

Winter 2002

An Analysis of Consistent Inclusion Programming District Wide

Laura N. Vos

Grand Valley State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vos, Laura N., "An Analysis of Consistent Inclusion Programming District Wide" (2002). *Masters Theses*. 577.
<http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses/577>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research and Creative Practice at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

**AN ANALYSIS OF CONSISTENT
INCLUSION PROGRAMMING
DISTRICT WIDE**

Laura N. Vos

Winter, 2002

MASTERS THESIS

Submitted to the graduate faculty at

Grand Valley State University

in partial fulfillment of the Masters of Education

ABSTRACT

Inclusive education is the newest and largest change that the district being examined has had to face in recent years. However, within the six elementary buildings, inclusion is delivered in different ways. The inconsistency amongst the buildings in regards to inclusion was examined to determine if the effects have a positive or negative impact on the district as a whole. An interview/questionnaire was administered to twenty-five samples throughout the district. The interviews determined overwhelmingly that the practices are inconsistent, but whether the effect was positive or negative was debateable. The study also found common successful practices, shared commonalities and concerns that each administrator and teacher faces as they deliver services through an inclusion model.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
CHAPTER ONE: THESIS PROPOSAL.....	1
Problem Statement.....	1
Importance and Rationale of Study.....	1
Background of Study.....	2
Statement of Purpose.....	6
Limitations.....	7
Key Terms and Definitions.....	8
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
Overview of Inclusion as a Practice.....	11
Examination of Inclusion Models.....	17
Inclusion Model X: Knights Elementary School.....	19
Inclusion Model Y: Worthington Elementary School.....	24
Inclusion Model Z: Madison Elementary School.....	29
Conclusions.....	36
CHAPTER THREE: THESIS COMPONENTS.....	37
Purpose of Study.....	44
Background Information.....	44
Participants.....	46
Survey.....	46
Survey Results.....	47
Conclusions.....	62
Inclusion Practices Per Building	62
Consistency of Inclusion District Wide.....	63
Comparable Concerns From the Literature.....	65
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	66
REFERENCES.....	68
APPENDIX.....	74
Appendix A: Interview/Survey.....	75

CHAPTER ONE

PROPOSAL

PROBLEM STATEMENT:

The district being examined is currently looked upon as a leader in the realm of inclusion. However, within the six elementary buildings, inclusion is delivered in different ways. This writer believes that the inconsistency amongst the buildings in regards to inclusion may be a problem to the overall congruency of the district as a whole. Some practices are effective and successful while others could use suggestions of improvement. Evidence of success within each model needs to be explored so that the programs can be utilized to the maximum extent possible and more consistency amongst the models can be considered.

IMPORTANCE AND RATIONALE OF STUDY:

Inclusive education is the newest and largest change that the district being examined has had to face in recent years. It is no longer happening sporadically, by chance, but implemented to some degree or another in every building in the district. Inclusion affects both special education and general education in very strong ways. Inclusion is here to stay (at least in the foreseen future). Attitudes toward inclusion and knowledge of effective strategies to use in the inclusion classroom are key to the success of inclusive education.

Due to the varied ways that inclusion is currently delivered in the district being examined, it is of the writers opinion that a more consistent method cross-district

could be very beneficial to the overall implementation of inclusion. An overall consistent philosophical view would help both students and staff. Students occasionally move from school to school within the district and inconsistencies from building to building in regards to service can be confusing and can affect academic progress and growth. Professional and paraprofessional staff also occasionally move from building to building for varied reasons due to pragmatics such as staffing numbers or personality issues. These changes constitute challenges for both students and staff when inclusion models district wide do not correlate.

BACKGROUND OF STUDY:

Schools have undergone many changes in the past twenty years. They have had to adjust and conform to many rules and regulations such as PL 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children) which passed in 1975. It states that children with disabilities have a right to a free and appropriate education and related services provided in the least restrictive environment (LRE) and that an individualized education plan (IEP) must be written for each student. It encourages social interaction between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers and it requires that students with special needs receive appropriate education (Shanker, 1994/1995). The Regular Education Initiative (REI) was next in the 1980's. REI had several goals. First, to merge special and general education into one inclusive system with shared responsibilities and second, to increase dramatically the number of children with disabilities into mainstreamed classroom by use of large-scale, full-

time mainstreaming (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). More recently the Americans with Disabilities Act (Public Law 101-336) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was signed law in 1990 to protect people with disabilities in private sector employment as well as public services and education (Putnam, Spiegel & Bruininks, 1995). .

Currently the proportion of students served in residential facilities and separate schools has declined dramatically. The placement of students in general education classes in public schools is increasing (Putnam et al., 1995). At least 68.6% of students requiring special education services are served in general education classrooms for part (40% or more) or all of the school day (Putnam et al., 1995). This trend continues to be on the rise with the push toward general classroom service for all students regardless of disability. Soon it may be inclusion for all.

Now that it has been established that the laws have been written to encourage inclusion, let us look at some of the components that it takes to actually make this thing called inclusion work. To effectively meet students' needs in an integrated, inclusive setting, school administrators are spending a considerable amount of time and effort in restructuring general and special education (Cook & Friend, 1995).

Seven of the most important and essential components of an effective inclusion model include the following; common planning time, flexibility, risk-taking, defined roles and responsibilities, compatibility of teaching staff, communication skills and administrative support.

Common Planning Time: A critical component of an effective co-teaching/inclusion

model is the scheduling of a common planning time (Reinhiller, 1996; Vaughn, Schumm & Arguelles, 1997). Teachers need to have uninterrupted time, preferably on a daily basis, when they can discuss and share ideas. This is especially critical if special education teachers are not in general education classrooms for the entire day. The planning time allows them to know what is going on in the classroom when they are not there, and gives them an opportunity to suggest adaptations and modifications to assist students' learning. (Arguelles, Hughes & Schumm 2000) During the planning sessions, teachers can reflect on the daily lessons, plan activities to meet the needs of all the children, and define their co-teaching roles and responsibilities before, during, and after a lesson. It allows both teachers to merge their strengths (Arguelles et al., 2000)

Flexibility: Both teachers and administrators must be flexible if inclusion is to work (Cook & Friend, 1995). Administrators have to be open to new ways of doing routine tasks, such as scheduling and allocation of personnel (Simpson & Myles, 1990). Teachers in turn need to be flexible with their instructional style and classroom management (Arguelles et al., 2000). Special education teachers who work with more than one teacher must adapt to the unique style of each.

Risk-Taking: Making significant changes in the way services are delivered to students requires administrators and teachers who are willing to take chances (Arguelles et al., 2000). In inclusion, both general and special educators work with students with whom they have little or no experience. This often leads to teachers challenging themselves to improve their teaching and actively work to include all

students (Pugach & Johnson, 1995).

Defined Roles and Responsibilities: An all-too-familiar complaint from teachers who have been involved in unproductive inclusion arrangements is that one of them felt like an outsider or an assistant. For co-teaching/inclusion to work effectively both teachers need to have equal footing (Johnson, Pugach & Devlin, 1990). Teachers have to fairly and explicitly outline their roles and responsibilities in the relationship (Reinhiller 1996). Both teachers need to be equally responsible for the academic achievement and discipline of all students. This is imperative to ensure that everyone involved is clear on academic and behavioral expectations (Arguelles et al., 2000).

Communication Skills: As with any significant relationship, inclusion partners must have proficient communication skills if their alliance is to be a successful one (Karge, McClure & Patton, 1995). Problems often arise when teachers have to work closely with another professional. Most teachers are accustomed to working independently and establishing their own classroom routines (Arguelles et al., 2000). With inclusion, many educators for the first time are faced with having to make joint decisions about every aspect of instruction. Arguelles (et al., 2000) goes on to explain that the need to compromise on issues such as grading, behavior management, and space, together with other stresses of a new working situation, often leads to disagreements and tension. Successful inclusion partners recommend that partners communicate early, clearly, and often.

Administrative Support: Support from school administrators is essential before and

during the implementation of co-teaching programs (Bauwens, Hourcade & Friend, 1989). Inclusion requires direction from administrators who must be willing to listen and learn, and to help overcome obstacles such as class size, scheduling, and personnel allocation (Arguelles et al., 2000).

It is of this writers opinion that, at a minimum, these components should be evident in a well designed collaborative, inclusive education model. By a district using some or all of these basic components, such consistency could lead to increased effectiveness of the inclusion program overall.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the six different models of inclusion within the district being examined. The study will focus on the elementary level by comparing and contrasting the basic components of each model for the goal of better consistency. Through a series of interview questions given to the six principals and a sample of special education and general education teachers, a list will be generated of successful practices, shared commonalities, and concerns that each administrator and teacher faces as they deliver services through an inclusion model. An analysis will also be done on the structure of each model paying close attention to staffing numbers within special and general education.

Throughout the past decade, the word inclusion has become more and more common in the field of education. It has implications for everyone involved, including students, parents, general education teachers, special education teachers,

and school administrators. The thought of integrating and including children with disabilities into classes that contain primarily children who are developing normally has facilitated much research. As we look at inclusion from a classroom perspective, we see that there are many issues which must be addressed.

Inclusion poses challenges to every aspect of the educational system. While many gains have been made by integrating children with disabilities into the general education setting, inclusion still remains a controversial issue. The purpose of this study is to explore the challenges that all educators must face district wide if they want to experience success in the inclusion classroom, to look at the consistency of the six elementary programs and to highlight basic models used within the school district as well as across the country for the district to use in future planning.

LIMITATIONS:

This study is limited to surveying only the principals, a sample of general education and a sample of special education staff per the six elementary buildings within the district. Due to such a small sampling size, results may not be as accurate as that of a full sampling including all professional teaching staff and paraprofessional staff. If time permitted, the test collector would find it very valuable to sit down and interview all staff involved with inclusion at the elementary level.

Test collector bias could be a limitation due to the fact that this test collector is currently involved as a teacher with inclusion to a limited degree within one of the buildings. Preconceived views of the way that building runs inclusion should not

support inferences made within this study.

A final limitation of this study is the possibility of teacher bias in regards to their own program. It is possible for teachers to have preconceived notions of inclusion. Although not intentional, one may not be able to describe the way their program runs in a completely accurate and non-prejudicial way. At times, it is possible to paint a “rosier” picture than actually exists.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS:

Co-Teaching: An instructional approach in which a general and special educator share responsibility for planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction for a mixed group of students, some of whom have special needs (Cook & Friend, 1993, 1995)

IDEA: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (formerly known as PL 94-142)

IEP: An individual student’s education plan that includes the following: a statement of present levels of educational performance; a statement of annual goals and objectives; a statement of specific education and related services to be provided to a student; projected dates for initiation and duration of services; and appropriate objective criteria with evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, on an annual basis, whether the short-term instructional objectives are being achieved (NEA, 1994, p. 94)

Inclusion: A philosophy in which a school system allows for a variety of placements that offer the conditions under which every individual feels safe, accepted, and valued and is helped to develop his/her affective and intellectual capacities (Kauffman, 1994)

LRE: Least Restrictive Environment described by the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975) as the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children...are education with children who are not handicapped (Beninghof, 1997, p.23)

Paraprofessional: A worker who is not a member of a given profession but who assists a professional (Morris, 1981)

PL 94-142: Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 which stipulates that no child, regardless of disability, can be denied appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment (Falvey, Givner & Kim, 1995)

Special Education: Specially designed instruction whose purpose is to meet the needs of students with disabilities, generally in a segregated setting (NEA, 1994, p. 95)

Student with a Disability: A student with mental retardation, hearing impairments (including deafness), speech or language impairments, visual impairments (including blindness), serious emotional disturbances, orthopedic impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities (NEA, 1994 p.

95). These students differ from the average or normal students in mental characteristics, sensory abilities, communication abilities, behavioral/emotional development, and /or physical characteristics. These differences require modifications in school practices and/or special education services (Castle, 1996)

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

OVERVIEW OF INCLUSION AS A PRACTICE

Little has affected American education as dramatically as the growing sense that the way education has been structured in the past is less than adequate today and will be even more inadequate in the future. The increasing cultural, linguistic, academic, and behavioral diversity of America's classrooms is challenging long-established approaches to curriculum and instruction. (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). More and more, the question is not whether students with special needs should be included in the general education classroom. Instead, the more productive question is how instruction might be provided most effectively for all students, including those with special needs. Thus, the practice of inclusion is the latest and greatest trend that education has seen in recent years.

Historically, American education has been a "lonely profession," with teachers working in near-total isolation (Bauwens & Hourcade, 1995). However, as schools re-examine policies and procedures in light of contemporary challenges, the "one teacher responsible for one group of students" paradigm is coming into question (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001).

Students with special needs are still placed in many different program options ranging from less restrictive to more restrictive. Less restrictive models have a variety of names. More frequently, schools are using the term inclusion to describe

placing students with special needs in classes with their typical peers for either most or part of the school day. In practice, inclusion is defined differently depending on the school district (Langone, 1998). Some schools refer to inclusion in a broad sense, allowing all persons with disabilities the right to participate with their general education peers to the maximum extent possible (full inclusion). Other programs view inclusion as more restricted, placing students with disabilities in general education only part of the day (two or three periods or segments a day).

Inclusion supporters agree that effective restructuring of education must incorporate enhanced professional collaboration. For example, in her groundbreaking 1986 report, Madeline Will, then an assistant secretary of the U.S. Department of Education, determined that the educational system, segregated as it was into general and special education, was fundamentally flawed. She concluded that educating students with learning problems must be a shared responsibility (Will, 1986).

From the inception of PL 94-142 in the mid 1970's to the current reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the concept of least restrictive environment (LRE) has been the cornerstone for understanding the current move toward more inclusive environments for students with special needs (Langone, 1998). In the past, parents and professionals occasionally misinterpreted the philosophy of the LRE. Basically, living and learning in the least restrictive environment means that individuals with disabilities have the right to participate in environments as close to normal as possible. Each situation is determined by

student's strengths and weaknesses. Originally, the principle of least restrictive environment was developed to offset the practice of placing learners in self-contained settings when their needs did not dictate placement in those environments (Langone, 1990).

For many reasons, inclusive environments have become increasingly popular in school systems across the United States. Some of these reasons are supported by research, and others are supported by a deep sense of "what is right." Not all parents and professionals support full inclusion, and their reasons also are supported by research and deep sense of "what is right." In any case, over the next decade, more special educators will participate in programs that offer either full inclusion for students with special needs or provide inclusion in general education at least part of the time (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996).

One reason that has led many to call for more inclusive options for students with special needs is the past effects of educational options, or what has been called the continuum of services, for those learners (Langone, 1990). Educational options for students in special education historically have been static, and to some extent this situation still exists in some school systems. Once a learner is placed, there generally is little change from one placement option to another. The principle of least restrictive environments highlights that student and family needs are continually changing, and with those changes comes the need to modify program options (McNulty, Connolly, Wilson, & Brewer, 1996). Program goals should be designed to

move learners on a continuum toward less restrictive environments. In reality, this has not been the case for many students with special needs and their families (Langone, 1990).

As we move into the next century, the roles of teachers will shift dramatically. Teachers will have to "wear a number of hats" to be successful in helping students gain the skills necessary for becoming independent and productive members of society (Langone, 1998). At the present, teachers from general and special education perform many duties. Completing the number and variety of these tasks places a burden of time on teachers that may cause some to lose sight of the existing continuum of services. When this happens, learners may lose out because they may not be properly prepared to meet the challenges presented in new situations (Langone, 1998). For example, learners with special needs entering a secondary program having not received instruction in career awareness and basic prevocational skills at the elementary and middle school levels may be disadvantaged in a program designed to instruct them in independent living, vocational skills and general academics.

Teacher teams (both from general and special education) need to be in continuous contact across grade levels (Cook & Friend, 1996). Initially, teacher teams should become thoroughly acquainted with professionals from all other grade levels where students will come from or move toward. For example, elementary teachers working as teams in inclusive environments should visit the classrooms of both preschool and secondary programs in their disability area (Langone, 1998). Visiting those classes

allows teachers to observe teaching techniques and materials and have the opportunity to coordinate program objectives in a scope-and-sequence fashion across different levels. This allows professionals team-teaching in inclusive programs to know what skills the students are working on at the various points in their programs (Eichinger & Woltman, 1993). This strategy becomes important for special educators because these professionals may not have the extensive training in academic subject areas that is afforded to their general education team members. Also, increased teacher contact can lead to more coordinated assessment methods. When teachers across grade levels have been communicating regularly, learners entering a new program should not arrive without adequate support data (Langone, 1998).

Unfortunately, no matter the good intentions or how much teachers prepare, the stress of working together as an inclusive team can become great, resulting in premature burnout for general and special educators alike (Frank & McKenzie, 1993). For example, Farber (1991) discovered that both role conflict and role ambiguity can cause teachers to exhibit behaviors consistent with burnout. Role conflict occurs when teachers perceive that the demands of the job are inappropriate and cannot be accomplished within the given time constraints (Vill, Thousand, Meyers & Nevin, 1996). Role ambiguity results when teachers' rights, responsibilities, and status are unclear (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Role conflict and ambiguity also can occur when teachers are placed in teaming situations without proper training in collaboration (Pugach & Johnson, 1995).

Experts have posited several suggestions for collaboration techniques that should be incorporated in any inclusive team-teaching situation (Fisher, Schumaker & Deshler, 1996; Pugach & Johnson, 1995; Voltz, Elliot & Cobb, 1994). First, school administrators need to assist teachers by providing them with clear guidelines as to what is expected of them or actually lead them in developing a workable plan that spells out the roles and responsibilities of each professional. Also, choosing teachers carefully prior to placing them in cooperative teams is an important variable that may reduce stress and burnout. Teachers should not be chosen randomly, nor should only new teachers be chosen for inclusive programs (Voltz, et al., 1994). Peer-support groups consisting of both seasoned and newer teachers can be of great assistance to the inclusive teams (Pugach & Johnson, 1995).

A truly collaborative team consists of two or more individuals who are equal in status and decision-making capabilities. In the case of an inclusive team composed of a general educator, both professionals come to the classroom with identifiable strengths and weaknesses; therefore, both teachers can provide each other with useful strategies for instructing learners (Nolet & Tindal, 1996). One way to accomplish this is to regularly schedule time to model instructional techniques targeted for use with specific learners (e.g., the special educator's demonstrating a behavior-management technique or the general educator's presenting a reading strategy).

EXAMINATION OF INCLUSION MODELS

Researchers, Zigmond, Baker, Jenkins, Jenkins, Deno, Fuchs, Fuchs, and Couthino have been involved with designing, implementing, and examining five models of inclusion and have found varying results regarding their effectiveness. This writer will describe three of these five models critically examining the components of each model.

The purpose of research and overview of each method will be identified through a review of each individual model. A general overview of each mode, framework of each model and a description of the teacher's roles in regards to the particular models will also be described. A brief conclusion will be given as to the effectiveness and/or drawbacks of the approach with respect to academic and social outcomes at the end of each model summary. The end of the review will summarize the findings and a conclusion will be drawn as the effectiveness of the inclusive programming for learning disabled students.

OVERVIEW

Five well-established elementary inclusion models, servicing students with learning disabilities were visited and the delivery of services offered in these inclusive models was documented in the spring of 1993. The five sites were chosen because of their geographical variety and their approach to full-time integration of students with disabilities (DeVries, 1997). The sites were located in Virginia, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Kansas, and Washington. (The later three were reviewed in this paper).

The names of the schools were changed to maintain confidentiality (Zigmond, 1995).

The purpose of their research was to examine and carefully describe educational programs of students with disabilities in the inclusive classroom across the country. The focus was on students with learning disabilities because these students were the largest segment of students being served in special education. (DeVries, 1997). "Nationwide, 2.25 million students, nearly one-half of all students with disabilities, are certified as having learning disabilities" (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1995). An administrator selected the individual students and arranged for permission to collect data on these students and scheduled time to talk with teachers and parents. Notes were taken within the classroom as to the experience of the students, the services the students received, and the roles of the teachers (DeVries, 1997). Interviews were taken from students, his or her parents, general and special education teachers, and the principal and the special education supervisor of the building. Interview protocols were designed for the research project. The target students with disabilities and the students without disabilities completed the Reading and Mathematic subtests of the basic academic Skills Samples (BASS). Mean scores for each class of students were compared to the norms derived from large-scale testing in Minnesota. Individual scores for each class were also converted into z-scores to compare each target student's reading level to his or her classmates. These comparisons were used to determine if students with disabilities were integrated into low-achieving classrooms and whether individual achievement of students with disabilities was low in relation

to the class (DeVries, 1997). Additional information was collected such as, standardized testing, reasons for referrals, and Individual Education Programming. Lastly, in efforts to understand the inclusive model to its fullest extent, copies of report cards, parent/students handbooks, IEP forms, and a local description on inclusive models were obtained.

INCLUSION MODEL X: KNIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Overview of the Model

The Kansas model was reviewed by Zigmond (1995). The Kansas model was in its fourth year implementing its own variation of the Hudson Class-Within-a Class Model (Reynaud, Pfannenstiel & Hudson, 1987), which is called the Collaborative Teaching Model (CTM). The model included three special education and five general education teachers. The teachers volunteered to participate in the model. The CTM focused on direct instruction, modified materials, assignments, and tests, remediation with study buddies, and extra practice for all students, disabled or non-disabled. These techniques were delivered through co-teaching of both special and general education teachers. Specific services delivered to students with disabilities included direct instruction in large group by the special education teacher, modified materials and extra practice (DeVries, 1997).

Framework of the Model

Knights Elementary School was an urban school with an enrollment of about 315

students. Forty-five of the students were labeled learning disabled or educable mentally impaired. The CTM model required a significant number of students with disabilities (seven to eight) at each grade level. The school building did not generate enough referrals for the program, resulting in a recruitment of students with disabilities to transfer from other buildings (Baker & Zigmond, 1995). No distinction in the CTM curriculum was made among these two groups.

Funds from the Kansas Department of Education helped to implement the CTM. Three special education and five general education teachers volunteered to participate in the model however. The model emphasized a high standard on placing students with disabilities in classrooms with only teachers who wanted to participate in the inclusive program (DeVries, 1997). Both the principal and teachers, stated the success of the program depended on teachers who wanted to participate in the inclusive model.

Literature distributed by the school stated no more than 40% of the students in the CTM classroom have disabilities. The CTM classrooms had three to five students less than their general education counterparts not participating in the CTM. At the primary level, one special education teacher was paired with one first grade teacher and one second grade teacher. The special education teacher spent three hours, five days per week in each classroom. At the intermediate level three teachers (one third grade teacher, one fourth grade teacher, and fifth grade teacher) were paired with two special education teachers. The special education teachers spent two hours, four

times per week in the CTM setting.

Collaborative planning was built into the schedule, however, planning time was not always continuous. That is, it was frequently interrupted. Planning was formerly conducted once a week, although impromptu planning seemed to occur all the time. During planning, roles of the special education teacher and general education teacher were not defined, but what and how the curriculum would be taught was determined. There was not distribution of responsibilities, both teachers did everything together. The general education teacher stated whoever teaches, the special education teacher of herself, just sort of happens. Planning was directed at the activity level (what assignment or worksheet would the group be given, not at the level of the individual student. The special education teacher contended that the general education teacher and her were very different people. She stated conflict was inevitable, so a compromise was accepted. The special education teacher stated, for example on Monday they would teach her idea and on Tuesday they would teach the regular education teacher's idea (DeVries, 1997).

The special education teachers spent all their time in the CTM classrooms teaching, implementing thinking strategies, and modifying materials. As the collaborative partner, the special education teacher did not feel isolated, but had others to share the responsibilities. Occasionally, the special education teacher was pulled from the CTM classroom to fulfill duties due to the charge of special education, for example, student referrals or attending an IEP meeting. The general

education teacher filled the traditional role of a teacher, rendering support and instruction to all learners in the classroom.

The teaching of strategies, such as the Cognitive Curriculum for Young Children (in the primary grades) and Building Thinking skills (in the intermediate grades) was a major feature of the CTM, and responsibility to teach curriculum fell on the special education teacher. These strategies were various types of thinking skills that enhanced students writing, reading, and mathematics abilities.

Teacher Roles

Both special and general education teachers were in the classroom four hours per day using a variety of strategies such as, graphic organizers and hands-on projects. The teachers manage the room with name cards and names on sticks. Both teachers monitored, prompted, and asked questions of students. According to the general education teacher, the CTM curriculum was the same as that of the other fifth grade classes. She explained that the curriculum was not sugar coated. She stated further, it was my responsibility to teach the unit and the special education teacher's responsibility to give advice and throw in strategies. The special education teacher expressed that certain students did struggle in fifth grade. She randomly pulled that ones who were struggling. Though, she admitted there was little time to work one-on-one with students. The special education teacher admitted that these students were pretty much treated like the rest of the class.

Summary

In reviewing the CTM model, many drawbacks seem to surface even though this well planned model was implemented with the best intentions from college professors, school administrators, and teachers. The following drawbacks were observed:

- (a) In the CTM classes, though the integrated classes were reduced 3-5 students less than that of the general classroom, the number of students with disabilities was high, average seven students with disabilities per classroom.
- (b) The model was not a school wide effort, holding a small proportion of the school responsible for the success of the CTM model.
- (c) The collaborative teaching model did provide two teachers 40-60% of the day, to be in the classroom at the same time (provided special mandated duties did not take the special education teacher out of the classroom). But, the infrequent planning time did not address individual abilities or define the individual roles of teachers.
- (d) Individualized planning was not evident in the model. One special education teacher stated that there was no difference in expectations of the students with disabilities. They were all students who were treated alike.
- (e) Training was not documented for teachers, support staff, or students. A great reliance was placed on the study buddy or partner to assist, redirect, and motivate students with disabilities. It was observed that the partners easily gave answers to students with disabilities.
- (f) The continuum of services was not maintained. That is services such as

resource room were not maintained for those students with disabilities that needed more specialized instruction that the regular education classroom could provide.

(g) Lastly, no students observed to be gaining academically in the CTM classroom. There was no evidence observed or provided through testing to prove these students with disabilities were benefiting academically. At best, the teachers, and one parent felt, that there was an improvement in the student's self-esteem.

INCLUSION MODEL Y: WORTHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Overview of the Model

The University of Washington researchers helped the staff integrate students with learning disabilities into the general education setting in September of 1998. Baker and Zigmond (1995) observed and described the model. University involvement continued for 4 years with continual reducing support. The inclusive programming included the whole school and all the teachers received in-service training. The design included Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC), Reading Mastery, cross-age tutoring, in-class specialist teaching, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), teacher assisted teams, Skills for Schools Success, Active Mathematics, and collaborative planning. Special services provided in the general education classroom replaced resource programming (DeVries, 1997).

Framework of the Model

Worthington Elementary School was a school of 400 students, grades kindergarten

through sixth, 42 of the students were learning disabled. These students attend their home school. There was two to three classes at each grad level and 30% were Mexican American. The principal stated any given class could have been predominately "at risk".

The whole school participated in service training. All teachers received some in-class, co-teaching support from the special education teacher or support staff. All the inclusive teachers were expected to change in instructional processes that were intended to help students with disabilities (DeVries, 1997). It was noted that teachers unwilling to work with students with disabilities were given the choice to transfer to another building in the district.

In completing their fifth year of design, CIRC had been modified and pull-out services added. Two-thirds of the students were receiving additional help outside of the classroom such as special education groups before and after school, Reading Mastery groups, and enrichment activities. Also, special educational personnel had developed support roles.

The special education teacher worked with one class at each grade level with the help of an assistant in alternating rooms. The special education teacher facilitated cross-age tutoring, conducted Reading Mastery groups, taught extended school day remedial groups, instructed one-on-one, monitored individual behavioral interventions and modified academic assignments. The special education teacher's day was so busy that co-planning periods were not built into her day. Collaborating

with other teachers happened in passing.

Two students with disabilities, one second grader and one sixth grader were observed over the course of two days in the inclusive setting.

Teacher Roles

Teacher A: The special education teacher described her role as offering instruction that supported what the students with and without disabilities did in the classroom. Depending on what was needed, additional assistance may have been within the classroom or at a different time of the day. The special education teacher stated her day began at 7:30 a.m., teaching an extended day for an hour. She was in and out of the inclusive classrooms until 10:30 where she held class wide peer tutoring sessions. She held a group called "lunch bunch" which gave support for general education math instruction. The rest of the day she was in the inclusive classrooms. The special education teacher stated she could plan with the inclusive teachers after 2:15 p.m., which was at the end of the day. She also stated she did not have co-planning time with the teachers. If planning time was found, discussion was based on what was being taught in the classroom. The discussion usually was about modifying assignments. The general education teacher participated in the traditional role of teaching. She also walked around the room and monitored students as they worked in groups.

Teacher B: The general education teacher taught in the general education classroom in the traditional manner, while the special education teacher supported the

classroom through monitoring and instruction in small group, pull-aside activities. The two teachers together modified materials when needed. The special education teacher was responsible for the extended day, which resembled the traditional resource instruction, reinforcing math and literature assignments for the given day. The general education teacher integrated class wide peer tutoring in his classroom. It was used to reinforce and reteach what was being taught in the regular education curriculum.

Summary:

In reviewing the model, many drawbacks seemed to surface even though this well planned model was implemented with the best intentions from college professors, school administrators, and teachers. The following drawbacks were observed:

(a) The model incorporated many different components to insure the students with disabilities were receiving enough remediation, but the individual education of the students with disabilities seemed to get lost in the shuffle.

(b) It was noted by the principal the objective of the inclusive program was students with disabilities had to only demonstrate knowledge of concepts taught such as grammar rules and high productivity was not necessary. However, both students with disabilities were observed being off task, cheating, not completing assignments, not following directions, and not demonstrating knowledge of concepts by the fact they were guessing.

(c) Special education assisted teaching in the integrated classroom seemed minimal because the special education teacher was being overworked.

(d) A great reliance of teaming and peer tutoring was used to monitor the students with disabilities. Behaviors, such as getting answers and accessibility to copying from partners and tutors raises the question to the benefits of pairing.

(e) No training, outside of the facilitating of the University, was noted for teachers, support staff, or students.

(f) Planning time was only in passing, which did not allow for collaboration of a student, namely for assessment or medication purposes. The program depended on the organizational skills of the special educator considering her tight schedule.

(g) Modifications occurred in volume of assignments and tests for all learners. Remediation occurred in small groups before and after school, while one-on-one help was also given if needed. This instruction was for all students, also no individual planning was demonstrated for the special learner.

(h) The continuum of services was not preserved. That is services such as resource rooms were not maintained for students with disabilities who may have needed more support than they were receiving in the general education.

(j) The students did not appear to be gaining academically. Zigmond, Jenkins, Fuchs, Deno, Fuchs, Baker, Jenkins, and Couthino (1995), in a three year multi-study, part of which was conducted in Washington, comprised fall and spring BASS reading performance scores of 13 students with disabilities. Of the students

with disabilities assessed in Washington, 38% surpassed the standard error of measurement which indicated the students with disabilities made a real growth in reading. However, this also means in one academic year 62% of the targeted students with disabilities failed to show gains in reading achievement.

INCLUSION MODEL Z: MADISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Overview of the Model

Morningside Public School District implemented a local inclusion model that focused on alternative reading strategies. The teachers participation was strictly volunteer. The students with disabilities had a preset schedule, however, they were clustered with other students with disabilities and pulled out for one-on-one. The clustered groups and the one-on-one were taught by the special education teacher through direct instruction. The special and general education teachers taught in the inclusive setting to the whole group. Within the classroom, study buddies were used to help students with disabilities.

Framework of the Model

Madison Elementary School, a suburban school, had an enrollment of 410 students in grades kindergarten through fourth. There were three classes at each grade level. Students with disabilities attended their home schools (Baker & Zigmond, 1995). Of the 21 students with disabilities, 12 were students labeled learning disabled. All the students with disabilities in-class, as well as pull-out services was received from two

special education teachers.

The intermediate school had an attendance of 1,650 fifth and sixth graders. To prepare students for junior high, a teaching exchange was developed. Special and general education teachers were divided into ten teams, averaging seven members each proportionately among the students. One special education teacher was given to seven of the ten teams.

Approximately 200 students were disabled. The continuum of services provided included; self-contained classes, resource rooms, and inclusion in the general classes.

The model was developed by the local personnel. The teachers volunteered to participate in the model. It was noted the success of the model depended on finding teachers that wanted to participate. This model distributed as many students with disabilities, as appropriate, in general classes. The in-class services consisted of the alternative reading program. The elementary level used a variant of Orton-Gillingham, as their alternate phonetic reading instructional program, while the intermediate level used strategies in small group lessons (DeVries, 1997). The teachers received special training to qualify them to teach the alternate reading program. Initially, the alternate reading program had been offered to students with disabilities. Students at-risk were included in the program because of the success of the program, which was paid by special education funds. However, at that time, the district adopted a new literature based basal reading program and many in the school district believed the new literature program placed more students at-risk. Also, the

state did not allow students without IEP's to be taught by special education funds, which the alternating reading program was funded by special education. The in-class special education program was designed to include students with disabilities and students who were at-risk. Also, students with disabilities participated in a pull-aside alternative reading instruction in the inclusive setting, regardless of need, in a small group. These students also received reinforcement of the reading skills taught in the alternating reading program, in a pull-out resource room program, taught by the second special education teacher. The principal replied as to the inconsistencies of having a special education teacher implement the alternative reading program within the general education classroom and when she would leave the students with disabilities, they would be taken to the resource room for more reinforcement in reading skills taught in the alternating reading program.

The special education reading program in the resource room was not supporting the general education reading program which all students were taught. Although, the pull-aside alternative reading program did support the general education's reading program.

At the intermediate level, inclusion was based on team decisions. Students with disabilities were distributed among the team teachers for homeroom and content area classes. During reading mathematics, students with disabilities were grouped in one class and the special education teacher and the general education teacher had the opportunity to co-teach.

At the intermediate level, no planning time was set aside for the special education teacher within the general education classroom. The teachers generally took time at the beginning of class to plan. At the primary level, the special education resource teacher, who had students in the inclusive setting, had no planned time to meet with the teachers in the classrooms or the inclusive special education teacher. Support teachers and aides kept the line of communication open about the students with disabilities within the inclusive setting (DeVries, 1997). The resource teacher developed her own lessons independent of the objectives taught in the inclusive classrooms. It was documented that she had no idea what was going on in the regular classrooms.

Teacher Roles

Teacher A: The special education teacher working in the inclusive classroom went into the rooms of students with IEP's. The district mandated special education services could only service students that had been labeled. The special education teacher taught a pull-aside alternative reading program within the general education classroom. It was designed to have the special education teacher in the resource room reinforcing the reading skills taught in the alternative reading program. This was not observed. The principal was not happy that the students with disabilities were having to be pulled from the general education classroom to be serviced by the resource teacher, which is inconsistent with the idea of inclusion, which is to keep students with disabilities full-time in the general education classroom. The special education

teacher stated in regards to the pull-aside alternative reading program and the pull-out resource reading program, that the two systems were not compatible, but that there was no choice in the matter. In some of the buildings in the district they did not participate in the alternative reading program and in this building the teachers wanted it.

The special education teacher did not have scheduled planning time with the general education teachers. The principal noted that some of the planning was done over lunch. Moreover, the special education teacher did not know if the skills taught in the alternative reading program were being transferred to the general education reading program. She confessed she did not know because she was not in the room when the students were reading their books. The special education resource teacher stated she depended on the general education teachers to make a contact with her if there was a problem with any of her students.

Teacher B: The special education teacher co-taught with the general education teacher in both reading and mathematics. It was observed the general education teacher reviewed the daily schedule for the students. She instructed students to work on an assignment in the computer lab monitored by the student teacher. The student teacher was observed later, working with a small group of students who were reading orally, discussing the novel, and completing a semantic map. The general education teacher was not observed working much with the students in the inclusive setting.

The special education teacher worked with a small group, including a small pull-

out group in the back of the general education classroom. The students reviewed a ditto containing measurements for half of the period.

Summary:

In reviewing the Minnesota model, many drawbacks seemed to surface even though this well planned model was implemented with the best intentions from the district, school administrators, and teachers. The following drawbacks were observed:

(a) The model was a part of the continuum of services for students with learning disabilities. Not all educators were involved in implementing the approach, approximately three-fourths were involved.

(b) Students "at-risk" were not allowed the services of the special educator so a second reading program was implemented, but the two reading programs did not coincide with one another. This contributed to the problem of inconsistencies of instruction between the special education inclusive reading teacher and the resource teacher.

(c) The primary level model was school wide, distributing students with disabilities evenly throughout the grade level, which held the whole school accountable for the success of the program. However, one special education teacher followed a fixed schedule in the general education classrooms, but she had no co-planning time set aside to collaborate with the general education teachers.

Furthermore, the special education resource teacher had no planning time with the

general education teachers or the special education teacher who implemented the alternative reading program.

(d) The special education teacher who implemented the alternative reading program in the inclusive setting and the special education resource teacher worked independently of each other. The in-class service focused on the alternative reading program, whereas the pull-out service provided reinforcement in oral reading and math, while neither programs aligned to support each other.

(e) At the intermediate level, roles were determined by the individual teams. During mathematics and language art, learning disabled students and low achievers were placed together.

(f) No training outside of the teachers receiving alternative reading training was noted.

(g) A strong dependence on the classroom partners and cooperative grouping was seen.

(h) The students observed in the classroom were not noted as gaining academically. There was no proof through observation or through test scores to indicate the inclusive program was meeting the special needs of the student. No social gains were noted by the testimony of the teachers or the observed students in the inclusive setting.

Conclusions

At this point, the models of Kansas, Washington, and Minnesota have been reviewed collectively and conclusions regarding inclusion can be drawn from these models.

First, special education in the form of inclusion is no longer special education. Baker and Zigmond (1995) wrote in their article about the implications of the models, "based on our observation of 10 students with learning disabilities in the six schools (three of which were reviewed in this paper) over 10 school days, as well as our conversations with school personnel, we believe that students with learning disabilities in these models of inclusive education were getting a very good *general education*" (p. 175). Individual programming for students with disabilities was not observed in the inclusive models. "Accommodations that were made were generally implemented for the entire class" (p. 175). It was clear in the inclusive classrooms, by design, special education was no longer special.

Special education has to be focused on individual need, carefully planned and delivered consistently with research supported practice (Zigmond & Baker, 1996). To support this point, Baker and Zigmond sent out their collection of data and observations of the models to colleagues that were experts in the field of inclusion. These colleagues responded with the following comments. The first colleague noted instruction was not more intensive or more individually delivered (Zigmond & Baker, 1995). He also stated instruction was the key ingredient, not placement (Zigmond &

Baker, 1995). The second colleague stated special education requires a deliberate organization and remarkable instructional efforts (Zigmond & Baker, 1995). The third colleague said special education needs the adapting of materials and instructional strategies and instruction presented in a structured, clear, paced manner, monitoring progress (Zigmond & Baker, 1995). It was clear opportunities in the inclusive classroom for students with disabilities were not available and it was evident by the researchers and their colleagues. Opportunities for individualized programming was lost to the idea students with disabilities needed to be in the same classroom as students without disabilities.

It is true the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) required "to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities...are educated with their nondisabled peers, and that separate classes, separate schooling, or removal of children within the regular environment occurs only when the nature and severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aides and services cannot be attained satisfactorily" (IDEA , sec. 6612 (5) (B)). The law protects students with disabilities to be placed in the general education classroom, but only when the students are served satisfactorily. The observed students were not served satisfactorily in the inclusive model.

Secondly, outcomes were poorly displayed through academic or behavioral outcomes. Washington was the only model providing reading performance test scores from the BASS of students with disabilities in the fall and spring. The scores

signified 38% of the students with learning disabilities assessed made reading gains above the standard error of measurement. Subsequently, 62% of the students with disabilities tested did not prove to gain in reading performance in the inclusive setting. More than half of the students with disabilities did not make any academic gains in reading in one academic year.

Moreover, the dissatisfaction of services, shown by the lack of output from students with disabilities, could have been a reflection of the fact that little or no continuum of services were available. The continuum refers to instruction for school-age children in resource rooms and self-contained classes, in day treatment and residential programs, to early intervention and school-to-work transitions (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1995). Carlberg, Kavale, Sindelar, Deno, Madden, Slavin, Leinhardt, and Palley all agree for certain that special education programs appear to promote greater academic gains than do general education classrooms (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1995).

Outcomes, in the inclusion model in achievement were unsatisfactory despite the fact that a great amount of monetary and professional resources were used, and extraordinary efforts by administrators and teachers in the models. An appropriate scale for measuring the effectiveness of inclusive programming is to demonstrate whether the student with disabilities performance had improved within the setting (Zigmond, Jenkins, Fuchs, Deno & Fuchs, 1995). In the observations of students with disabilities in the inclusive classroom, the level of participation and the engagement in learning tasks suggested not much learning was taking place (Zigmond

& Baker, 1996).

Moreover, the inclusive school personnel needed to make a commitment, adopting the integrated philosophy that students with disabilities could achieve in the general education classroom, if individual programming was received.

Within the classroom, the general and special education teachers needed to monitor and adapt on-going instruction to meet the individual needs of students with disabilities. All the sites used modified materials, assignments, and evaluated tasks. Teachers had shortened assignments such as weekly spelling words, numbers of problems in math assignments and made opportunities available to rehearse reading selections. Literature has suggested that general education teachers make few substantive instructional modifications in their classes, although minor modifications such a shortened assignments and preferential seating are somewhat made more often (Baker & Zigmond, 1990). These modifications were made not only for the students with disabilities, but also the student without disabilities. "Rarely were adaptations directed at a single student. When they did, they consisted of more explicit instructions repeated, specifically, to a particular student" (Baker & Zigmond, 1995, p. 173).

Along with adaptation to the individual student with disabilities, goals and objectives in the students IEP needed continual assessment through observation, classroom work, teacher made tests, informal assessment, and standardized testing, in order to monitor progress. The curriculum needed to be adapted (outside of just

reducing assignment length and reducing the number of spelling words) to the specific style of learning of the student with disabilities, adding new material, at the student's individual pace. Curriculum needed to be presented at an instructional level, in the students zone of proximity. It was observed the students with disabilities were functioning at a frustration level within the integrated classroom. Also, learning strategies needed to be implemented, such as preorganizers, memory games, highlighting new and important information, reducing expectations, breaking down tasks, and using assisted adaptations like computers and larger print. These help the students with disabilities use specific tools in how to learn.

Thirdly, co-planning and collaboration are an important component in inclusive work together outside of the co-teaching environment. Planning time was built into the schedule of special education teachers in Kansas, on-the-fly in Washington, and not at all in Minnesota. "Observations of two planning meetings highlighted the types of decisions that were required for co-teaching to work smoothly. Mostly teachers talked about what would be taught and how it would be taught. The special education teacher made suggestions for ways to infuse learning strategies, graphic organizers, or a hands-on activity into a lesson that was outlined in the teacher's manual" (Baker & Zigmond, 1995, p. 172). Planning did not include data from the students IEP's. Formal and informal testing was not part of the collaborative planning. Discussions of what worked well previously were not heard (Baker & Zigmond, 1995)

Planning and collaboration was essential in the implementation of individual

programming. "For inclusive classrooms, teachers need to plan what will be taught by whom and to map out how the special education teacher will function in the classroom" (Roach, 1995). It has been noted planning time was helpful in not only enhancing the inclusive setting but also in helping teachers build on the strengths of the other inclusive teachers (Roach, 1995).

Lastly, all the models wanted to give the students with disabilities more assistance, which was given in the form of peer assisted help, or namely a study buddy. "Peer-mediated strategies served to increase the opportunities for individual student responding and provided coaching for students who could not manage classroom work on their own" (Baker & Zigmond, 1995, p. 174). Teacher assisted support was replaced with peer assisted support. This was concerning because the support by the students was not always behaviors that would benefit the student with disabilities, such as students without disabilities giving answers and cheating.

In closing, the three models that were reviewed provided instruction to students with and without disabilities in the general education classroom. However, many implications from this type of instruction was observed for the student with disabilities. One of the implications noted was lack of teacher training. Bender (1985) found in earlier studies teachers were anxious about the quality of academic work students with disabilities were producing in the mainstream classrooms, and expressed it was because their own level of preparation for mainstreaming.

Training would help in developing an inclusive program that would better meet

the individual needs of students with disabilities. Throughout this overview of the three inclusive models, it was noted in two of the three cases, administrators, teachers, and students involved in the inclusive classrooms were consistently not trained in the implementation of the inclusive program. Lack of training was apparent, through the observation of little or no planning time, poor or no collaboration, very few effective strategies or remediation implemented for students with disabilities, no distinction in teacher roles, and no academic proof students with disabilities were benefiting in the inclusive classroom.

Those involved with the inclusive classroom, administrators, teachers, parents, and possibly students, needed training such as in-service training designed to highlight all the components that promote success. First, special education teachers must have unique preparation as to provide unique services to students with disabilities (Zigmond & Baker, 1995). Noted by one of the colleagues, preservice and inservice preparation for general education teachers must continue to emphasize the way in which the general education teacher can accommodate the needs of diverse learners, students with disabilities among them, in the general education classroom (Zigmond & Baker, 1995). Examples needed to be demonstrated as to preferred roles of teachers, support staff and students involved with the inclusive students. The administrator needed to be educated in special education and have knowledge of the importance of properly delivering inclusion. The administrator could have then helped oversee the delegation of roles and ensure the proper services were being

rendered. Also, if trained properly with the right information, the administrator could have lobby for her school to keep the continuum of services, keeping in mind inclusion does not meet the needs of all students. Proper training could be beneficial to all those involved with inclusion.

Specific roles for teachers in the inclusive setting include providing large and small group instruction, teaching learning strategies, planning collaboratively to meet individual students needs, assessing groups needs, planning whole-class instruction, and monitoring. As teachers, both special and general education, prepare for the roles of inclusion, addressing both individual and group needs, it is safe to assume training is an inevitable component for the success of inclusion.

CHAPTER THREE

PURPOSE OF STUDY:

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the six different models of inclusion at the elementary level within the district being examined. Attention will be drawn to the overall consistency of the district as a whole. Highlighted issues of concern to be examined include: implementation of inclusion, key challenges of inclusion, successful practices of inclusion, key components of change within inclusion and individual perspectives on district consistency in regards to inclusion. Comparison will also be referenced back to the literature review in chapter two within Inclusion Model X, Y and Z.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The district being examined was chosen because of its positive reputation in regards to its implementation of inclusion. The district is a public school district in a suburban setting. Enrollment for pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade is 4,797 students including all general, alternative and special education students. Enrollment for pre-kindergarten through sixth grades contained in the six elementary buildings being studied is 2,460 students. Enrollment includes students in both general education and special education services self-contained rooms for the disabilities of emotional impairments (E.I.), mental impairments (M.I.), autistically impaired (A.I.), and resource rooms servicing E.I., M.I., A.I., learning disabled (L.D.), physically or otherwise health impaired (POHI), speech impaired and all inclusion services.

For the purposes of this study, the six elementary buildings will be labeled buildings A,B, C, D, E and F. Enrollment and staffing numbers are as follows:

BUILDING	MODEL	ENROLLMENT	SECTIONS PER GRADE LEVEL	SPEC. ED. STAFF	PARA-PRO'S	GEN. ED. STAFF
A	K-6 inclusion w/ nec. Pull-out	556	3	3 inclusion fac.	13 total 5.5 inclusion	13
B	K-6 inclusion w/ nec. Pull-out	385	2-3	3 inclusion fac. 2 self-cont. A.I.	10 total 4 inclusion	12
C	K-6 modified inclusion w/ nec. Pull-out	171	1	1 resource 1 inclusion	4 total 2 inclusion	7
D	K-3 modified inclusion 4-6 resource	413	2	2 self-cont. E.I. 1 inclusion 1 resource	9 total 3 inclusion	3
E	K-2 resource 3-4 modified inclu. 5-6 inclusion	513	3	1 inclusion fac. 2 resource	4 total 3 inclusion	12
F	K-6 modified inclu. w/ nec. Pull-out	422	2-3	1 self-cont. EMI 1 self-cont. MI 1 inclusion fac. 2 resource	14 total 8 inclusion	15

**General Education staff numbers reflect those classrooms who service inclusion students

**Inclusion Fac.= Inclusion Facilitator (a title that some buildings use)

From the break-down of the preceding numbers in regards to enrollment and staffing, it can be concluded that within the models, Buildings A and B stay more in line with the definition of "true inclusion". Buildings C, E and F use a more modified approach and Building D uses a more resource/pull-out model.

PARTICIPANTS:

A sampling was taken from all six elementary buildings within the district. 25 participants were given an interview survey either in person or over the phone. The test collector recorded all results. Participants included all six principals from Buildings A-F. Building A included 3 teachers; 1 special education teacher (K-3) and 2 general education teachers (first and second grade). Building B included 3 teachers; 2 special education teachers (K-2, 6th) and 1 general education teacher (third grade). Building C included 3 teachers; 1 special education teacher (K-3) and 2 general education teacher (fourth and fifth grade). Building D included 4 teachers; 2 special education teachers (K-3, 4-6) and 2 general education teachers (first and second grade). Building E included 3 teachers; 1 special education teacher (5-6) and 2 general education teachers (fourth and fifth grade). Building F included 3 teachers; 1 special education teacher (3-6) and 2 general education teachers (first and sixth). Buildings A-F total 25 participants with 6 principals, 8 special education teachers and 11 general education teachers.

SURVEY:

The interview survey was developed to 1) gain perspective on the overall consistency of implementation of inclusion practices, 2) find commonalities of successful practices within the inclusion models, 3) find common challenges within implementing inclusion and 4) gain a clearer understanding of staff perspective on the issue of inclusion.

Survey questions included the following: a) How is inclusion being implemented in your classroom? (Note: when asking this question to the six building principals, wording was changed slightly in the following way: How is inclusion being implemented in your "building"?) b) What are the key challenges you face with implementing inclusion? c) Tell me, in priority order, the five things that make this a successful inclusion program. d) If you had the authority to create the most successful inclusion program possible, what would be the key components? (Note: this question was often para-phrased in such a way to include additional prompts such as: "in a perfect world, what would you change?" ..."if you could start from scratch with your program, would you make any changes or would you keep it the same?" ..."what key components would you add that are not currently there?"...etc. These prompts of clarity were needed in the test collectors opinion for better overall understanding of the question. If this survey was to be repeated in another study, the question would be totally rewritten for better clarification, consistency and clarity). e) Do you feel inclusion is functioning consistently across the district? f) Please provide any additional comments you would like to share in regards to inclusion.

SURVEY RESULTS

The responses to the questions on the interview/survey will be organized by building (A-F). Pertinent comments to the overall view of consistency within the district will be included for reference. Notes of similarities and differences will be described within each building and then by the district as a whole. For the third

question of *"tell me, in priority order, the five things that make this a successful inclusion program"*, all answers will be listed out with a number behind it signifying the people that gave the same response. Therefore, more than five responses may be listed to this question.

BUILDING A:

How is inclusion being implemented in your classroom/building?

"Inclusion is being implemented consistently across the whole building. I feel it is being run very close to a textbook case for inclusion. There is very little pull-out being done. We currently staff 3.5 special education teachers. 13 classrooms in all do inclusion (5 classrooms do not). We also staff a zero-hour program before school begins each morning. Zero-hour also includes our itinerant staff of speech, O.T. and P.T. so that less pull-out during the day is needed."

"I service 6 rooms and oversee 5 para-pros. In grades K-1, I pull students out for reading. In grade 2, I do a lot of team-teaching with the regular education teacher and in grade 3, I oversee the adaptations that my para-pros implement within the classroom."

"My classroom looks different every year in the regards to inclusion depending on the student's needs. I currently have 2 special education students (L.D.) in my room full-time. The inclusion facilitator comes into my room for 1 hour each day to team teach the whole class with me. My special education students are pulled for ½ hour each afternoon to work on writing and math skills on an individual basis"

"I currently have 4 special education students included all day in my room. I have one para-pro for the majority of the day (that person is primarily staffed for one of the special education students in particular, but she works with more than just that student). The inclusion facilitator comes into my room for 30-45 minutes/day."

What are the key challenges you face with implementing inclusion?

"To make sure that the students are making 1+ year academic gains per year within this model and to monitor these gains"

"To establish a schedule in the beginning of the year with how much I come

and go throughout the building. Sometimes I'm just spread too thin. I'd like to be in all the classes all the time."

"Keeping track of what the special education students are doing. Making sure that I'm not focused on just regular ed., but keeping special ed. and reg. ed. Balanced."

"It depends on the year, but this year it is the variation of disabilities. One of my special education students is so severe, that a 1 on 1 para-pro is needed"

Tell me, priority order, the five things that make this a successful inclusion program:

1. Parental support (2)
2. Incredible staff
3. Zero-hour
4. General education staff knowledge
5. Administrative support by special education director
6. Staffing support (number of para-pros at the right time of day) (2)
7. Team Model (not "my kids" / "your kids" philosophy) (3)
8. Administrative support by principal
9. Knowledge of adaptations by special education staff
10. Establishing a flexible working schedule (3)
11. Planning time with general education staff (2)
12. Support staff (O.T., P.T., speech, etc.) in constant communication
13. Class size

If you had the authority to create the most successful inclusion program possible, what would be the key components?

"The same components we currently have...I love how it's going, finally! It took us 5-6 years to get here with lots of training of staff...Attitudes are awesome and working well! This is the first year of better comfort with inclusion for everyone!"

"The same components we currently have...I love my current program, however we have a lot of special education kids here because we are one of the few buildings in the district doing true inclusion. I would not allow for special education numbers to get too high. I would try to keep special ed. and gen. ed. in more natural proportions that are a better reflection of the community as a whole which is 3%-7%."

"I would train and hire more competent staff. I would not just hire to fill another spot in the building. I would have lots of staff training."

"I would make a matrix on each student be a mandatory requirement for all staff to work on for each special education student. The matrix would be reflective of IEP goals. I would create planning time for the staff to work on these matrixes in the beginning of each year."

Do you feel inclusion is functioning consistently across the district? Please explain.

"No. Building based decision making options are a very good thing. It's not a cookie cutter aspect in regards to inclusion across the district. All buildings are different and that's a good thing."

"No. Percentages are not equal, therefore it is skewed inappropriately. We have way too many special education kids here because other buildings are not doing true inclusion and parents want their kids here. If all buildings would do it how we do it, numbers would be spread more proportionally."

"No. I think it's a disservice to students not to do inclusion, but it can't be pushed on anyone. It's a philosophical choice, if you don't believe in it, it's not going to work. Administration is at fault for not giving adequate training when this whole change occurred. If training would have been consistent across the district, they practices would have been more consistent across the district. People are only scared of the unknown, the things that they don't feel comfortable with. Give them training and knowledge and their comfort levels will increase dramatically. Administration is too passive, too easy and thus there are problems. They let anyone do anything...as long as no one rocks the boat too much and too far."

"No. I feel 2 buildings are doing it well (although even within those buildings, some pull-out is needed). You must be flexible to individual students needs. The rest of the buildings are simply doing a glorified model of pull-out and calling it inclusion with no idea of what inclusion truly is."

Additional comments:

"Inclusion benefits all special and regular education. We're surrounded by this in our community, and teach kids to be more empathetic in regards to all people by doing inclusion."

BUILDING B:

How is inclusion being implemented in you classroom/building?

"We take what they give us. We look at numbers for the following year."

Each year is different. We have 3 inclusion facilitators servicing K-2, 3-4 and 4-5."

"I work with K-2. We go (para-pro or myself) in the room with small groups. Option is there to team teach within full group too. Three para-pros are overseen by me."

"I work afternoons only. In the mornings, my para-pros support the rooms. In the p.m., I do math ability groups (gen. and spec. ed.) in room. Language in room supporting general ed. teacher. Reading is taught in pull-out model."

"I receive services for my special education students for ½ the day by special education staff. The special education students are pulled for reading 1.5 hours and then back to regular ed."

What are the key challenges you face with implementing inclusion?

"The struggle between whether you can deal with the given issue within the classroom or do you need to do pull-out. How you do mixed groups appropriately for reading and math for general ed. and spec. ed."

"Working with general education teachers and their attitudes."

"Communication issues with personalities and time. There are too many general education teachers for me to communicate effectively with."

"Communication with the vision of inclusion. Staff certainly does vary on this philosophically."

Tell me, in priority order, the five things that make this a successful inclusion program:

1. Quality staff who are all on board (2)
2. Ability to keep in mind individual student needs
3. Parental buy-in / communication (3)
4. Funding
5. Few behavior problems
6. Flexibility (2)
7. Cooperation between general ed. and special ed.
8. Administrative support
9. Staff expertise
10. Creative planning
11. Positive modeling to students by teachers
12. Physical space

- 13.Accountability to curriculum
- 14.Communication of staff
- 15.Structured schedules
- 16.High standards

If you had the authority to create the most successful inclusion program possible, what would be the key components?

"I would keep the same components we have. Inclusion started here by a lot of special education teachers...it truly is going well here. The teachers knew what they were doing from the beginning and implemented it correctly. This particular staff (gen. ed. and spec. ed.) is on board together which is truly rare."

"Good communication with the general education teachers and to be more aware of what's going on in general ed."

"One special education teacher to one general education teacher ratio. I would have trained para pros who are involved in an extended zero-hour program."

"I would actually do away with inclusion and go back to a more "mainstreamed" mode...only including special education students in the fun subjects or subjects that they can handle well (science, soc. studies, etc.). I think they (special education students) should be pulled back to resource for the major key subjects."

Do you feel inclusion is functioning consistently across the district? Please explain.

"No. And this is not necessarily a negative thing. There are different needs in different buildings. We all have different categorical rooms and different pressures. Some buildings primarily service E.I., some primarily A.I., and some primarily M.I., and all service L.D. Due to these differences, inclusion runs differently."

"Not been in the district long enough to know"

"I don't know because I'm just coming back from a long leave back into a part-time inclusion position."

"No. It's bad if you're in a bad setting (and some are bad in this district). It's good if you're in a good setting. If we all moved to a good, consistent model you would have less talk/poor reputations about some buildings."

Additional comments:

"I think the director of special education is way ahead of the game. There is true balance within these programs. We do a good job of being seamless to service all special education kids to the best extent possible."

BUILDING C:

How is inclusion being implemented in your classroom/building?

"I facilitate inclusion for grades K-3 and oversee/schedule paraprofessionals for each grade level. In the a.m., I'm in classrooms all the time (all grades broken to ability reading groups...I take the lowest across the board). I have a room, but meet in small groups all over the building. I team-teach in the p.m. for math."

"I have an inclusion paraprofessional or the inclusion facilitator in my room everyday for at least half the day. We do whole group and small ability groups for both general ed. and special ed. with accommodations."

"I have a lot of support from 2 inclusion facilitators and a paraprofessional for at least half of the day."

What are the key challenges you face with implementing inclusion?

"Time issues are a big concern with planning. Getting all staff on board to allow special ed. kids to come into the general ed. classrooms. Balance of what to allow the paraprofessional staff to plan for and accommodate. You can only put so much confidence in this."

"Adult supervision of staffing. Keeping all schedules clear. Keeping abreast to everyone's concerns. Having flexibility with regular ed. staff."

"Making sure that we're meeting all student's needs. We try to remedy that by team teaching and much communication between us...we talk a lot!"

"Communication between special and general ed. staff."

Tell me, priority order, the five things that make this a successful inclusion program:

1. Dedicated staff (2)
2. Flexible staff (4)
3. Financial support
4. Building space
5. Team effort with administration (2)

6. Parental support (2)
7. Exceptional paraprofessionals
8. Flexibility of placements (realization that inclusion is not for every child)
9. Adequate staff numbers (2)
10. Knowledge of individual student goals/objectives
11. Having the zero-hour program
12. Awesome students who buy into the program

If you had the authority to create the most successful inclusion program possible, what would be the key components?

"I wouldn't add any more key components...we've been able to start from scratch three years ago already."

"The biggest key component to successful inclusion is teacher attitude...you just pray for positive ones."

"I think we already have many of the key components. To have a special education teacher in my general education room full time would be great, however!"

"Some of the keys are adequate planning time (in my opinion this is at least one time per day). Smaller class sizes and more paraprofessional assistance is also key."

Do you feel inclusion is functioning consistently across the district? Please explain.

"No. I believe this is happening for different pragmatic reasons. I don't think we're doing inclusion well across the board through the district...I don't know how this could be changed, but change needs to happen to make it more effective. There is too much leniency among administration to implement this. We need to have more direct guidelines from the top."

"No. It's not that we're not servicing children effectively, but because the buildings all run so very differently. If we were more consistent across the district we could explain ourselves better and teacher attitudes may be more positive. Non-compliant choices about doing inclusion may not be as acceptable as they are now."

"No. If there are better ways out there, I'd love to know how they work (as a resource) I've heard that lots of the programs in the district are not running as "true" inclusion, yet they call it that."

"I don't know much beyond my small little world, but from what I here at

grade level meetings, I think they run it in other buildings the same as we run it here."

Additional comments:

"I don't know how we ever did without it. Pull-out was not the answer. Kid's self-esteem has risen dramatically. I love doing it!"

BUILDING D:

How is inclusion being implemented in your classroom/building?

"We don't have inclusion at this school. It's a sketchy model that only happens around certain people's comfort zones. There are many who think inclusion happens here in lower el., but inclusion is more than just a parapro in a classroom and more than team teaching one lesson, one time a week. Our upper el. program knows it's not inclusion, so they don't call it that."

"Every year looks different. I team teach on Fridays. We have a balance with some pull-out. I oversee three parapro at three different grade levels. The parapro adapt the curriculum."

"Inclusion is done on a limited basis. It is individualized for each student. Some kids are just shifted from resource to self-contained. A more mainstreamed model is done from social studies and science with no special education or parapro support."

"No team teaching is done. I have a parapro in my room full time to adapt the curriculum and really work with all students. Inclusion person pulls my special education kids for reading working on phonographics and individualized reading needs."

"Para-pro all day...phonographics on Fridays taught by inclusion specialist to full group...ability reading groups from special education and general education everyday."

What are the key challenges you face with implementing inclusion?

"Personnel...staff attitudes are very difficult. This can be a group dynamic or individual dynamic."

"Meeting everyone's needs by being just one person. Thank goodness for the extra help of parapro."

"Staffing... if the numbers aren't enough, it comes back on me for planning and implementing everything. The kids have learned a lot of problem solving skills (without adult supervision). You just get creative and flexible."

"Ability reading levels constitutes more groupings. Too many levels all in one room is hard."

"I don't really have many challenges. It's gotten easier with keeping track of all their needs and services."

Tell me, in priority order, the five things that make this a successful inclusion program:

1. Regular education teacher support/flexibility (3)
2. Parapro support (3)
3. Flexibility among pull-out
4. Ability to satisfy individual needs
5. Serving all kids (not just special ed.)
6. Communication with staff
7. Positive attitude of students
8. Parental trust/imput
9. Ability to adapt curriculum (2)
10. Inclusion person coming in to do ability group

If you had the authority to create the most successful inclusion program possible, what would be the key components?

"The biggest component would be to make every new hire essentially critical to the overall success of a new inclusion program. This is where a positive change could happen. It is extremely difficult with older staff. I would ask the question of whether this staff wants to do inclusion. I would ask the question of central administration if I have their support. I would start training the staff on true inclusion."

"I like our current components and don't feel any needs for change."

"I don't know of any key components because I'm not interested in full inclusion. I like this modified version of more resource. I don't think this general education staff wants inclusion or could really do inclusion."

"I'd run a true inclusion program starting with sixth grade and filter it down. Team-teaching would play a big role. More staff would be needed. If you're not running a program in a true inclusion model, those kids are falling. Either

do full pull-out of true inclusion. This in-between is where the students fall through the cracks."

Do you feel inclusion is functioning consistently across the district? Please explain.

"No. Absolutely not...there is no leadership."

"No. And that's not good...Some people have the choice (regular ed.) to do inclusion or not. Some buildings allow this and others don't. If we're an inclusion district, we should all be doing it across the board. They may look different, but they exist."

"I truly don't know what's going on across the district because I'm not that involved with inclusion that much. It's not functioning consistently in this building. I know that the ones who are doing it, love it...let's just do what's best for each kid."

"No. From grade level meetings, I can see that the programs are run very differently. Guidelines would be helpful."

"I don't know what's going on around the district. I barely know what's happening in my own school. I don't get out of my room very much."

Additional comments:

"I really think the target focus should be on principals. The only people who think we're leaders in inclusion is us. We have the arrogance of success."

"I think a lot of regular education teachers are ignorant. They have a lack of knowledge which could be rectified if there was more teacher training."

"I have mixed feelings on inclusion. I just want to be able to keep my parapro."

BUILDING E:

How is inclusion being implemented in your classroom/building?

"Our 1st and 2nd grades are run like a traditional resource room model with full pull-out, our 3rd and 4th grades are run as modified inclusion and our 5th and 6th grades are run as full inclusion with some ability grade pull-outs. All programs receive some parapro support to some degree or another."

"I would call my program full inclusion, however, I 'm probably not a purist. I do some pull-out for ability groups, but service both general ed. and special ed. within the group. I team-teach almost the entire day in the 5th grade classroom. I also oversee the zero-hour program."

"I have a parapro almost the entire day. I have about one hour per day with the special ed. inclusion person coming into my room for math to take the low ability group."

"I have an inclusion parapro for about ½ the day who is very reliable and helpful. The inclusion person comes to pull my reading kids because they are so low. She also does ability groupings for general ed. and special ed. students for math."

What are the key challenges you face with implementing inclusion?

"Having enough support in the classroom for students and teachers without regular ed. feeling burdened. Finding the comfort level (of regular ed.). It's not necessarily more assistant parapro support that is the answer."

"Planning time is a challenge to find because my blocks of time are taken up so quickly. Parapro assistant training in the beginning of the year is a challenge. To plan and test my kids with formal assessments is very hard due to time constraints."

"Being able to meet special ed. student needs when special ed. staff isn't around or available. Stations seem to work well to alleviate this, but that's a challenge with time also. Time to plan accommodations is also hard."

"You want kids to be a part of the classroom, but want to cover basic skills appropriately. Some days I don't have enough time."

Tell me, in priority order, the five things that make this a successful inclusion program:

1. A willing attitude from regular ed. (2)
2. Flexible special ed. staff
3. Supportive parents (3)
4. Adequate parapro support (4)
5. Atmosphere of building (going beyond comfort level)
6. Understanding/flexible principal (2)
7. Little behavioral issues with students (2)
8. Adequate foundation in lower el. to prepare for upper el.
9. Regular ed. teachers with special ed. background

- 10.Ability group flexibility
- 11.Proper adaptations/modifications
- 12.Accepting general ed. students

If you had the authority to create the most successful inclusion program possible, what would be the key components?

"I would keep all of our components and make no changes."

"I would try for more assistant education and training. I would try to create more time in a day...ha, ha.! Otherwise, I'm very happy with the way we're doing things."

"I would create smaller class sizes (18 or fewer students). I would try to match up academic levels better. We have three sections of each grade level, so I would try to separate them low, medium and high. Right now we put ACT (superior advance students) with low inclusion students and I just don't think it's always right with such a wide spectrum. Competent special ed. staff across the board would also be key. Creating ample time with staff within the school day."

Do you feel inclusion is functioning consistently across the district? Please explain.

"No. I think the reason is because from the very beginning of implementation of inclusion five to six years ago, too much leniency and 'do whatever you want' attitude was accepted. People were told to work it how they saw fit. Not enough guidelines for implementation and consistent training so we'd all be on the same page."

"No. I do not think that is necessarily a bad thing. If you look at kids individually, one program of inclusion may work so much better than another program. Having differences within these programs lends much more to flexibility of what the child needs uniquely."

"No. Some of us think we're doing inclusion as a whole consistently, but in reality I think many are just "modified" examples with much pull-out."

"I just don't get out enough. I only know what happens here at my school. I don't hear enough about the outside."

BUILDING F:

How is inclusion being implemented in your classroom/building?

"For grades 1 and 2, there is a combo of in classroom instruction and pull-out. It is not necessarily a traditional resource room because there are times during the day that team teaching occurs with teachers or paraprofessionals."

"I oversee 5 paraprofessionals. I pull some kids, but I also team teach in the regular ed. classroom for about 4 hours/day. My paraprofessionals assist in general ed. rooms most of the day."

"The inclusion facilitator meets weekly with me to discuss curriculum. She team-teaches for social studies. We both work on adaptations. Math is taught with many adaptations. Reading is pulled into separate room."

"I don't participate in a full inclusion model. It is more a resource model. In the morning the special ed. students are pulled for reading and math and in the afternoon, they are included with a paraprofessional."

Tell me, in priority order, the five things that make this a successful inclusion program:

1. Communication (2)
2. Parental involvement and support
3. Teacher knowledge
4. Student profiling
5. Administrative support (3)
6. Willing teachers (2)
7. Adequate paraprofessional support (2)
8. Flexibility (2)
9. Patience
10. Team planning
11. Compromise in teaching styles/ideas

If you had the authority to create the most successful inclusion program possible, what would be the key components?

"I would start from scratch, but still look at who my staff is philosophically. I would do away with assumptions until the real process starts to happen. In this school, we've always just gone about our own business with no one telling us that we're doing it wrong...that has been a disservice. The building blocks were never laid. I would start with staff development training because now we're paying the price."

"I would limit the amount of classrooms and teachers you would have to work with (ideally I think it should be one special education teacher to two general education teachers). I would also limit the caseload numbers. I would find only willing teachers to work with."

"I would have one special education teacher working with only one general education teacher all day. I would probably design it so that we would team teach for $\frac{3}{4}$ of the day and pull-out for $\frac{1}{4}$ of the day."

"The only key component I would include would be more parapro support, but I must say that we tried the full inclusion model and hated it. I think it is important that the flexibility is there to meet individual kids' needs."

Do you feel inclusion is functioning consistently across the district? Please explain.

"No. Not even close. There is no district consensus. As long as there is a continuum of services, inclusion can come in many different forms. There are pieces that you have no control over (like staff attitude). Overall, however, I don't see it as a major problem to be functioning differently."

"No. It is a big problem in this district. You will always have differences between buildings, but the general feel across the district should be the same. There is a lack of cohesiveness and lack of standards through the district. There is too much freedom to simply do things how we want. If someone simply stepped in and said this is how we're now going to function as a district in regards to inclusion as a whole, I think a lot of people would welcome it. There are inequities between buildings due to lack of leadership and administrative control."

"No. But it can be a good thing depending on how it's handled. I've heard through the grapevine that many kids are not serviced adequately in other buildings, however."

"No. I think it's a good thing because we used the flexibility we've been granted to not have to go be a prescription of how inclusion should work. We tried it and didn't like it and revamped to a more resource model. The population is simple too different in each building."

Additional comments:

"I fully believe in the whole idea of inclusion. It evolves over years. A lot of work is to be done between special education teachers and administrators. It's a process that takes a lot of time, but needs to have leadership manning every aspect to stay on target."

CONCLUSION

From the documented survey results in the previous section, many conclusions can be drawn. The following conclusions are based on the survey/interview given to the samples within each building and informal conversations with each sample, most specifically the building principal on staff attitudes, etc. Only questions #1-#4 will be reported in this section. Extra attention and detail will be given later on question #5 in the area of district consistency.

Inclusion Practices Per Building:

Building A focuses on a very linear and pure model of inclusion building wide. Most of the staff is very happy with what is happening and have bought into the philosophical idea of inclusion. There is great support and collaboration between special education and general education. Building A is looked upon as a leader within the district. Building B is run very similar to Building A and would also be looked upon as a leader within the district. Building B seems to have a few more issues with teacher personalities and staff attitudes. Not everyone has bought into inclusion, but the high majority has and makes the program very successful. Building C is run as a slightly more modified version of inclusion due to the amount of pull-out being used. However, all pull-out is deemed necessary due to individual student needs. As a whole, the overall view of inclusion is clear and consistent throughout the building. Most staff love what is going on and buy into inclusion philosophically. Building D is struggling in the area of inclusion the most. The staff is very divided on comfort level and philosophical views. Some general education

teachers are completely disinterested in doing inclusion and currently have the choice of opting out. Where inclusion is thought to be happening in lower elementary, is not due to the fact that the model pulls all special education students all week long except for one hour, one time a week for collaborative team teaching. The whole upper elementary program is run as a true resource model. Building E is run in a clear and concise way with labeling or calling the different programs exactly what they are. They do not try to glorify inclusion or try to apologize for not doing it. They do what works for the building, students and staff ability/comfort levels. They describe three programs: 1) resource: full pull-out for grades 1-2, 2) modified inclusion for grades 3-4, and 3) full inclusion/team teaching for grades 5-6. Building F did not start off on a good note from the beginning with inclusion. Staff attitudes and personalities are a hindrance. Each grade level runs differently depending on teacher comfort level. Modified inclusion with necessary pull-out describes the program as a whole.

Consistency of Inclusion District Wide:

When asked the question on opinion of consistent inclusion practices through out the district, the following results were found:

Do you think inclusion is functioning consistently throughout the district?

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Yes	0	0%
No	19	76%
I don't know	6	24%

Is this positive or negative for the district?

<u>Opinion</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
positive	4	21%
negative	14	74%
indifferent (or both pos. + neg.)	1	5%

These results reflect the major basis of this study as a whole. It is this writers intent to answer the question of whether inclusion is being run consistently. From the results shown above, it can be concluded that no one thinks that it is run consistently. Most people (76%) certainly think that it is not run consistently. This result falls in line with the writer's initial prediction/description of the district's consistency. The 24% who do not know all, all came from the regular education classrooms. Historically, those people have not had the opportunity to get out of their building/placement to see what is going on throughout the district. When looking at staff perception's of this inconsistency, it can be concluded that 6% (in actuality, 1 response) thinks that it is neither a positive or negative. 21% think this is a positive thing and 76% think that it has a negative effect on the district as a whole. In the writer's opinion, many good and critical statements were made on why this is negative for the district. Similarly, many good and critical statements were made on the positive impacts that inconsistency and choice can make throughout the district.

Overall, it can be concluded that the district is not currently running conclusion in a consistent manner. Many arguments have been found in support of this way of

implementation. Similarly, arguments have been found to not support this implementation.

Comparable Concerns From the Literature:

Four major areas of concern are common between Models X, Y and Z from the literature review in chapter two and the district being studied in this chapter. The areas include: 1) little to no planning time amongst general education and special education staff, 2) little training to the staff as a whole, 3) not every classroom in the buildings were implementing inclusion, and 4) overworked/ / "spread too thin" special education staff.

Model Y (Worthington Elementary School), Model Z (Madison Elementary School) and Buildings C, D and E from the district studied all make references to the issue of planning time. Model Y is described as, "Planning time was only in passing which did not allow for collaboration of a student, namely for assessment of mediation purposes. The program depended on the organizational skills of the special educator considering her tight schedule." Model Z is described as, "The primary level model was school wide, distributing students with disabilities evenly throughout the grade level, which held the whole school accountable for the success of the program. However, one special education teacher followed a fixed schedule in the general education classrooms, but she had no co-planning time set aside to collaborate with the general education teachers. Furthermore, the special education resource teacher had no planning time with the general education teachers or the special education

teacher who implemented the alternate reading program."

Model X (Knights Elementary School), Model Z (Madison Elementary School) and Buildings A, D, E and F of the district studied all make references to the issue of staff training. Model X is described as, "Training was not documented for teachers, support staff, or students...". Model Z is described as, "No training outside of the teachers receiving alternate reading training was noted."

Model X (Knights Elementary School), Model Z (Madison Elementary School), Buildings C, D and F of the district studied all make references to the issue of building-wide implementation. Model X is described as, "The model was not a school-wide effort, holding a small proportion of the school responsible for the success of the program." Model Z is described as, "The model was part of the continuum of services for students with learning disabilities. Not all educators were involved in implementing the approach, approximately three-fourths were involved."

Model Y (Worthington Elementary School) and Buildings A, B, D, E and F of the district studied all make references to the issue of overworked special educators. Model Y is described as, "Special education assisted teaching in the integrated classroom seemed minimal because the special education teacher was being overworked."

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are several recommendations from this analysis of consistent inclusion programming district wide. First, when dealing with inclusion, a positive attitude is

required. An inclusive classroom is a place of trust, collaboration, and effective problem-solving among adults and children. An inclusive classroom takes hard work, honesty, a willingness to listen to others, open-mindedness to try new ideas, patience, and compromise in order to be effective (Cutting, 1998).

Second, appropriate teacher training should be available and mandatory to staff implementing inclusion. The training should be the same district wide so that a better chance of collaboration and consistency could be visible throughout the district. Differences will always be visible due to staffing, students and attitudes, but training could make a major difference.

Third, teachers must attend conferences, read literature on inclusion, and have additional planning time with the IEP team and other individuals who have a role in the education of the child with disabilities. Just planning in passing is not adequate to meet the academic and behavioral concerns of each individual student.

Fourth, teachers must seek out others who will support them in meeting the needs of the children with disabilities by getting parents and community members involved in the inclusive classroom. Create cooperation and acceptance among the students and families involved in inclusion.

Finally, adequate resources are essential to the success of inclusion. "Inclusion without resources, without support, without teacher preparation time, without commitment, without a vision statement, without restructuring, without staff development, won't work" (O'Neil, 1994/1995, p. 8).

REFERENCES

Arguelles, M.E., Hughes, J.T. & Schumm, J.S. (2000). Co-teaching: A different approach to inclusion. Principal, 79, (4), 48-50.

Baker, J. and Zigmond, N. (1995). The meaning and practice of inclusion for students with learning disabilities: Themes and implication from the five cases. The Journal of Special Education, 29 (2), 163-180.

Bauwens, J. and Hourcade, (1995). Cooperative teaching: Rebuilding the schoolhouse for all students. Pro-Ed.

Bauwens, J., Hourcade & Friend, M. (1989). Cooperative teaching: A model for general and special education integration. Remedial and Special Education, 10 (2), 17-22.

Bender, W.N. (1985). The case against mainstreaming: Empirical support for the political backlash. Education, 105, 279-287.

Beninghof, A. (1997). Making Inclusion Work: Practical Classroom Strategies (Grades K-6). Resource Handbook. Bellevue, WA: Bureau of Education & Research.

Cartledge, G., and Johnson, C.T. (1996). Inclusive classrooms for students with emotional and behavioral disorders: Critical variables. Theory Into Practice, 35, 51-57.

Castle, S. L. (1996). Improving Interpretative Skills of Preservice Teachers for Modifying Curriculum to Improve Instruction for Young Special Needs Students Placed within Inclusive Education Settings. Nova Southeastern University: Practicum II Report presented to Education Dissertation Program in Child Youth Studies in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of Doctorate of Education.

Cook, L., and Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. Focus on Exceptional Children, 28, (3), 1-16.

Cook, L. and Friend, M. (1993). Inclusion. Instructor, 104, (4), 52-56.

Cutting, S. (1998, January/February). Inclusion: Keys to Making it Work. Schooldays. pp. 6-7.

Eichinger, J., and Woltman, S. (1993). Integration strategies for learners with severe multiple disabilities. Teaching Exceptional Children, 26, (1), 18-21.

Falvey, M.A., Givner, C.C. & Kimm, C. (1995). What is an Inclusive School? In Richard A. Villa & Jacqueline S. Thousand (Eds.), Creating An Inclusive School. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Farber, B. (1991). Crisis in education: Stress and burnout in the American teacher. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fisher, J.B., Schumaker, J.B., and Deshler, D. D. (1996). Searching for validated inclusive practices: A review of the literature. In E. L. Meyer, G. A. Vergason, & R. J. Whelan (Eds), Strategies for teaching exceptional children in inclusive settings. Denver: Love Publishing.

Frank, A., and McKenzie, R. (1993). The development of burnout among special educators. Teacher Education and Special Education, 16, 161-170.

Fuchs, D., and Fuchs, L.S. (1994). Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform. Exception Children, 60, (4), 294-309.

Fuchs, L.S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C.L., Phillips, N.B., and Bentz, J. (1994). Classwide curriculum-based measurement: Helping general educators meet the challenge

of student diversity. Exceptional Children, 61, (5), 440-459.

Fuchs, D. and Fuchs, L.S. (1995). Counterpoint: Special education- ineffective? Immoral? Exceptional Children, 61, (3), 303-306.

Fuchs, L.S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C.L., Phillips, N.B., and Karns, K. (1995). General educators' specialized adaptation for students with learning disabilities. Exceptional Children, 60, (6), 518-537.

Hourcade, J., and Bauwens, J. (2001). Cooperative teachers: The renewal of teachers. The Clearing House, 74, (5), 242-247.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C. Chapter 33, Amended as Public Law 101-476.

Johnson, L., Pugach, M. & Devlin (1990). Professional collaboration: challenges of the next decade. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22, (2), 9-11.

Karge, B.D., McClure, M. & Pattan, P.I. (1995). The success of collaboration resource programs for students with disabilities in grades 6 through 8. Remedial and Special education, 16, (2), 78-79.

Kauffman, J. (1994). One Size Does Not Fit All. Beyond Behavior, 5,(3), 13-14.

Langone, J. (1990). Teaching students with mild and moderate learning problems. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McNulty, B. A., Connolly, T.R., Wilson, P.G. And Brewer, R.D. (1996). LRE policy: The leadership challenge. Remedial & Special Education, 17, 158-167.

Morris, W., Editor. (1981). The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. pp. 951.

NEA Teacher-to-Teacher Books. (1994). Toward Inclusive Classrooms. National Education Association of the United States.

Nolet, V., and Tindal, G. (1996). Curriculum-based collaboration. In E. L. Meyen, G. A. Vergason, & R J. Whelan (Eds.), *Strategies for teaching exceptional children in inclusive settings*. Denver: Love Publishing

O'Neil, J. (1994/1995, December/January). Can Inclusion Work? A Conversation with Jim Kauffman and Mara Sapon-Shevin. Educational Leadership, 52, (4), 7-11.

Pugach, M.C., and Johnson, L.J. (1995). Collaborative practitioners, collaborative schools. Love Publishing.

Putnam, J.W., Spiegel, A.N., and Bruininks, R.H. (1995). Future directions in education and inclusion of students with disabilities: A delphi investigation. Exceptional Children, 61, (6), 553-576.

Reinhiller, N. (1996). Co-teaching: New variations on a not-so-new practice. Teacher Education and Special Education, 19 (1), 34-48.

Reynaud, G., Pfannenstiel, T., & Hudson, F. (1987). Park hill secondary learning disability program: An alternative service delivery model. Implementation manual. Kansas City, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 28931).

Scruggs, T.E., and Mastropieri, M.A. (1996). Teacher perceptions of mainstreaming/inclusion: A research synthesis. Exceptional Children, 63, 59-74.

Shanker, A. (1994/1995). Full inclusion is neither free nor appropriate. Educational Leadership, 52, (4), 18-21.

Simpson, R., and Myles, B. (1990). The general education collaboration in an elementary school. Intervention in School and Clinic, 27, (2), 116-120.

Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. & Arguelles, M. (1997). The ABCD's of co-teaching. Teaching Exceptional Children, 30, (20), 4-10.

Villa, R.A., Thousand, J.S., & Chapple, J.W. (1996). Preparing teachers to support inclusion: Preservice and inservice programs. Theory Into Practice, 35, 42-50.

Villa, R.A., Thousand, J.S., Meyers, H., & Nevin, A. (1996). Teacher and administrator perceptions of heterogeneous education. Exceptional Children, 63, 29-46.

Voltz, D., Elliott, R., & Cobb, H. (1994). Collaborative teacher roles: Special and general educators. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27, 527-535.

Will, M. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education.

Zigmond, N. (1995). Inclusion in Kansas: Educational experiences of students with learning disabilities in one elementary school. The Journal of Special Education, 29, (2), 144-154.

Zigmond, N. and Baker, J.M. (1995). Concluding comments: Current and future practices in inclusive schooling. The Journal of Special Education, 29, (2), 245-250.

Zigmond, N., Jenkins, J., Fuchs, D., Deno, S., & Fuchs, L. (1995). When students fail to achieve satisfactorily. Phi Delta Kappan, 76 (7), 303-306.

Zigmond, N., Jenkins, J., Fuchs, L.S., Deno, S., Baker, J., Jenkins, L., & Couthino, M. (1995). Special education in restructured schools. Findings from three multi-year studies. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 531-540.

Appendix

**INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
ON THE TOPIC OF INCLUSION**

Person interviewed: _____ position: _____
Building name: _____ date: _____

1. How is inclusion being implemented in your classroom?

2. What are the key challenges you face with implementing inclusion?

3. Tell me, in priority order, the five things that make this a successful inclusion program:
 - 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
 - 4.
 - 5.

4. If you had the authority to create the most successful inclusion program possible, what would be the key components?

5. Do you feel inclusion is functioning consistently across the district? Please explain.

6. Please provide any additional comments you would like to share in regards to the JPS inclusion program.

GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

EDS 695 DATA FORM

NAME: Laura N. Vos


MAJOR: Special Education Administration

TITLE: An Analysis of Consistent Inclusion Programming District Wide

PAPER TYPE: Thesis

SEM/YR COMPLETED: Winter 2002

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE OF APPROVAL



DESCRIPTORS:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Inclusion | 6. Staff Development for Inclusion |
| 2. Inclusion Concerns | 7. Problems with Inclusion |
| 3. Inclusion Strategies | 8. Communication |
| 4. Teaching Methods | 9. Elementary Special Education |
| 5. Teacher Attitudes Toward Inclusion | |

ABSTRACT:

The purpose of this study was to survey staff members in a given district to find shared commonalities and concerns amongst the six different models of inclusion currently being implemented district wide. An analysis was done to see if practices are consistent throughout the district and whether this has a negative or positive impact on the congruency of the district.