5-8-2000

A listing of modifications, models, and teaching roles utilized by inclusion teachers at a secondary school

Bruce N. Krout
Rowan University

A LISTING OF MODIFICATIONS, MODELS, AND TEACHING ROLES UTILIZED BY INCLUSION TEACHERS AT A SECONDARY SCHOOL

by
Bruce N. Krout

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree in the Learning Disabilities
Graduate Division of Rowan University
May 2000

Approved by_____
Professor

Date Approved May 8, 2000

ABSTRACT

Bruce N. Krout

A Listing of Modifications, Models, and Teaching Roles Utilized
by Inclusion Teachers at a Secondary School
May 2000

Dr. Stanley Urban
Graduate Program in Learning Disabilities

The purpose of this study was to determine which modifications, teaching roles, and responsibilities the regular and special education team teachers use to give support in inclusive secondary classrooms. The co-teachers were asked to make recommendations to improve inclusion program effectiveness. The information was collected through a questionnaire disseminated to seven regular educators and five special educators who team-teach in grades seven to twelve. The percentages of the teachers' responses were reported along with a list of teacher recommendations.

The first part of the questionnaire included a checklist of classroom modifications related to classroom organization, instructional methodology, assignment adaptations, testing modifications, and socialization adaptations. The majority of the team teachers use many modifications with the physical organization of the class, instruction, assignments, and testing. Very few inclusion staff utilize social adaptations at this secondary level. Part two of the survey found that the majority of the team teachers share classroom responsibilities such as determining materials, lesson planning, grading, and test development. The third survey section shows an equal use of the team teaching model and support instruction. The final section of the questionnaire asked for recommendations the respondents believed would improve the effectiveness of the inclusion program.

MINI – ABSTRACT

Bruce N. Krout

A Listing of Modifications, Models, and Teaching Roles Utilized
by Inclusion Teachers at a Secondary School
May 2000

Dr. Stanley Urban
Graduate Program in Learning Disabilities

The purpose of this study was to determine which modifications, teaching roles and responsibilities the regular and special education team teachers use in inclusive secondary classrooms. The staff, with the exception of social adaptations, uses a variety of modifications. The co-teachers were found to share classroom responsibilities and use team teaching models or support instruction equally.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Dr. Stanley Urban for his guidance and insight, and the Maple Shade Jr./Sr. High School team teachers for their time and efforts in this project. I also want to thank my loving wife, Lori, for her ongoing support.

Table of Contents

Page

Tables

Tables Page

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background

Teachers are being challenged to an extent never experienced before. The public school system in the U.S. is facing stronger demands for accountability and opportunities for parental choice in the form of vouchers. During the late 1980's and 1990's, teachers in New Jersey's public schools were being asked to prepare their students to pass high stakes, mandated, standardized tests. Paradoxically, during this same period more and more pressure by Federal and state education departments, as well as advocacy groups mounted to include special education students in regular classroom settings. Regular education teachers are being asked to meet the varied needs of included students along with the increased demands of the regular student population.

One of the earliest critics of special class placement was Lloyd Dunn. Many look at Dunn's article (1968), in which he questions the practice of placing students with disabilities in self-contained special schools and programs, and see him as one of the earliest critics of such placements. He believed in developing alternate methods of educating socioculturally deprived children with mild learning problems who were labeled educable mentally retarded. Dunn thought we should try serving these students in

the regular education classroom with special education staff acting as consultants or as part of a team of teachers.

A major educational milestone during the 1970's was the passage of Public Law 94-142, also known as the Education for All Handicapped Children's Act. That Act was later amended and became the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990 (IDEA). This Federal legislation mandated that schools were required to provide a free and appropriate education to all pupils with disabilities as defined in the legislation. This education was to occur in the "least restrictive environment" (LRE). IDEA does not mandate that all children with disabilities be placed in a regular class, but rather that school districts must offer a continuum of placement options from the most restrictive to the least restrictive settings.

Madeline Will (1986), an Asst. U.S. Secretary of Education of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, began promoting the Regular Education Initiative (REI). She was pressing for more accommodation of disabled students in general education classes and schools. The basis for this movement was the mixed results achieved by the "pull-out" programs, as well as the increasing interest in restructuring schools so that students with learning problems could learn in regular education programs. The inclusion movement has expanded since Will's address of the mid 1980's. The number of students with disabilities who are educated in general education classrooms has increased substantially since then, while the number of students educated in resource classes and segregated schools has declined (McLesky, Henry, & Hodges, 1998).

Need for the Study

While inclusionary placements have taken place for all types of disabled students, often the teachers involved feel ill prepared to take on this new venture. Many regular education and special education teachers are scheduled to work together with little experience, training, or direction to prepare and plan for the included students.

At the Maple Shade Jr./Sr. High School I have found many of the staff members asked to team teach are unaware of the teaching roles and accommodations used by other staff in the inclusion of mildly disabled students. In the last few years, team teaching has expanded from the Jr. High into the Senior High level. This expansion occurred into many more areas of study besides English and math. This has caused many teachers to be scheduled in team teaching/inclusive settings for the first time. There has been little formal preparation with mostly sporadic and informal networking by the inexperienced staff.

Purpose of the Study

This study will survey the Maple Shade Jr./Sr. High School staff to determine what the teaching roles and responsibilities are between the regular and special education team teachers along with the listing of accommodations used. As pointed out by participants in the Burlington County Inclusion Project (1999), "networking with others who have already made integration work within their building" was the one of the best ways to prepare and plan.

Value of the Study

The survey results will further the development of knowledge necessary to collaborate successfully. The administration and supervisors at Maple Shade High School could find the results helpful in directing others in their teaching experience. It will provide an insightful reference for teachers involved in an inclusive class for the first time. Inexperienced teachers will be able to have their questions answered regarding roles they could fill in their team teaching assignments. The staff will know what accommodations their colleagues are using to help the included students as well. The information shared in this study may also help to expand ideas for those who are already team teaching.

Research Questions

In order to accomplish the general purposes of this study, the following research questions will be answered:

Research question #1. What types of modifications or accommodations are used in the inclusive classrooms?

Research question #2. What are the division of roles and responsibilities between the regular and special education teachers who are team teaching in an inclusive setting at the Maple Shade Jr./Sr. High School?

Research question #3. What teaching models are utilized? Do the general and special education teachers jointly teach the lessons or does the team have one lead teacher while the other offers supportive instruction? Do the team teachers teach the same content but with the students divided into two smaller groups?

Research question #4. What recommendations do the team teachers have to make the program more effective?

Definition of Terms

- Continuum of services – This is the range of placement and instructional options that a school district can use to serve children with disabilities. Placement options may include regular class, resource room, separate class, separate school, residential facility, or a homebound/hospital environment. (Haring, N., McCormick, L. and Haring T., 1994).
- Inclusion - The practice of providing a child with disabilities with his or her education within the general education classroom, with the supports and accommodations needed by that student. This inclusion typically takes place at the student's neighborhood school (NICHCY, 1995).
- Full Inclusion – To have all handicapped children educated in regular classrooms regardless of the nature and severity of their handicap (Shanker, A., 1994 – 1995)
- Mainstreaming - The practice of providing a student with disabilities with *some* of his or her education in a general education classroom. Mainstreaming is not necessarily synonymous with inclusion or may be called "partial inclusion" (NICHCY, 1995).
- Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) – The educational plan mandated by the federal legislation in P.L. 94-142 for children with disabilities, which is designed and signed by parents, teachers, sometimes the child, and any additional professionals needed to implement the plan. The plan reflects short and long term goals for the child for a year, and the process is designed to ensure confidentiality; placement in

the least restrictive environment; and appropriate, individualized education (Haring, N., McCormick, L. and Haring T., 1994).

- Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) - The educational setting that is closest to full participation in the regular classroom but that still meets the exceptional student's special needs (Haring, N., McCormick, L. and Haring T., 1994).
- Regular Education Initiative (REI) – a perspective that all students with mild disabilities, as well as some with moderate disabilities, can and should be educated in regular classrooms under the primary responsibility of general education rather than special education (Haring, N., McCormick, L. and Haring T., 1994).

Study Limitations

There are certain limitations that must be taken into account when generalizing the results of this study. These limitations have their source in the selection of the sample and the methods used in this study.

- The sample size is limited to the thirteen teachers who team teach at Maple Shade High School. They represent a convenience sample.
- Due to the timing of this mid -year survey of team teachers, some responses may have varied compared to possible responses given later in the school year.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

History of Inclusion Programming

During the last forty years, there has been a continuing evolution in educating students with disabilities. Students who had been placed in segregated programs are being placed into more regular classes. The great debate of the past decade or so for school districts and parents is the issue of inclusion programming. What is the appropriate educational placement for the disabled student? What level of inclusion into general education is best for the student with disabilities?

Since the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) in 1975, students with disabilities have had a right to a "free and appropriate public education" in the least restrictive environment. Prior to this time during the 1960's and early 1970's, special education students were taught primarily in segregated classrooms and schools. Once a student was labeled, he was automatically placed into a special education class or school.

Critics of the special education system of the 1960's questioned its efficiency. Johnson (1962) stated the following:

> It is indeed paradoxical that mentally handicapped children having teachers especially trained, having more money (per capita) spent on their education, and being designed to provide for their unique needs, should be accomplishing the objectives of their education at the same or at a lower level than similar mentally handicapped children

who have not had these advantages and have been forced to remain in the regular grades [p. 66].

Lloyd Dunn (1968), the past president of the Council for Exceptional Children, wrote that the special education practices of that time were "morally and educationally wrong". Dunn felt that special educators were ineffective in educating the educable mentally retarded and wanted to halt the continuing expansion of special education programs as they were at that time.

Deno (1970) was in favor of a cascade system of special education service. This system was designed to meet the educational needs of individuals while keeping children as close as possible to their normal or home school setting. A cascade system offers a range of programs from homebound instruction to educational mainstreaming for the atypical learner. Almost thirty years ago, Deno stated, "Before the handicapped child can enjoy his right to respect as an individual human being, the total social organization of the schools must be remarkably changed from what it now is".

During the early 1970's many parents, educators, and legislators heard the critics' voices. Amidst this heightened awareness of the many questions and concerns of the quality of special education, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) was passed in 1975. This landmark legislation protected the rights of children with disabilities. The major components of P.L. 94-142 included:

1. Free appropriate public education.
2. Notification and procedural safeguards for parents.
3. Appropriate and necessary related services.
4. Individualized assessment by a trained professional.
5. Individualized education programs (IEP) developed for each student.

6. Education in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Of all of the above components listed, determining what the least restrictive environment should be for students with disabilities has been the most debated, most controversial topic. With the passage of P.L. 94-142, many students with special needs spent more time in general education classrooms. This mainstreaming movement became a popular way to meet the legal requirements of LRE. The special educators often found themselves in a new role as part-time consultants to the regular education teachers, sharing ideas about academics and behavioral management.

Following a call for general education reform in the early 1980's, Madeleine Will (1986), Asst. Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation, introduced a special education reform during a keynote address. In her speech, she questioned the efficiency of segregated special education programs, in both costs and educational outcomes. Will saw the "pullout" approach as a barrier to a successful education for students with disabilities. The beginning of the Regular Education Initiative (REI) is usually attributed to Will and her fellow proponents of "full inclusion", Wang, Reynolds, and Walberg (1886). These proponents of REI believe that regular educators can accommodate students with disabilities through curriculum-based assessment, effective teaching practices and collaboration with special educators.

As a result of REI and the movement toward inclusion during the past 14 years, students with special needs have been placed in general education classrooms for more of the school day. McClesky et al. (1998) examined the data on placements from 1988 – 89 to 1994 –95 school years from the *Annual Reports to Congress* by the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. They found that students with

special needs are being included in general education settings at an increasing and substantial rate while resource class and separate school placements have declined. In 1988 – 89, approximately 30% of the students with disabilities were educated 80% or more of the school day in a regular class. Seven years later, the number of students jumped from 30 to 48%. Meanwhile, resource room placements fell from 37% to 31%.

There have been many debates about inclusion, especially full inclusion. Many schools are moving toward the full inclusion of students with special needs into regular classrooms. This movement in recent years has come about through successful lawsuits brought by advocates and parents of severely disabled children. One such case, Oberti v. Clementon, NJ Board of Education, involved a young elementary student with severe disabilities. The federal judge who decided the case supported this young boy with Down's syndrome and his right to be educated with non disabled peers with adequate support.

During the early 1990's many major education organizations developed position statements cautioning against "full inclusion" (Learning Disabilities Association of America, 1993; Council for Learning Disabilities 1993). These organizations believe that not all students would benefit from being served in the regular education classroom. They do emphasize support for the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) which mandates the components of a free appropriate public education in the LRE while offering a continuum of alternative placements determined by a team approved IEP.

Reasons for Inclusion

There are numerous reasons given to include students with disabilities. There are researchers that address the educational benefits of inclusion for the disabled. There are others who point out the social benefits that the non-disabled have on the disabled and vice versa. Even the regular and special educators gain in the knowledge shared by teaching together in the same classroom.

Pro-inclusion advocates such as the NASBE (1992) point out that frequently: the expectations placed on many special education students in their special programs are often lower than the expectations placed on them in general education classes. Special education instruction has been criticized for focusing on 'drill and skill' activities rather than on high quality instruction. The thinking is that the "drill and skill" activities don't allow the student with special needs to use higher order thinking or be accustomed to paying attention for longer periods of time.

Reynolds (1989) advocates inclusion programming for mildly handicapped students. He sees a lack of evidence that special education enhances the academic and/or social growth anymore than what would be expected without it. By moving special teachers into the mainstream classes as co-teachers with the regular educators, Reynolds envisions both groups sharing in the instruction. The special educators would be effective in offering individualized, intensive instruction to students in need.

Using a curriculum-based measure, Waldron and McLesky (1998) found that students with mild learning disabilities taught in an inclusive class made significantly more growth in reading than similar students placed in a resource room setting. Math

progress was comparable for the two groups. Students with severe learning disabilities were also compared in the inclusive and resource classes. Both groups investigated made similar growth in reading and math. The authors see these results as a call to develop more effective materials and teaching techniques for the students with disabilities who are educated in nonrestrictive settings.

Banerju and Dailey (1995) found fifth-grade included students developed reading skills at a rate similar to the regular student population.

Opponents of inclusion practices often raise concern about what the educational impact would be on the regular students. Would educating a diverse group of students in an inclusive setting create a decline in academic or behavioral outcomes of the regular students? In a study by Sharpe, Youk, and Knight (1994), the findings revealed no adverse effects on the classmates of the included elementary aged students.

One outcome of inclusion programming has been the redefining of teacher roles as the regular educator and special educators find themselves co-teaching in the same classroom. Since the establishment of formal education in the U.S., the classroom setting has remained the same, a group of students taught by one authority figure, the teacher. Special education programs have seen the utilization of support staff to take direction from and to aid the special education teacher in implementing the program. Regular educators have been on their own. The only time a regular teacher had another person in their class was for practicum or student teaching purposes. Otherwise, the sharing of techniques or ideas only occurred in the teacher's lounge.

Because teaching has been a one person venture, co-teaching or team-teaching can be a stressful and demanding situation. To insure that team-teachers understand their

roles and collaborate effectively, preservice and inservice training programs are imperative to create an effective educational team (Wood, 1998). The co-teachers must collaborate as to what their respective teaching responsibilities are in each class situation. It is important for administrative staff to provide time for special educators and general educators engaged in co-teaching as specified in the program criteria of Chapter 14, Title 6 of the New Jersey Administrative Code (1999). There needs to be time during the school day for the co-teachers to plan for instruction and discuss student progress.

Both team teachers and students benefit from collaboration as the sharing of resources, expertise, and understanding of student needs occurs (Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Banerji et al., 1995). As Vaughn, Schumm, and Arguelles (1997) point out, team teachers learn from each other how to implement strategies, provide student support, and gain an understanding of curricular expectations.

Social Benefits of Inclusion

The social benefits of including students with special needs are an area of major importance to pro-inclusionists. The opportunity for the included students to develop a variety of social relationships and to view positive role models in class has had great appeal. Greater self-esteem has been suggested as another advantage of inclusion programming.

Over the years there have been numerous studies that have questioned the lower social skill levels of students with disabilities (Sale & Carer, 1995; Vaughn, Elbaum, & Schumm, 1996). Parents, educators, and advocates for students with special needs recognize this area of weakness and are looking for answers to help in development of

social functioning. One study by Kennedy, Shukla, and Fryxell (1997) found that included students with severe disabilities had more frequent interactions with non-disabled junior high students compared to the disabled students whose education occurred solely in special education classrooms. The included students also acquired larger friendship networks and more durable relationships. In other research, Gottlieb (1981) argued there is little evidence to support the idea that mainstreamed EMR children's social status is improved simply by placement. In fact, Gottlieb, Semmel & Veldman (1978) found that mainstreamed EMR children were rejected more frequently by their non-classified peers than their segregated EMR classmates.

In yet another study, Vaugh, Elbaum, Schumm and Hughes (1998) examined two slightly different elementary class settings for social outcomes. Comparisons of peer ratings of acceptance and overall friendship quality were studied between students with learning disabilities placed in a consultation/collaborative setting versus the co-teaching setting. Learning disabled students fared better socially in the consultation/collaborative setting where the special educator provided 1-2 hours of in-class services which included leading lessons, as well as working with individuals. The interesting factor the authors point out in this study, is that observations in the consultation/collaborative setting noted a "climate of high acceptance and high expectations while the co-teaching setting offered high acceptance but lacked high expectations. The mixed results of these various studies indicate the complexity involved in determining positive social outcomes and the factors that truly prompted this growth.

Improved self-esteem or self-concept is frequently discussed as another outcome of including students with disabilities. Stainback, Stainback, East, and Sapon-Shevin (1994)

recognized that students with disabilities who are included into regular classes may still need opportunities to associate with others with similar handicaps for support and a well-developed sense of identity. The findings of parent and teacher surveys of fifth-grade included students with disabilities suggested improved self-esteem (Banerji, et al., 1995). Students' comments in this study indicated that they enjoyed the lack of stigma associated with placement in special classes.

The inclusion of mildly handicapped students carries with it a two-edged sword when considering the potential stigma a pull-out education program has over the mainstream program. A student who is educated in a pull-out special education class has to deal with the shame or embarrassment of being taught "in the slow class". If on the other hand, a student that is included and receives intensive individualized or small group assistance from support staff or is accommodated by alternative tests or given copies of lecture notes, may be more stigmatized by virtue of these actions.

Preferences of Students with Disabilities

What do the students with mild disabilities prefer, pull-out resource support or in-class support? Jenkins and Heimen (1989) determined through their survey of elementary students', preferences about where and from whom they wished to receive instruction. The majority of the students preferred not to draw attention to their learning problems by having a specialist report to their class for specific assistance. The students surveyed would rather have their classroom teacher and the special educators who team-teach in class give the extra help required. If students must receive extra help, leaving the class altogether has slightly more appeal than having a specialist come into the class.

Their thinking was when they are pulled out, their peers are less aware of their skill deficits. Despite the fact that this is the more restrictive service, students see it as less embarrassing.

In another survey of sixteen 6th grade students with learning disabilities, eight preferred the pull-out service model, while six preferred inclusion, and two liked both models (Klingner, Vaughn, Schumm, Cohen, Forgan, 1998). These 6th graders were presently in an inclusion program but had been in a pull-out program over the past two years. Many of the students with LD perceived the inclusion setting as academically more challenging and that they accomplished more work. Some of the students with LD felt frustrated by the demands of an inclusion class and valued the pull-out setting. Klingner et al. (1998) believed that the survey results endorsed a continuum of services since some students with LD favored a more restrictive setting.

Teacher Preferences Toward Inclusion

Three and five years after the Regular Education Initiative was introduced, two separate studies were conducted to assess the attitudes and opinions of teachers about aspects of REI. The earlier study by Coates (1989) surveyed 94 regular classroom teachers. Generally, the respondents favored the current special education system. The most frequent suggestion by the regular teachers was to expand resource room services. The results showed that there was much skepticism about educating students with mild disabilities within the regular class while also obtaining the achievement levels of the entire class.

Two years later a similar study by Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, and Lesar (1991) reflected the results of the Coates study. The majority of the respondents felt the current pull-out programs in special education were the most effective. Less than one-third of the teachers surveyed thought that the regular classroom with special education consultants was the best placement to educate elementary students with mild disabilities.

Parental Preferences Toward Instruction

For any educational program to be successful parental support is a crucial element. One study by Palmer, Borthwick-Duffy, & Widaman (1998) pointed out the parental view on including children with severe disabilities. The results of this study indicate that when parents placed a higher value on the development of social skills, the more likely they were to embrace inclusion programming. Those parents who placed more value on individualized instruction and related educational services were less in favor of inclusion. As Irmsher (1996) points out, "a major complaint about inclusion from parents (of students both with and without disabilities) is that they don't feel their children are getting what they need to maximize their learning potential".

Inclusion Limitations and Considerations

There were many proponents of full inclusion who made comparisons between the Civil Rights Movement of the '60's and the rights of students with disabilities to be included in the regular education classroom. Critics believed that many placements were not only inappropriate for the disabled student but, in a number of cases, the rights of the regular students were ignored.

There were many instances where as Leo (1994) states, "schools lost much of their ability to maintain order", and "the right of all schoolchildren to a chaos-free classroom was not taken into account". Too often children with severe disabilities or behavioral problems, who required more than their fair share of the teacher's attention, were placed into a regular class at the expense of all of the regular students' education. Albert Shanker (1994;1996), a critic of indiscriminant full inclusion, points out that students with disabilities have varied needs where some would benefit from full inclusion and others may not. General education placements need to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Those responsible for school placements should look very closely at the pros and cons of including students with disabilities, especially children with severe behavioral problems, severe mental deficits, and the medically fragile.

Advocates of inclusion programming often questioned the success special educators had prior to the REI reform. Hallahan, Keller, McKinney, Lloyd, and Bryan (1988) found limitations with the research that was so critical of special education efficacy. They felt that a range of services should be available to educate the special education population.

There are many considerations that should be evaluated by team members, teachers, and parents when placement decisions are made. Would the student with disabilities successfully learn in a general classroom taught by a teacher who utilizes the indirect, discovery approach so commonly used and embraced? Will there be adequate support and accommodations provided? Will the curriculum be too abstract or too fast paced for the student with cognitive disabilities? Will it meet his/her needs for postschool life? These are just a few of the issues that should be addressed.

During the 1980's there was a push by education reformers to press for higher student performance. This was especially true in the areas of science and math curriculum. Math organizations, such as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, were looking for changes in the way math was taught (Woodward & Baxter, 1997). Emphasis on computational problem solving was decreasing while more involved problem solving was sought after to meet these higher standards. The teaching approach was also becoming more discovery oriented. This indirect instructional approach is likely to lead to failure by students with disabilities (Kauffman, 1999; Woodward & Baxter, 1997).

Woodward, et al. (1997) found that low-achieving students and students with learning disabilities made only marginal improvement after instructed by an indirect, yet innovative math curriculum. Average and high ability students benefited from this approach, however. On the other hand, students with disabilities have had success learning in a more systematic approach, such as direct learning (Gersten, Woodward, & Darch, 1986). The directed learning approach gives specific instruction, student response, guided practice, independent practice, and then the generalization of skills. Support staff need to realize that if placing a student with disabilities in with a teacher who utilizes the discovery approach, intensive direct instruction may be necessary to complete the learning.

At the secondary school level, those who are making placement decisions need to be aware that full inclusion is often very difficult to accomplish successfully. The skill level discrepancy between the student with moderate and severe disabilities and the regular student grows as the grades increase, making it more difficult for any similarity in the

activity to occur. Many teachers of students with moderate cognitive disabilities stress a "functional curriculum" (Gallagher, 1994). This curriculum emphasizes learning in areas such as basic consumer education, job skills, and other non-abstract, but usable life skills. Many courses at the secondary level, such as chemistry or U.S. History, are very abstract. The more abstract the activity the less chance for students with moderate and severe disabilities to learn and benefit from it. IEP participants need to consider the most appropriate placement for teenage students with disabilities. The focus of instruction should be on skills that will truly benefit the disabled student during and after his/her school years. When activities require large discrepancies in trials and time, the information may not be worth the effort, and something more valuable can be developed elsewhere (Brown, Schwarz, Udvari-Solner, Kampschroer, Johnson, Jorgensen, & Gruenewald, 1991). Brown et. al (1991) made good points related to socialization during inclusion. When adapting the regular education curriculum downward for an included student with severe disabilities, too often the amount of engagement socially is minimal while important learning opportunities are lost. IEP participants of secondary students should recognize that ample opportunities for meaningful social relationships can occur during the school day during non-academic activities such as: homeroom, gym class, lunchtime, extracurricular activities, etc. Parents who want to include their child with disabilities in a general education setting in hopes of developing social growth may be throwing away a specialized curriculum with intense, individualized instruction while really gaining little socially for the student.

Those who are making placement decisions about including students with disabilities need to consider, if they can, which regular education teacher they will schedule the

student with. Students with learning disabilities appreciated certain types of instruction and teaching styles.

In a study by Sawyer, Nelson, Jayanthi, Bursuck, & Epstein (1996), high school students with learning disabilities indicated that homework assignments were made more difficult by teachers explaining assignments too quickly or inadequately or not answering questions about it. The surveyed students recommended that teachers write the assignments on the board and make sure they understand what is to be done. Teachers who utilized a multi-modality teaching style were valued. In the Vaughn, Schumm, & Kouzekanani (1993) study, students of various abilities, including learning disabled, appreciated the teacher who slowed down instruction when needed. Often regular education teachers must decide between completing the pre-planned curriculum for the course or slowing down the pace of instruction to meet the needs of slower learners. Sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities by the teacher is an important consideration when determining placements.

Certain class activities are more beneficial for one type of student than another. For example, Pomplun (1997) found that students with moderate cognitive abilities and students with behavioral disorders fared poorly when asked to participate in cooperative learning groups. These students appeared to participate less in the activities and listened to group members less than other group members. This knowledge, along with an understanding of the types of activities certain teachers favor, could help in making the most beneficial placement decisions.

Maximizing the learning potential of students with disabilities should be the priority of IEP participants. Placing the individual student into the regular education setting that

will foster the most growth requires knowing the teacher's instructional techniques, disposition, and teaching philosophy while also understanding the student's needs, abilities, and goals. Add to this the evaluation of the type of support provided, and you realize the complexity inclusion brings to the education of students with special needs.

CHAPTER 3

Research Design

Design of the Study

This study examined the many types of accommodations used in inclusive programming within a Burlington County Jr./Sr. High School. A checklist will be used to explore the types of accommodations used by the team teachers. A follow-up questionnaire will also be used to determine how the regular education teachers and special education teachers divide their roles and responsibilities and which teaching model they employ. Lastly, the team teachers will be asked for any recommendations in order to improve inclusive programming for students and staff.

Subjects of the Study

The subjects will be seven regular education teachers and five special education teachers who team-teach at the Maple Shade Jr./Sr. High School. These teachers are engaged in instruction and teach in seven departmentalized classrooms in grades seven through twelve. The inclusion class settings include English, math, science, reading, and history. These teachers represent all of the teachers scheduled for team teaching and

represent a convenience sample for the researcher. The majority of classified students involved in this study are students with specific learning disabilities (NJ Administrative Code, 1999). The remaining special education students are classified as students with behavioral, communication, or neurological disabilities as defined in the NJ Administrative Code.

Instrumentation

The instrumentation used in this study is made up of a 57 item checklist that will be used to determine which modifications are being used and how frequently they are utilized. The modifications will cover classroom organization, instructional methods, assignment and testing adaptations, as well as, socialization adaptations. Respondents will be asked to select from four choices to indicate how often they utilize a specific modification; the choices are: frequently, often, seldom, or never use. The checklist format by Bacon and Schulz (1991) was used as a model in the development of this portion of the survey.

Teachers will be asked how they divide their roles and responsibilities. The following are examples of the types of questions that will be asked: Who decides what and how long a concept is to be taught and what materials are used? Who develops tests and who grades them? Who develops notes for lessons?

The teachers will also be asked to identify the type of co-teaching model they use based on the teaching options identified by the Burlington County Inclusion Project (1999). The options include parallel teaching, support instruction, team teaching, or complementary instruction. Finally, the teachers will be asked to make any

recommendations to make the inclusion program work more effectively. These recommendations will be related to areas of planning, scheduling, or programming.

Collection of Data

The information for this research will be gathered through a checklist, questionnaire, and interviews and distributed January 3rd, 2000. One survey will be given to the co-teachers in each of the seven inclusive class settings. They will be asked to confer and agree on each response to the checklist and open-ended questions. The completed questionnaires will be returned to this researcher's office mailbox. A cover letter and a copy of the actual survey can be found in Appendix A and Appendix B.

Analysis of Data

Each of the four research question results will be reported in a different way. The items from the modification checklist that teachers rated as using "frequently" or "often" will be ranked in order of frequency of use. The breakdown of teaching responsibilities by the collaborative teachers will be identified as a primary task of the regular education teacher, special education teacher, or a shared responsibility of both. Each task area will be reported separately. Four collaborative teaching models will be listed. A percentage of each teaching model utilized by the co-teachers will be determined. Teacher recommendations for inclusive programming improvement will be listed.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Results

Introduction

This study examined the collaborative programming used in a secondary school setting. A survey composed of four parts was disseminated among the 7 groups of team teachers. The special educators conferred with the regular teachers with whom they taught when filling out the survey.

A rating scale was the first part of the study used to determine the frequency that various modifications were being utilized. Items ranked as being used "frequently" or "often" were combined, as were the "seldom" or "never" responses. The percentage of inclusion settings that utilized a specific modification "frequently" or "often" were counted as an accommodation being utilized in that class.

The second part of the survey was a listing of teaching responsibilities to determine if the regular education teacher, the special education teacher, or both were responsible for specific classroom planning or grading activities. The results have been tabulated into number of teachers, and into percentages.

The team teachers were asked to identify the type of co-teaching model utilized in their classes. The four options to choose were: parallel, complementary, supportive, or

team teaching. If a combination of options was used, they were to report the estimated amount each was utilized.

Finally, the respondents were asked to make recommendations about the collaborative teaching experience to make it more effective for staff and students. The responses will be listed. Responses that overlap will be noted with a number after each repeated recommendation.

Research Question 1-Results of the Modification Checklists

The first part of the survey rated the frequency that modifications were utilized "often" or "frequently". This part of the survey was broken into five sections, classroom organization, instructional methodology, assignment adaptations, testing modifications, and social adaptations. Each area's results will be discussed.

Classroom organization- Seventy-one percent (5/7) of the co-teaching groups used preferential seating to allow a student with special needs to sit close to the board. The same results were found for planned seating to limit distractions. Twenty-nine percent (2/7) of the team teachers developed small groups for individualized instruction. None of the teachers made cooperative learning groups.

Instructional Methodology- One hundred percent (7/7) of the co-teaching groups provided assistance in note taking, highlighted important vocabulary, and used primarily direct instruction. Providing copies of lecture notes, use of a study guide, highlighting the main information, and teaching study skills are methods used by 86% (6/7) of the teachers. Seventy-one percent (5/7) of the co-teaching groups consider student learning styles, highlight notes, and adjust the pacing of lessons. The same percent use discovery-

oriented instruction and provide for frequent reviews. Four out of seven co-teaching groups (57%) teach vocabulary prior to a lesson, use different methods or materials to teach the same concept, and meet with students with special needs other than during class time. Forty-three percent (3/7) of the teachers reduce the reading levels of assignments or use manipulatives.

Assignment Adaptations- All of the team teachers (7/7) allow more time to complete assignments. Eighty-six percent (6/7) of the co-teachers give prompts or clues to questions, read directions to students, give directions through several channels and also grade for content alone on writing assignments. Five out of seven co-teaching groups (71%) accept assignments late without penalty toward the grade. Four out of seven (57%) team teaching groups lessen the difficulty level of assignments given. Adapted texts or worksheets are used by 43% (3/7) of the groups. The same percent assign less work in class to students with disabilities than the regular education students. Twenty-nine percent (2/7) assign less homework to students with disabilities than regular education students and also use story maps or webbing. One out of seven (14%) team teaching groups provide alternate assignments for work found to be too demanding and use timelines for long term projects. None of the respondents make use of computers for written work within the classroom.

Testing Modifications- All of the respondents (7/7) extend time for tests, grade tests on what is completed, and use short answer and multiple-choice testing. Eighty-six percent (6/7) give extra clues during tests. Five out of seven (71%) co-teaching groups give extra credit assignments and grade tests of students with disabilities less stringently than the regular education students' tests. Shortening lengths of tests, reducing essay

items, and allowing students to retake tests were modifications used by 57% (4/7) of respondents. Forty-three percent (3/7) of team-teachers give open-book or open-notebook tests or read tests to some students. Two out of seven (29%) co-teaching groups give practice tests or test their students with disabilities in a separate classroom. Finally, 14% (1/7) of the co-teachers allow for oral responses on tests and modify tests based on student's language levels.

Socialization Adaptations- At the secondary level, very few social adaptations are being utilized. Fourteen percent (1/7) of the co-teaching groups use a peer/buddy system or peer tutoring in class. None of the respondents use peer tutoring outside the class or utilize cooperative learning groups.

Research Question 2-Questionnaire on Teaching Responsibilities-

The seven collaborative teaching groups were surveyed on how they breakdown teaching responsibilities between the special educators and the regular educators. Their responses show that the regular education teachers and special education teachers share in the work and decision making about material usage, lesson planning, and test development the majority of the time. As Table 1. illustrates below, in five of the six areas questioned, 71% (5/7) of the groups reported sharing these responsibilities. The one area where there was some variation to this was in grading tests of special education students. In three out of seven teaching groups, the special educator does the grading. The remaining groups reported that either teacher might grade the work.

Table 1 -**Division of Teaching Responsibilities**

	Regular Education Teacher	**Special Education Teacher**	**Both**
Who decides what or how long a topic or concept is taught?	14% 1 out of 7	14% 1 out of 7	71% 5 out of 7
Who is responsible for developing tests or quizzes?	14% 1 out of 7	14% 1 out of 7	71% 5 out of 7
Who decides what materials to use?	29% 2 out of 7		71% 5 out of 7
Who grades the tests, reports, etc., for the regular education students?	29% 2 out of 7		71% 5 out of 7
Who grades the tests, reports, etc., for the special education students?		43% 3 out of 7	57% 4 out of 7
Who develops notes for lessons?		29% 2 out of 7	71% 5 out of 7

Research Question 3- Collaborative Teaching Models Used

The collaborative teachers were asked to identify which teaching models they utilize. They chose from the following models: parallel teaching, team teaching, support instruction, and complementary instruction. If the teachers used a combination of the above mentioned models, they were to estimate the percentage of time utilizing each teaching model.

The four categories of collaborative teaching options were defined by the Burlington County Inclusion Project (1999). The first teaching option is team teaching. In this scenario, the general and special education teachers jointly plan and alternately teach the lessons. The second option is support instruction in which one teacher instructs while the other teacher, usually the special educator, develops supplemental learning activities. The third option is parallel teaching in which the students are divided and the collaborative teachers are responsible for instructing smaller groups. Complementary instruction is the last option. This teaching option occurs when the special educator instructs skills that are not the primary focus of the regular education class. The alternative curriculum taught may involve non-academic skill areas such as motor or social activities.

The survey results of the seven collaborative teaching groups at the Maple Shade High School show that 50% of the teachers utilize the team teaching method and 50% use support instruction. One of the collaborative groups used both support and team teaching evenly. No parallel or complementary instruction was reported.

Research Question 4- Collaborative Teacher Recommendations

The collaborative teachers were asked to make recommendations they thought would make future team teaching experiences more effective for staff and students. Below is a list of the responses given. The number following the response indicates how many teaching groups out of seven made the same recommendation.

- Schedule a common preparation period for the regular and special educators (4).
- Schedule collaborative teachers to be free of homeroom responsibilities to allow for instructional planning and to meet with students who need supplemental help (2).
- When scheduling regular and special education teachers for an inclusion class, compatibility of personalities needs to be considered (1).
- Inclusion assignments should not involve more than two classes per teacher (1).
- Collaborative special educators should have input on the subjects they teach in the inclusive classes (1).
- Team teachers of reading have serious questions about the benefits of the placement of classified students in the Reading Workshop course who read at grade levels far below that of the regular students enrolled (1).
- Limit the number of times a special educator is pulled from the collaborative class setting to attend I.E.P. or annual plan meetings (1).

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Findings, and Conclusions

Summary

Over the last decade American schools have been educating a greater percentage of students with disabilities in regular education classes. Through the evolvement of Federal legislation from the Education for All Handicapped Children's Act to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990, schools have been mandated to provide a "free and appropriate education to all pupils with disabilities in the least restrictive environment". Since the early 1990's, the special education programming at the Maple Shade High School has expanded to include collaborative teaching.

The purpose of this study was to survey the Maple Shade Jr./Sr. High School collaborative staff to determine what the teaching roles and responsibilities are between the regular and special education team teachers. The survey results will also show the types of modifications and teaching models being used in the inclusive settings. Finally, the team teachers were asked to make recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the programming. Each of the seven groups of co-teachers completed the survey

together. It is hoped that the present and future collaborative staff would review the compilation of data from this survey to help guide them in their classroom planning. The information in this project may reassure co-teachers about their programming or give the inexperienced team teachers a good foundation and understanding of what has been done in this endeavor.

Conclusions

The conclusions are drawn from the four research questions found in Chapter One. Table 2 of Appendix C lists the classroom accommodations co-teachers used "often" or "sometimes".

- Classroom organization - The majority of collaborative teachers use preferential seating for students with learning disorders.
- Instructional methodology - The majority of teachers provide assistance in note taking, primarily use direct instruction, teach study skills, consider learning styles, and adjust lesson pacing.
- Assignment adaptations – The majority of team teachers allow students more time to complete assignments, give clues to questions, give directions through several channels, and grade for content alone on written assignments. Most teachers accept assignments late without penalty, as well.
- Testing Modifications – The majority of collaborative teachers extend test time, grade tests on what is completed, and use short answer and multiple choice testing. Most teachers give extra clues during tests and give extra credit assignments. Reducing test lengths and essay questions is a common occurrence.

- Division of teaching responsibilities – In most classes, both teachers were reportedly involved in the course planning, test development, and grading of tests.
- Collaborative teaching models used – The team teaching and supportive models were the only types of instruction used. These two types were used equally.

Discussion

The team teachers who participated in this study indicated the use of a variety of modifications. It is crucial for the co-teachers to consider the many possible types of accommodations that can be instituted into their class settings to create the greatest opportunity for a successful learning environment. It is important for the administration to be sensitive to the needs of the team teachers and students involved in this relatively new educational experience.

Implementing a co-teaching arrangement requires a great deal of planning. Defining the collaborative roles and responsibilities is necessary for the union of teachers to work smoothly and effectively. Misunderstanding and miscommunication can make it difficult for the included staff and students. Effective communication is vital from the beginning and throughout the school year.

Most of the surveyed respondents recommended that a common preparation period be established between the team teachers. This time together is necessary for teachers to plan for instruction, to work through problems, to monitor progress, and to communicate with parents. Administratively, scheduling common preparation periods may be difficult to accomplish, especially for special educators who are co-teaching with two regular teachers, but the value of this shared time cannot be overstated. Serious consideration of

this issue needs to be made when scheduling teachers. A partial, but easily acquired solution to this concern would be to insure that co-teachers not have any homeroom responsibilities each school day. The fifteen minutes of the homeroom period would not only allow teacher collaboration time, but also the opportunity to give supplemental instruction or testing to the students with disabilities.

None of the respondents of this study made the following recommendation, but it is this author's belief that an entire period should be scheduled for included students to meet with a resource teacher. This period of the day could be utilized in giving a variety of academic support activities. These activities could include a review of skills or highlights of previous lessons taught, the teaching of study skills, or the completion of tests. This study period could be effective in giving the included student the support and confidence he or she needs to maintain a satisfactory level of success and confidence and alleviate the potential for frustration that may occur.

Respondents suggested that special educators not be assigned to more than two inclusion class settings. Considering the amount of preparation and planning required by teachers of inclusive classes, this recommendation makes sense. Limiting the collaborative teaching responsibilities allows the involved teachers to give the proper amount of support and energy to the included students.

The co-teaching experience can be a difficult and trying situation if personalities and teaching strengths are not considered. Respondents of this study recommended teacher compatibility of personalities and subject preferences be considered when scheduling team teaching assignments. In the state of New Jersey, a teacher of the handicapped has the freedom to teach any course. It is up to the special educator and supervisory staff to

consider the strengths and preferences of the teacher before making teaching assignments, especially at the secondary level. The better the "marriage" of staff members, the more likely that the inclusive education will be effective and productive.

A recommendation was made to limit the number of times a special education teacher is pulled from the inclusive classroom for I.E.P. or annual plan meetings. Teacher support is necessary for each class period, as can be seen by the variety of modifications reported by the team teachers. The non-teaching duty period would be the ideal time to pull a teacher for attendance at these meetings.

The final recommendation made by the reading co-teachers was to curtail the inclusion of students with considerable reading disabilities into the Reading Workshop course. Many of the included students are found to be functioning at a reading level many grades below the 11^{th} grade work assigned in the Reading Workshop course. Having students read material at their frustrational reading level is not educationally sound and needs to be addressed. Trying to develop reading materials at various grade levels from the general reading work assigned is next to impossible. Giving reading material that is too difficult to students with significant reading disabilities is a set up for frustration for all involved.

There are a number of limitations to this study. The first is the small number of survey respondents. Secondly, two of the special educators surveyed are team teaching in two inclusive classes. Considering that the sample size is limited to seven team teaching groups means that the results are skewed by the multiple responses of the special educators who team-teach with two different regular educators. A team teacher is likely to utilize similar modifications in both classes even if team teaching with two different

teachers. Another limitation is that one of the special educator respondents was a first-year team teacher. This lack of experience may have limited the use of certain modifications that a more experienced collaborative teacher might utilize. This study took place in the middle of the school year. Different modifications could be utilized later in the year by some of the staff, especially by the inexperienced co-teachers.

Appendix A

Cover Letter Sent to Team-Teachers

January 3, 2000

Dear Colleague,

Teachers are being challenged to an extent never experienced before. One of the newest challenges has been collaborative teaching. To make an inclusive programming successful requires much thought, planning, and preparation.

The information you are about to share may be helpful to the teachers presently in the collaborative teaching experience at M.S.H.S., but also may help future staff to better understand and prepare for their co-teaching experiences. Your honest responses and time put toward this study could be an insightful reference for all teachers involved in inclusive programming.

The information you share will remain confidential in that your responses will be known as Classroom A or Classroom B, etc. Each pair of team teachers will receive one survey. Please confer with your co-teacher in filling out the questionnaire. You will find a wide range of accommodations listed. It is unlikely that you would use all of them.

As pointed out by participants of the Burlington County Inclusion Project, "networking with others who have already made integration work within their building" was one of the best ways to prepare and plan.

Thank you in advance for your efforts in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Bruce Krout

Appendix B

Team-Teacher Survey on Modifications, Teaching Roles, and

Recommendations for Inclusive Programming

Modification Checklist for Students with Disabilities

DIRECTIONS:
How often have you utilized the following modifications in your inclusive class setting so far this school year?

Place appropriate initial in blank – (F) for frequently use ~ 25 or more times, (O) for often use ~ 6-24 times, (S) for seldom use ~ less than 5 times, or (N) for never use.

F=frequently O=often S=seldom N=never

Classroom Organization

___ Preferential seating- close to teacher or the board
___ Planned seating- based on limiting distractions
___ Paired seating
___ Vary grouping arrangement into individualized, small group instruction based on ability levels
___ Vary grouping arrangement into cooperative learning groups
___ Other: _____

F=frequently O=often S=seldom N=never

Instructional Methodology

___ Consider student learning styles
___ Provide assistance in note taking
___ Provide copies of lecture outline or notes to students with disabilities
___ Use a study guide
___ Highlight study guide or notes

___ Highlight main information
___ Teach vocabulary prior to unit/lesson
___ Highlight important vocabulary
___ Use different methods/materials to teach same concept
___ Focus of instruction is active teaching, direct instruction, and supervised instruction
___ Focus of instruction is discovery oriented and supervised practice
___ Use manipulatives
___ Reduce reading level of reading assignment
___ Adjust pacing of lesson or extend lesson when concepts not well understood

F=frequently O=often S=seldom N=never

___ Provide for frequent reviews
___ Work with students with disabilities other than class time
___ Teach study skills, such as note taking, test taking, and understanding the textbook
___ Other _____

F=frequently O=often S=seldom N=never

Assignment Adaptations

___ Give directions through several channels
___ Read directions to student
___ Assign less work in class than regular education students
___ Assign less homework than regular education students do
___ Lessen the difficulty level of assignments
___ Use adapted text or worksheets
___ Provide alternative assignments when work level is too demanding
___ Give prompts or clues to student
___ Use of computer for written work
___ Grade for content, not spelling, mechanics, or penmanship
___ Use story maps or webbing
___ Allow more time to complete assignments
___ Accept assignments late with no penalization to grade
___ Accept assignments late with reduced grade
___ Use timelines for long term projects
___ Other: _____

F=frequently O=often S=seldom N=never

Testing Modifications

___ Allow for oral responses on tests
___ Use short answer tests
___ Use multiple choice tests
___ Shorten length of tests
___ Reduce number of essay items
___ Allow for open book or open-notebook during tests
___ Read test to student
___ Test given separately by special education teacher
___ Modify tests based on language levels
___ Give extra clues or prompts during testing
___ Practice tests given
___ Extend time allowed for testing
___ Adjust test grading based on what pupil completes
___ Allow students to retake tests as a way to improve grades
___ Grade tests of students with disabilities differently/ make allowances for errors or change grading criteria
___ Provide additional or alternate ways of improving grades, such as extra credit assignments
___ Other: _____

F=frequently O=often S=seldom N=never

Socialization Adaptations

___ Use peer/buddy system in class
___ Utilize cooperative learning group experiences
___ Use peer tutoring in class
___ Use peer tutoring out of class
___ Other: _____

Questionnaire on Teaching Responsibilities

Please check whose responsibility it is to do the following:

	Regular Education Teacher	Special Education Teacher	Both
Who decides what or how long a topic or concept is taught?	_____	_____	_____
Who decides what materials to use?	_____	_____	_____
Who develops notes for lessons?	_____	_____	_____
Who is responsible for developing tests or quizzes?	_____	_____	_____
Who grades the tests, reports, etc., for the regular education students?	_____	_____	_____
Who grades the tests, reports, etc., for the special education students?	_____	_____	_____

Comments?

_____

_____

_____

_____

There are four categories of collaborative teaching options according to the Burlington County Inclusion Project (1999). They are the following:

- **Parallel teaching**

The general and special education teachers divide the class. Each becomes responsible for smaller instruction subgroups. These are flexible groupings.

- **Support Instruction**

One teacher instructs essential content, while the other teacher develops and implements supplemental and supportive learning activities and arrangements.

- **Team Teaching**

The general and special education teachers jointly plan, then teach content. The lesson is divided into segments with each teacher alternating as instructor/facilitator.

- **Complementary instruction**

The special education teacher assumes responsibilities for instruction of skills (life, motor, social, etc.) which are not the primary focus of the lesson being taught in the regular education class. The alternative curriculum for the special education student is integrated into the lesson so they are working on different instructional objectives within the context of the regular education class. A student with physical disabilities might be learning to indicate his responses using a keyboard, for example.

In your collaborative teaching situation, which of the above joint teaching models would you say most closely represents your team teaching situation?

_____

If you find that you use a combination of teaching options, write down the types and percentage of time utilizing each

_____ _____%

_____ _____%

What recommendations do you have as a team teacher to make collaborative teaching more effective for the staff and students at Maple Shade Jr./Sr. High School?

Appendix C

TABLE C2

Collaborative Teachers Rating Modification Use as "Frequently" or "Often"

Modification of classroom	
Preferential seating	71%
Planned seating	71%
Use individualization or small group instruction	29%
Paired seating	14%
Modifications of Instructional Methodology	
Provide assistance in note taking	100%
Highlight important vocabulary	100%
Focus of instruction is active teaching, direct instruction and supervised instruction	100%
Provide copies of lecture outline or notes to students with disabilities	86%
Use a study guide	86%
Highlight main information	86%
Teach study skills, such as note taking, test taking, and understanding the textbook	86%
Consider student learning styles	71%
Highlight study guide or notes	71%
Focus of instruction is discovery oriented and supervised practice	71%
Adjust pacing of lesson or extend lesson when concepts not well understood	71%
Provide for frequent reviews	71%
Teach vocabulary prior to unit/lesson	57%
Use different methods/materials to teach same concept	57%
Work with students with disabilities other than class time	57%
Use manipulatives	43%
Reduce reading level of reading assignment	43%

Modifications of Assignment Adaptations

Allow more time to complete assignments	100%
Give directions through several channels	86%
Read directions to student	86%
Give prompts or clues to student	86%
Grade for content, not spelling, mechanics, or or penmanship	86%
Accept assignment late with no penalization to grade	71%
Lesson the difficulty level of assignments	57%
Accept assignments late with reduced grade	57%
Assign less work in class than regular education students do	43%
Use adapted text or worksheets	43%
Assign less homework than regular education students do	29%
Use story maps or webbing	29%
Provide alternative assignments when work level is too demanding	14%
Use timelines for long term projects	14%

Testing Modifications

Use short answer tests	100%
Use multiple choice tests	100%
Extend time allowed for testing	100%
Adjust testing grade based on what pupil completes	100%
Give extra clues or prompts during testing	86%
Grade tests of students with disabilities differently/ make allowances for errors or change grading criteria	71%
Provide additional or alternate ways of improving grades such as extra credit or assignments	71%
Shorten length of tests	57%
Reduce number of essay items	57%
Allow students to retake tests as a way to improve Grades	57%
Allow for open book or open-notebook during tests	43%
Read test to student	43%
Test given separately by special education teacher	29%
Practice tests given	29%
Allow for oral responses on tests	14%
Modify tests based on language levels	14%

Modifications of Socialization Adaptations

Use peer/buddy system in class	14%
Use peer tutoring in class	14%

References

Bacon, E.H. & Schulz, J.B. (1991). A survey of mainstreaming practices. Teacher Education and Special Education, 14 (2), 144-149.

Banerji, M., & Dailey, R. A. (1995). A study of the effects of an inclusion model on students with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28 (8), 511-522.

Brown, L., Schwarz, P., Udvari-Solner, A., Frattura Kampschroer, E., Johnson, F., Jorgensen, J., & Gruenewald, L. (1991). How much time should students with severe intellectual disabilities spend in regular education classrooms and elsewhere: Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 16 (1), 39-47.

Burlington County Inclusion Project (1999). Needs Assessment Results [On-line]. Available: www.elvis.rowan.edu/bcip/new/needs-assessment-results.num

Coates, R. D. (1989). The Regular Education Initiative and opinions of regular classroom teachers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22 (9), 532-536.

Council for Exceptional Children. (1993). Statement on inclusive schools and communities. Reston, VA; Author.

Council for Learning Disabilities. (1993). Concerns about the full inclusion of students with learning disabilities in regular education classrooms. Learning Disability Quarterly, 16 (2), 126.

Deno, E. (1970). Special education as developmental capital. Exceptional Children, 37 (3), 229-240.

Dunn, L. (1968). Special education for the mildly retarded—Is much of it justifiable? Exceptional Children, 35, 5-23.

Gallagher, J. (1994). Pull of Societal Forces. Kauffman, J. M. & Hallahan, D. P. (Eds.), The Illusion of Full Inclusion, (pp. 99). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Gersten, R., Woodward, J., & Darch, C. (1986). Direct instruction: A research based approach to curriculum design and teaching. Exceptional Children, 53 (1), 17-31.

Gottlieb, J. (1981). Mainstreaming:Fulfilling the Promise? American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 86 (2), 115-126.

Gottlieb, J., Semmel, M. & Veldman, D. (1978). Correlates of social status among mainstreamed mentally retarded children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 396-405.

Irmsher, K. (1996). Inclusive education in practice. ERIC Review: Inclusion, 4 (3), 1-5.

Jenkins, J. R. & Heinen, A. (1989). Students' preferences for service delivery: Pull-out, in-class, or integrated models. Exceptional Children, 55 (6), 516-523.

Johnson, G. O. (1962). Special education for mentally handicapped—a paradox. Exceptional Children, 19, 62-69.

Kauffman, J. M. (1999). Commentary: Today's special education and its messages for tomorrow. The Journal of Special Education, 32 (4), 244-254.

Learning Disabilities Association of America. (1993). Position paper on full inclusion of all students with learning disabilities in the regular education classroom. Pittsburgh, PA; Author.

Leo, J. (1994, June 27). Mainstreaming's 'Jimmy problem'. U.S. News & World Report, 22.

McClesky, J., Henry, D., & Hodges, D. (1998). Inclusion: Where is it happening? Teaching Exceptional Children, 31 (1), 4-10.

New Jersey Administrative Code, Title 6A, Education, Chapter 14, Special Education.

Palmer, D. S., Borthwick-Duffy, S. A., & Widaman, K. (1998). Parent perceptions of inclusive practices for their children with significant cognitive disabilities. Exceptional Children, 64 (2), 271-282.

Pomplun, M. (1997). When students with disabilities participate in cooperative groups. Exceptional Children, 64 (1), 49-58.

Reynolds, M. C. (1989). A historical perspective: The delivery of special education to mildly disabled and at-risk students. Remedial and Special Education, 10 (6), 7-11.

Sale, P., & Carey, D. M. (1995). The sociometric status of students with disabilities in a full-inclusion school. Exceptional Children, 62, 6-19.

Sawyer, N., Nelson, J. S., Jayanthi, M., Bursuck, W. D., Epstein, M. H. (1996). Views of students with learning disabilities of their homework in general education classes: Student interviews. Learning Disability Quarterly, 19 70-85.

Semmel, M. I., Abernathy, T. V., Butera, G., & Lesar, S. (1991). Teacher perceptions of the regular education initiative. Exceptional Children, 58 (1), 9-25.

Shanker, A. (1994, March 27). Problematic Placements. American Federation of Teachers, President's Column, Where We Stand [On-line]. Available: www.aft.org

Shanker, A. (1996, August 25). Ideology and Common Sense. American Federation of Teachers, President's Column, Where We Stand [On-line]. Available: www.aft.org

Sharpe, M. N., York, J. L., & Knight, J. (1994) Effects of inclusion on the academic performance of classmates without disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 15 (5), 281-287.

Stainback, S., Stainback, W., East, K., & Sapon-Shevin, M. (1994). A commentary on inclusion and the development of a positive self-identity by people with disabilities. Exceptional Children, 60 (6), 486-490.

The National Association of State Boards of Education. (1992). Winners All: A call for inclusive schools. Alexandria, VA; Author.

Vaughn, S., Elbaum, B. E., & Schumm, J. S. (1996). The effects of inclusion on the social functioning of students with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 29, 598-608.

Vaughn, S., Elbaum, B. E., Schumm, J. S., & Hughes, M. T. (1998). Social outcomes for students with and without learning disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 31 (5), 428-436.

Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., & Arguelles, M. E. (1997). The ABCDEs of co-teaching. Teaching Exceptional Children, 30 (2), 4-10.

Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., & Kouzekanani, K. (1993). What do students think when their general education teachers make adaptations? Journal of Learning Disabilities, 26, 545-555.

Waldron, N. L., & McLesky, J. (1998). The effects of an inclusive school program on students with mild and severe learning disabilities. Exceptional Children, 64 (3), 395-406.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1986). Rethinking special education. Educational Leadership, 44 (1), 26-31.

Will, M. C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52, 411-416.

Wood, M. (1998). Whose job is it anyway? Educational roles in inclusion. Exceptional Children, 64 (2), 181-195.

Woodward, J. & Baxter, J. (1997). The effects of an innovative approach to mathematics on academically low-achieving students in inclusive settings. Exceptional Children, 63 (3), 373-388.