire.

A post questionnaire interview was held with seven principals who had returned their questionnaires, in order to establish further content validity.

Following the statistical analysis of the data in order to establish the variables that were significantly related to suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools, two schools with similar size, racial makeup and poverty level were selected for an in-depth comparison, in order to further establish significant factors that might have a relationship to the suspension rate in a given school.

Major Findings

Analysis of the responses on the questionnaire and during interview sessions revealed that:

1. The attitude or philosophy of the principal was significantly related to the suspension rate of a school.

2. The Chicago Board of Education Policy, implemented in 1975, mandating guidelines for the suspension of students, did not alter the decision making process of the majority of principals.
3. The Supreme Court decisions relating to student suspensions appeared to have little impact upon the decision making process of Chicago Public High School principals. In fact, the overwhelming majority could not name a single decision, and were not aware of their substance.
4. Alternatives to suspension were found in very few schools.
5. The Chicago Public High Schools with the most enriched curricula had significantly lower suspension rates.
6. School codes or student handbooks were very common in Chicago Public High Schools, however, reinforcement of the codes through group discussion and interaction was seldom used.
7. Teacher handbooks were almost universally present in Chicago Public High Schools, and their presence had no significant relationship to the suspension rate in a given school.
8. Schools that had the most frequent inservice sessions related to the topic of discipline, had the highest suspension rates.
9. The majority of the principals were aware of Article 30, the discipline clause in the Board/Union contract, allowing teachers to bar students from their classes if disruptive; but found that the clause did not cause teacher pressure for suspending students.
10. The most important and most significant variable related to the suspension rate in a given school was the attitude and knowledge of the principal about suspension policy, practices and procedures.

With respect to the specific questions to be answered in this study, the results were as follows:

1. There were no significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions in Chicago Public High Schools since the change in Chicago Board of Education policy concerning suspensions was enacted in 1975.
2. There were no significant differences in the proportions of suspensions among schools where teachers were aware of the clause (as perceived by the principal) in the Board/Union contract, relating to discipline, and in schools where the

majority of teachers were perceived to be unaware of the clause.

3. There were no significant differences in the proportions of student suspensions among schools that had printed behavior codes and those that did not.
4. There were no significant differences in suspension rates between schools having school handbooks for staff and those that did not.
5. There was a significant difference between schools that had more frequent inservice meetings concerning discipline and those that had no or few inservice sessions concerning discipline. Schools that had fewer meetings tended to have lower levels of suspension. The significance of this variable was at the .10 level for the school years 1974-75 and 1976-77, and at the .05 level for the school year 1975-76.
6. There was a significant difference at the .10 level between schools that had enriched curricula and those that did not.
7. There was a significant difference in the suspension rates between schools that had primarily black populations and schools that had mixtures of students of other races. The variable of race was significant at the .05 level for the school years 1974-75 and 1975-76, and at the .10 level for the school year 1976-77.
8. There were no significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools with differing socioeconomic status.
9. There was a significant difference at the .01 level during the school years 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77, between schools that had principals who approved of suspensions and those who did not.
10. There were no significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools in relationship to the personality type of the principals as measured by the FIRO-B psychological test.
11. There were no significant differences in the proportions of students suspended among schools exhibiting a combination of variables encompassed in this study and those that did not. However, there were wide variations in the suspension rates of schools with combined variables, and while those variations were not statistically significant, it was found that majority black schools, where the principals approved of suspension, and where there were frequent inservice sessions

devoted to discipline, had the highest suspension rates. The schools with lower suspension rates tended to have a combination of variables that included few inservice sessions devoted to discipline, school populations with low populations of black students, and principals who did not approve of suspension. This problem warrants further study.

Conclusions

The findings of the study indicate that the philosophy and leadership style of the principal, the type of inservice training concerning discipline available for staff, the curricular offerings, and the racial composition of a school are the factors to consider when tackling the problem of high suspension rates in schools.

Specifically, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. Principals of Chicago Public High Schools involved in this study appeared to be aware of the 1975 guidelines implemented by the Chicago Board of Education, guaranteeing due process rights, concerning suspension, to students; but apparently continued suspending students according to personal philosophy. The only changes that occurred after 1975, were not in the suspension rates, but in the process used prior to suspension and in the length of time; principals granting perfunctory hearings and imposing suspensions of less than ten days. ✓

The majority of principals were not aware of the Goss, Wood or Briscoe Supreme Court decisions. Ignorance of the law, appeared to be an obstacle to the implementation of the law, and probably this lack of knowledge is related to the statistical evidence indicating that there was no significant drop in suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools in the years following the implementation of new Board policy concerning suspensions.

2. This study indicated that teachers have been successful in securing the right to bar disruptive students from class in Chicago Public High Schools, via the Board/Union contract, but their pressures upon administrators to suspend students from school, have had little impact upon the suspension rate in the high schools of the City of Chicago.

3. The variable of the presence of a school code did not prove to be significant in this study, however further research into this matter may very well reveal a relationship between the suspension rates of schools with codes that have been reinforced through discussion and student input and schools that have codes that have been written by local administrators, without reinforcement. In this study, only six principals had indicated that their codes had been discussed with students. The results of this study might have been different if a greater number of Chicago Public School principals had involved their students and staffs in the drafting and implementation of their codes.
4. The vast majority of Chicago Public High Schools, thirty-six out of forty had teacher handbooks for their staffs. While the presence of teacher handbooks did not prove to be significantly related to the rates of suspensions in the schools, administrators and union leaders evidently feel that handbooks are valuable organizational artifacts. Further research into this variable might be worthwhile, in order to ascertain how handbooks are used in public schools. If they are merely available without the added reinforcement of inservice training or teacher input and implementation, their full benefit to professional staff is probably short circuited.
5. Chicago Public High School principals who had two or more inservice sessions related to discipline, tended to head schools that had significantly higher suspension rates than their colleagues who held few sessions related to this topic. It appeared that the principals who scheduled discipline inservice sessions with regularity might have perceived that the sessions were necessary in order to combat the greater number of discipline problems present in their schools.

Another factor concerning the frequency of discipline inservice sessions, is that the inservices apparently were ineffective. This study revealed that administrators from other parts of the country found discipline inservice sessions ineffective, just as Chicago principals had, and had devised programs to involve teachers in the planning of such sessions, which tended to improve their effectiveness in lowering suspension rates. Further study of this matter might prove fruitful, as the quality of the inservice is probably more important than quantity.

6. This study indicated that there was a significant relationship between the presence of enriched curricula and lower suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools. It is possible that creative programs can make a difference in

dealing with troubled youth, and that alternatives to suspension can cut down on high school suspension rates. Further research should be conducted in order to determine whether over a period of time, the number of suspensions are actually reduced through the use of alternative programs or change in curricula to reflect the needs of students.

7. It was found that there was a significant difference in the suspension rates between schools that had primarily black students and schools that had mixtures of other races. Administrative attitudes toward minority students might be a factor in the high black suspension rate. While belonging to the black race enhances one's chances for suspension, according to this study and statistics collected by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), the variable of under-achievement should be considered for further research.
8. This study found the variable of poverty not significant, a result which was not congruent with findings made by the Children's Defense Fund. Further research would be warranted in order to test the variable of poverty, as poverty, in this study correlated significantly with the variable of race, which was significant. The variable of poverty might be interwoven with other factors such as achievement and race.
9. This study established a very powerful relationship between principal attitudes about suspension and suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools. The level of significance could not only be computed at the .05 level of confidence, but at the .01 level as well. It appeared that the philosophy of the principal was so strongly related to suspension rates, that one could safely guess that suspension rates would be higher at schools where the administrator favors the use of suspension as a disciplinary tool.
10. While this study did not establish a significant relationship between scores on the FIRO-B psychological test and the suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools, further research might establish a link between the leadership styles of persons in charge of schools. However, additional variables to measure leadership style would give an added dimension to the test scores, which may not give the complete picture of the administrator as a leader.

Most of the high school principals who took this test had lower than average scores for administrators, according to the norm table, except in the area of control, and represented a group of administrators who on the whole were structured, efficient people who tended to be impersonal. It could be that the traits necessary for promotion to a large city high school tended to produce a selection factor for

this type of leadership in contrast to the type of leadership needed to run smaller organizations.

11. Ten independent variables were examined in this study, and four of the ten factors were found to be significant either at the .01, .05 or .10 levels of confidence. It was determined, however, that the interaction analysis of related variables did not establish a statistical relationship to suspension rates in Chicago Public High Schools.

While the results did not appear to link combinations of factors related to the suspension rates of the schools, it was revealed that the schools who were headed by principals who disapproved of suspension, had infrequent inservice sessions, and enriched curricula, had the lowest suspension rates. Further research exploring synergistic effects of variables would probably shed further light upon this issue.

12. An analysis of the two Chicago Public High Schools of similar size and characteristics with differing suspension rates revealed that:
 - a. The suspension rate in the school with a strong principal, enriched curriculum, and few inservice sessions concerning discipline was much lower than in the matched school. The suspension rates were 30% for the school with weak leadership, basic curriculum, and frequent inservice sessions relating to discipline, and 7% for the comparable school.
 - b. Principal knowledge and attitude about policy, rules, and the law could possibly be related to the suspension rate. The principal of the school with the lower rate was knowledgeable in all of these areas, while the other principal was not well informed about these issues.

In conclusion, the attitude and knowledge of the principal about suspension appears to be the most strongly significant factor in the prediction of suspension rates in a given school.

Recommendations for Further Research

The conclusions stated in this study suggest that there were areas of concern that were beyond the scope of this study, but that could be explored by other researchers. The following are such areas:

1. The study of the effects of inservice training for administrators about legal decisions concerning due process rights for students. ✓
2. The study of the relationship between sex and the suspension rates in schools. For example, the OCR data has indicated that boys appear to be more susceptible to suspension than girls. ✓
3. The study of the relationship between school achievement and the suspension rate in schools.
4. The study of variables or factors in relationship to student expulsion. ✓
5. The study of the relationship of emerging legal issues concerning suspension, such as teacher liability for barring students from class, liability of school board members, and the role of hearing officers hired by boards of education to hear suspension cases.
6. The study of the relationship to suspension between schools that develop model behavior codes with student and staff input and those that do not. A
7. The study of the type of inservices that are most effective in improving student discipline, and lowering suspension rates. ✓
8. The study of the relationship between curriculum, student achievement, and suspension. ✓
9. The study of the leadership styles of principals in relation to suspension. ✓
10. The study of organizational pressures such as advocacy groups, upon administrators in relationship to student rights.

Recommendations for Principals

As a result of the study, several recommendations are made:

1. It is recommended that principals keep abreast of current policies and legal decisions concerning due process rights of students. Since there is no established network to disseminate information about court decisions, principals should encourage their superiors to include such knowledge in their inservice sessions and educational conferences. ✓

2. It is recommended that principals work cooperatively with Union delegates in developing local policies and procedures that would not only encourage teacher participation in improving discipline, but in securing liability coverage for teachers, who may be next in line to become liable for violating the constitutional rights of students.
3. It is recommended that principals develop a program whereby students would assume significant responsibility for creating a school code and a judicial process for dealing with those accused of violating it. Such a program would include an educational component for helping the students learn about governing laws and regulations within which they operate.
4. It is recommended that principals involve their staffs in the creation of a handbook that would assist teachers in relating to their students in a more positive way.
5. It is recommended that principals actively involve teachers in the planning of meaningful inservice sessions related to discipline. These inservice sessions should encourage active teacher participation instead of using lecture techniques that might bore staff members.
6. It is recommended that principals develop alternatives to suspension, and reexamine the curriculum in order to modify it to meet the needs of contemporary students. Suspensions cheat students of an education and cost school districts money for lost days in membership.
7. It is recommended that principals who head schools made up primarily of black students, become sensitive to the needs of their clients. It would behoove white principals, especially to learn about black culture and mores, and instill respect for these students among staff members, both by attitude and constructive in-service training for teachers. ✓
8. It is recommended that principals use suspension only for the most extreme violations of school rules, and that due process procedures be followed not only to the letter of the law, but also to the "spirit" of the law.

REFERENCES

- Administrator's Service. "Policies and Student Codes of Conduct." Vandalism and School Discipline in the 1979's, 1976. ✓
- American Federation of Teachers. "School Violence and Discipline: An American Dilemma." American Educator, Vol. 1, No. 2, Summer, 1978. ✓
- American Friends Service Committee. "Chicago's Schools Suspension." April, 1976.
- Anson, Ronald. "The Educator's Response to Goss and Wood." Kappan, Vol. 57, September, 1975.
- Arnstein, George E. "Bad Apples in Academia." American Teacher, April, 1975.
- Associated Press. "Hard-nosed Principal Wins Test." Chicago Sun Times, March 26, 1976.
- Associated Press. "Report Bias in Discipline of Integrated Black Students." Chicago Sun Times, March 26, 1976.
- Associated Press. "Students May Sit During Salute to Flag." Chicago Sun Times, August 17, 1977.
- Ban, John. "Teacher Unions Fight Back." The American Educator, Vol. 2, No. 2, Summer, 1978. ✓
- Bangser, Henry. "The Role of the Federal Judiciary." Education and Urban Society, Vol. 8, May, 1976.
- Bayh, Birch. "Seeking Solutions to School Violence and Vandalism." Kappan, Vol. 59, January, 1978.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 US 483 (1954). ✓
- Carey, Preston. "The Role of the Principal in Establishing Policy." Chicago Principals Reporter, Fall, 1977.
- Chicago Region PTA. Report of Suspension Committee, September 20, 1967.
- Children's Defense Fund. Children Out of School in America, October, 1974. ✓

- Children's Defense Fund. School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children?, September, 1975.
- Connelly, George W. "Let's Hear It for the Principal." Chicago Principal Reporter, Spring, 1976.
- Crandell, G. E. "Why Teachers Quit." Chicago Tribune, February 10, 1978.
- Croft-Nei. Discipline and Control Update, October, 1977.
- Cutler, Charles L. and Schwach, Howard J. "You're Suspended--Can You Argue Your Case?" Juveniles and the Law, 1975.
- DeCecco, John and Richards, Arlene. "Using Negotiation for Teaching Civil Liberties and Avoiding Liability." Kappan, Vol. 57, September, 1975.
- Doane, Robert H. "Court Makes Teacher a Slave." Chicago Daily News, March 21, 1975.
- Draba, Robert E. "Short Suspensions: The Goss Decision Establishes a Student's Due Process Rights." Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 23, No. 4, 1975.
- Dule, Daniel L. "Emerging Legal Issues Related to Class Room Management." Kappan, December, 1978.
- Elasser, Glen. "Court Limits the Scope of Pupils Damage Claims." Chicago Tribune, March 22, 1978.
- Elasser, Glen. "High Court to Act on Suspension Case." Chicago Tribune, April 19, 1977.
- Engelhart, Max. Methods of Educational Research, Rand McNally, 1972.
- Epperson v. Arkansas, 393 US 97, 104.
- "Fair Play at the Schoolhouse." Chicago Tribune, January 31, 1975.
- Flygare, Thomas. "Student Rights." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 44, No. 1, 1974.
- Flygare, Thomas. "Two Suspension Cases the Supreme Court Must Decide." Kappan, December, 1974. ✓
- Gault, 387 US 1, 61 (1967). ✓
- Goss v. Lopez et al., in the United States Law Week, 43 LW (January 21, 1975). ✓

Hagan, Robert. "High Court Sets Standards on Lawsuits Against School Officials." School Law News, Vol. 3, No. 5, 1975.

Hager, Phillip. "Children's Rights Explosion." Chicago Sun Times, January 23, 1977.

Halpin, Andrew W. "The Organizational Climate of Schools." Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 11, March, 1963.

Harris, Sid. "Children's Lib Long Overdue." Chicago Daily News, April 1, 1975.

Hickman, A. "Student Discipline Records: HEW Gets Tough." Nation's School Report, Vol. 1, No. 1, September 29, 1975.

Hazard, William R. "Courts in the Saddle: School Boards Out." Kappan, December, 1974.

Hazard, William R. "Goss v. Lopez and Wood v. Strickland: Some Implications for School Practice." Journal of Law and Education, Vol. 4, No. 4, October, 1975.

Hazard, William R. "Schooling and the Law." Education and Urban Society, Vol. 8, No. 3, May, 1976.

Hazard, William R. Student Rights: A Brief Outline of Due Process. Unpublished paper presented at AASA Academy for School Executives, Baltimore, Md., August 6, 1975.

Jones, Lonnie. "The Effectiveness of Suspension Practices in Deterring Student Misbehavior in Two Big City High Schools." Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Kansas City, 1974.

Keith, C. "Court Decisions Praised." Chicago Tribune, March 31, 1978.

Kilpatrick, James J. "Judges Take Over the Classroom." Chicago Daily News, February 7, 1975.

Konstantelos, Demetri. Suspensions and Expulsions in Chicago Public Schools, February, 1977.

Kotsakis, John. Chicago Union Teacher, March, 1978.

Krasnow, Bernard. "What Kind of Principal Do Teachers Want?" Kappan, October, 1978.

Landers, Ann. "T-Shirt Furor Flaunts Letter of the Law." Chicago Sun Times, October 16, 1977.

Maynard, D. "Working with Disruptive Youth." Educational Leadership, Vol. 34, No. 6, March, 1977.

- McClung, Anna. "Alternatives to Disciplinary Exclusion from School." Inequality in Education, July, 1975.
- McVey, Marcia. "School Climate: The Administrator Makes the Difference." Thrust for Educational Leadership, Vol. 5, March, 1976.
- Miller, Gail. "AFT Project to Investigate School Discipline and Violence." American Teacher, January, 1977. X
- Mizell, Hayes. "Background Paper for AFSC Education Roundup." Unpublished report, March, 1976.
- Monson, Harry A. "An Analysis of Current Practices Regarding the Suspension of High School Students in California." Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1969.
- Mullen, William. "School Permissiveness Takes a Beating." Chicago Tribune, August 14, 1977.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. A Legal Memorandum, June, 1975.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. School Violence and Vandalism, April 16, 1975.
- Neil, Shirley Boss. "Suspensions and Expulsions." National School Public Relations, 1976.
- Newsnotes. "The Dark Side of the Discipline Picture: New Laws Don't Change Unfairness." Kappan, Vol. 60, No. 6, February, 1979.
- Osborne, Donald. "Race, Sex, Achievement and Suspension." Vol. 3, No. 3, October, 1977.
- Oster, Patrick. "Supreme Court Rules on Student Suspensions Here." Chicago Sun Times, March 22, 1978. ✓
- Rodham, Hillary. "Children Under the Law." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 43, No. 4, 1975. 73 ✓
- Rollin, Stephen A. "The Governor's Task Force on Disruptive Youth." Kappan, December, 1974.
- Rubin, Louis. "Curriculum, Affect, and Humanism." Educational Leadership, Vol. 32, No. 1, October, 1974.
- Rowan, Carl T. "Due Process in Schools Will Stem Discrimination." Chicago Daily News, January 28, 1975.

San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 411 US 1 (1973).

Schneider, Frank. "Teacher's Pests." New Orleans Times Picayune,
March 16, 1975.

Schutz, Will. Profound Simplicity, Bantum Books, June, 1979.

St. Ann v. Palisi, 495 F. 2nd at 429.

Strobel, Lee. "Suspended Students Win Right to Sue." Chicago Daily
News, January 28, 1975.

Sullivan v. Houston Independent School District, 475 R. (5th Cir.
1973).

United Press. "Iowa Pupils Find Education Confining." Chicago
Tribune, December 8, 1977.

United Press. "Minority Pupils Bear Brunt of Discipline." Chicago
Tribune, September 4, 1975.

Voelz, John. "The Legal Status of Pupil Suspensions and Expulsion."
Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1970.

Von Brock, Robert. "Coping with Suspension and the Supreme Court."
NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 61, No. 407, March, 1977.

Weidrich, Bob. "Seat of Wisdom vs. Student Rights." Chicago Tribune,
June 4, 1975.

"What Schools are Doing to Improve Suspension Procedures." American
School Board Journal, March, 1976. X

Wood, Kingsley. "Two Standards of Discipline at Thornton." Chicago
Sun Times, May 19, 1975.

Zirkel, Perry A. "A Test on Supreme Court Decisions Affecting
Education," Kappan, Vol. 59, No. 8, April, 1978,

APPENDIX A

MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name _____
2. Current School _____
- A. How many years at current school? 1 2 3 4 5 (circle)
- B. If less than 5 years, name other school, only if principal of another Chicago Public High School.
 (1) _____
 (2) _____
3. Does your school have: (circle)
- A. Printed Student Behavior Codes? Yes No
 If yes, about how many years since instituted? _____
- B. Handbook of Rules and Regulations for staff? Yes No
 If yes, about how many years since instituted? _____
- C. Faculty Inservice meetings relating to student discipline? Yes No
 If yes, indicate approximate number each year.
 1976-77 _____
 1975-76 _____
 1974-75 _____
 1973-74 _____
 1972-73 _____
- D. Unique programs in addition to standard offerings? Yes No
 If yes, list programs.
 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____
 4. _____
 5. _____
4. Briefly state your personal philosophy regarding suspension.

QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW FORM--PART II

I. Board Policy

- A. How have the number of students suspended in your school changed since 1975 when the Board of Education adopted a new policy?
- B. To what extent has this policy either handicapped or helped with your decision making?

II. Union Contract

Without consulting the agreement between the Board and teachers union please answer the following questions.

- A. Are you aware of the clause in the contract relating to discipline? Yes No (circle one)
- B. If yes, what does the clause mean?
- C. What proportion of your teachers are aware of the clause?
- D. What effect has teacher awareness of the clause in the contract had on the numbers of students suspended in your school?

III. Legal Decisions

A. Have legal decisions by courts affected student suspension in your school? Yes No (circle one)

B. If so, in which way?

C. Can you name some specific legal decisions affecting student suspension?

1.

2.

3.

IV. Curriculum

A. What programs have you that meet the needs of students with special problems?

B. What alternatives to suspension are present in your school?

C. What alternatives would you institute if possible?

V. Behavior Code

A. Does your school have a printed behavior code?

B. Are students aware of the penalties exacted when the code is violated? Yes No (circle one)

If yes--how:

VI. Inservice

A. Which inservice sessions during the past several years, have related to student discipline?

B. Describe effectiveness.

Chart I
Summary of Data Collected for 57 Chicago Public High Schools

| School | 1972-73 | | 1973-74 | | 1974-75 | | 1975-76 | | 1976-77 | | R | P | C | H |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|------|---------|------|---------|-----|---------|------|-----|-----|----|---|
| | M ₁₉₇₂ | S ₁₉₇₂ | M | S | M | S | M | S | M | S | | | | |
| 1 | 1868 | 168 | 1685 | 205 | 1673 | 160 | 1766 | 133 | 1818 | 133 | C | 12% | X | X |
| 2 | 4029 | 1209 | 3744 | 1918 | 4005 | 2127 | 4605 | 614 | 4476 | 1284 | B | 41% | X | X |
| 3 | 2926 | 241 | 1946 | 332 | 2856 | 377 | 2636 | 250 | 2651 | 432 | C | 5% | X | X |
| 4 | 3975 | 1960 | 3616 | 1500 | 3717 | 561 | 3229 | 58 | 3219 | 223 | B-M | 32% | X | X |
| 5 | 3125 | 420 | 3175 | 58 | 3571 | 1066 | 3609 | 462 | 3698 | 841 | B | 36% | - | - |
| 6 | 2593 | 61 | 2560 | 25 | 2485 | 136 | 2407 | 82 | 2390 | 67 | B | 68% | - | - |
| 7 | - | - | 2533 | 132 | 3101 | 302 | 3130 | 255 | 3154 | 391 | C-M | 15% | - | - |
| 8 | 3057 | 34 | 3114 | 388 | 2968 | 57 | 2797 | 380 | 2810 | 6 | B | 70% | X | X |
| 9 | 2190 | 7 | 2377 | 19 | 2398 | 17 | 2135 | 19 | 2128 | 64 | B | 90% | - | - |
| 10 | 2583 | 0 | 2633 | 12 | 2650 | 53 | 3127 | 42 | 3138 | 85 | B-M | 78% | X | X |
| 11 | 4899 | 1665 | 5296 | 1699 | 4552 | 894 | 3607 | 746 | 3575 | 192 | B | 32% | - | - |
| 12 | 1939 | 83 | 1803 | 77 | 1836 | 123 | 1764 | 53 | 1786 | 32 | C | 11% | No | X |
| 13 | 1985 | 332 | 2583 | 309 | 2804 | 1285 | 2526 | 602 | 2226 | 997 | B-M | 56% | X | X |
| 14 | 3440 | 1414 | 3462 | 946 | 3530 | 1692 | 3033 | 741 | 3050 | 1127 | B | 33% | X | X |
| 15 | 2012 | 12 | 1757 | 7 | 1989 | 20 | 2439 | 20 | 2459 | 73 | B | 50% | No | X |

Key:

M=Membership

S=Number of Suspensions

R=Race

C=Caucasian

B=Black

L=Latino

C-M=Majority Caucasian

B-M=Majority Black

L-M=Majority Latino

P=Poverty Level

C=Behavior Code

H=Teacher Handbook

--=No Response to Questionnaire

Chart I-- Cont'd

| School | 1972-73 | | 1973-74 | | 1974-75 | | 1975-76 | | 1976-77 | | R | P | C | H |
|--------|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|-----|-----|----|----|
| | M | S | M | S | M | S | M | S | M | S | | | | |
| 16 | 2894 | 232 | 2560 | 348 | 2667 | 261 | 2564 | 161 | 2061 | 160 | L-M | 98% | X | X |
| 17 | 2075 | 425 | 2075 | 585 | 1903 | 564 | 1712 | 462 | 1720 | 346 | B | 48% | No | X |
| 18 | 886 | 33 | 1325 | 195 | 2170 | 528 | 2109 | 161 | 2073 | 850 | B | 76% | - | - |
| 19 | 2671 | 40 | 2271 | 23 | 2363 | 27 | 2216 | 177 | 2228 | 11 | C | 8% | X | X |
| 20 | 1327 | 5 | 1304 | 15 | 1614 | 41 | 1972 | 16 | 2433 | 46 | B | 59% | X | X |
| 21 | 3095 | 0 | 2351 | 0 | 2225 | 0 | 2454 | 82 | 2469 | 22 | C-M | 23% | X | X |
| 22 | 1863 | 73 | 1795 | 86 | 1779 | 85 | 1685 | 112 | 1690 | 237 | C-M | 32% | - | - |
| 23 | 3543 | 84 | 2671 | 30 | 2515 | 87 | 2420 | 506 | 2427 | 83 | C | 12% | X | X |
| 24 | 1970 | 273 | 1930 | 250 | 1936 | 240 | 1940 | 138 | 1923 | 64 | B-M | 23% | X | X |
| 25 | 1945 | 143 | 2089 | 163 | 2148 | 214 | 2438 | 51 | 2413 | 96 | B | 84% | X | X |
| 26 | 2500 | 403 | 2165 | 284 | 2206 | 187 | 2110 | 139 | 2114 | 86 | L-M | 40% | - | - |
| 27 | 5257 | 904 | 5309 | 658 | 5597 | 546 | 4883 | 439 | 4908 | 660 | C-M | 19% | X | X |
| 28 | 2671 | 56 | 2561 | 24 | 2573 | 15 | 2501 | 376 | 2530 | 448 | B | 40% | - | - |
| 29 | - | - | 984 | 153 | 1415 | 90 | 2012 | 119 | 2004 | 108 | B | 83% | X | No |
| 30 | 3565 | 96 | 2293 | 6 | 2227 | 8 | 1620 | 570 | 1637 | 15 | B | 55% | - | - |

Key:

M=Membership

S=Number of Suspensions

R=Race

C=Caucasian

B=Black

L=Latino

C-M=Majority Caucasian

B-M=Majority Black

L-M=Majority Latino

P=Poverty Level

C=Behavior Code

H=Teacher Handbook

--=No Response to Questionnaire

Chart I-- Cont'd

| School | 1972-73 | | 1973-74 | | 1974-75 | | 1975-76 | | 1976-77 | | R | P | C | H |
|--------|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|------|---------|------|---------|------|-----|-----|----|----|
| | M | S | M | S | M | S | M | S | M | S | | | | |
| 31 | 1818 | 4 | 1840 | 6 | 1754 | 5 | 1676 | 18 | 1674 | 48 | C | 8% | - | - |
| 32 | 3092 | 71 | 3200 | 28 | 3457 | 30 | 3459 | 145 | 2944 | 104 | B-M | 33% | X | X |
| 33 | 2028 | 34 | 2271 | 307 | 2273 | 1488 | 2723 | 1104 | 2709 | 2270 | B-M | 64% | - | - |
| 34 | 1940 | 14 | 2153 | 35 | 2367 | 43 | 2313 | 34 | 2291 | 7 | B | 70% | No | No |
| 35 | 3400 | 22 | 3373 | 22 | 3519 | 78 | 3150 | 282 | 3150 | 282 | B | 88% | X | X |
| 36 | 1898 | 7 | 1812 | 38 | 1827 | 92 | 1860 | 82 | 1880 | 124 | C-M | 15% | - | - |
| 37 | 4399 | 508 | 4109 | 376 | 4151 | 530 | 4094 | 429 | 4096 | 608 | C-M | 27% | No | X |
| 38 | 2719 | 13 | 2379 | 12 | 2458 | 64 | 2645 | 61 | 2618 | 56 | C-M | 49% | No | X |
| 39 | 2715 | 124 | 2769 | 117 | 2973 | 268 | 3407 | 433 | 3418 | 287 | B | 33% | X | No |
| 40 | 2819 | 226 | 2801 | 225 | 2837 | 238 | 2439 | 183 | 2750 | 243 | C | 6% | X | X |
| 41 | 1571 | 0 | 1348 | 32 | 1411 | 80 | 1382 | 88 | 1397 | 122 | C-M | 14% | X | X |
| 42 | 2465 | 5 | 2420 | 4 | 3280 | 8 | 3231 | 5 | 3250 | 12 | C | 4% | X | X |
| 43 | 2540 | 31 | 2631 | 48 | 2674 | 187 | 2693 | 327 | 2747 | 489 | B-M | 68% | - | - |
| 44 | 1169 | 90 | 1175 | 79 | 1146 | 52 | 1060 | 40 | 1049 | 23 | C-M | 18% | X | X |
| 45 | 1989 | 225 | 1866 | 179 | 2070 | 274 | 2021 | 165 | 2000 | 88 | B | 73% | - | - |

Key:

M=Membership

S=Number of Suspensions

R=Race

C=Caucasian

B=Black

L=Latino

C-M=Majority Caucasian

B-M=Majority Black

L-M=Majority Latino

P=Poverty Level

C=Behavior Code

H=Teacher Handbook

--=No Response to Questionnaire

Chart I-- Cont'd

| School | 1972-73 | | 1973-74 | | 1974-75 | | 1975-76 | | 1976-77 | | R | P | C | H |
|--------|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|-----|-----|---|----|
| | M | S | M | S | M | S | M | S | M | S | | | | |
| 46 | 1694 | 76 | 1511 | 111 | 1421 | 340 | 1334 | 373 | 1333 | 357 | B-M | 74% | X | X |
| 47 | 2232 | 253 | 2263 | 212 | 2335 | 274 | 2259 | 180 | 2263 | 86 | C | 7% | X | X |
| 48 | 1795 | 19 | 1793 | 134 | 2034 | 46 | 1940 | 33 | 1974 | 37 | L-M | 64% | X | X |
| 49 | 4920 | 737 | 4003 | 772 | 4187 | 485 | 4547 | 313 | 4125 | 289 | B | 40% | X | X |
| 50 | 585 | 16 | 596 | 12 | 595 | 110 | 612 | 81 | 619 | 269 | B | 79% | X | X |
| 51 | 810 | 12 | 803 | 0 | 784 | 10 | 1077 | 9 | 834 | 18 | B | 65% | X | X |
| 52 | 2585 | 17 | 2556 | 26 | 2586 | 47 | 2449 | 68 | 2464 | 7 | B | 75% | X | No |
| 53 | 906 | 104 | 807 | 42 | 809 | 106 | 942 | 91 | 903 | 169 | B | 77% | X | X |
| 54 | 1134 | 58 | 1116 | 93 | 1124 | 39 | 1068 | 2 | 1079 | 15 | B-M | 44% | - | - |
| 55 | 1484 | 17 | 1440 | 12 | 1485 | 28 | 1503 | 34 | 1519 | 27 | C-M | 35% | X | X |
| 56 | 956 | 13 | 952 | 16 | 828 | 29 | 866 | 43 | 881 | 73 | L-M | 32% | - | - |
| 57 | 1689 | 180 | 1785 | 178 | 1895 | 218 | 1881 | 128 | 1890 | 228 | B | 43% | X | X |

Key:

M=Membership

S=Number of Suspensions

R=Race

C=Caucasian

B=Black

L=Latino

C-M=Majority Caucasian

B-M=Majority Black

L-M=Majority Latino

P=Poverty Level

C=Behavior Code

H=Teacher Handbook

--No Response to Questionnaire

APPENDIX B

BOARD OF EDUCATION

CITY OF CHICAGO

228 NORTH LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60601

290

JOSEPH P. HANNON
GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

DEPARTMENT OF OPERATIONS ANALYSIS
JOAN M. RAYMOND
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
TELEPHONE 641-3880

January 31, 1977

Dear Mrs. Petak:

This is in response to your request of January 6, 1977, for permission to obtain access to data related to suspension rates.

We shall be pleased to share the data which we have available with you, and members of the staff in the Department of Operations Analysis will be available to assist you in its interpretation. As I indicated to you in our conversation, it will be necessary for you to respect the confidentiality of the data and to treat it accordingly.

I hope this will be helpful to you and I wish you success in your project. Please let us know if we may be of further assistance.

Cordially,


Joan M. Raymond

dma

cc: Dr. Bessie Lawrence
Dr. Joseph J. Connery

Mrs. Dorothy Petak, Principal
Julia Ward Howe Elementary School
MR 72

November 22, 1977

Dear Colleague:

As a fellow principal, I am seeking your cooperation in providing information for a doctoral study I am doing, relating to student suspension.

Clearance to contact you has been obtained through our Deputy Superintendent, Dr. Bessie Lawrence, with the stipulation that no names of personnel or schools will be mentioned in the dissertation. All information solicited will be treated in a confidential manner.

Enclosed you will find:

1. A questionnaire
2. FIRO-B Personality Inventory
3. Self-addressed return envelope

Your prompt return of these materials as well as copies of (if available):

- A. Student behavior codes
- B. Teacher handbooks
- C. Course offerings

would be greatly appreciated.

After the return of these materials, it is possible you will be contacted by me for a personal interview.

A copy of the final dissertation will be available in the Chicago Principals' Association Library for your perusal.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Dorothy Petak,
Principal-Howe Elementary School

DP/tp

January 24, 1978

Dear Colleague:

Re: Doctoral Questionnaire

My desk is piled high with papers, as I am sure yours must be. Perhaps, buried in the pile is a packet that was sent by me on January 4, 1978, to all Chicago High School principals containing:

- A. FIRO-B Personality Inventory
- B. Suspension Questionnaire

The success of my doctoral study at Loyola is dependent upon your good will, and as a fellow Chicago Public School principal, I would greatly appreciate any effort extended upon my behalf.

Clearance for this study was obtained by the Deputy Superintendent, Dr. Bessie Lawrence, and the Chicago Principals Association consequently advertised the project in a newsletter.

If you failed to receive a packet, which included a self-addressed stamped envelope and wish to participate in this study please, fill out the attached tear off sheet.

I shall also gladly share the results of the FIRO-B Personality Inventory with the principals who express an interest.

Please be assured that there are no right or wrong answers for the FIRO-B and that people in leadership positions have a variety of leadership styles that are successful.

Your prompt reply would be appreciated and I shall be happy to cooperate with any other fellow principal doing research.

Very truly yours,

Dorothy Petak
Howe Principal

Name _____ School _____

- () I did not receive a packet, but will participate in the study if sent the materials.
- () I received the packet, and would like the results of the FIRO-B returned after it is sent and scored.

SEND TO:

Dorothy Petak
Howe Elementary School
Mail Run #61

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Dorothy Petak has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Melvin P. Heller, Director
Professor, Educational Administration and
Supervision, Department Chairman, Loyola

Dr. Jasper J. Valenti
Associate Dean, School of Education
Professor of Educational Administration and
Supervision, Loyola

Dr. Robert Monks
Director of Continuing Education, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

December 8, 1980
Date

M. Heller
Director's Signature