Theses and Dissertations

5-31-2002

Inclusion, the forced game plan for levelling the playing field: one high school's first attempt

Rebecca Tribbett
Rowan University

INCLUSION, THE FORCED GAME PLAN FOR LEVELLING THE PLAYING FIELD

ONE HIGH SCHOOL'S FIRST ATTEMPT

by
Rebecca Tribbett

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
May 16, 2002

Approved by_____
Professor

Date Approved _____

MINI ABSTRACT

Rebecca Tribbett

Inclusion, a game for leveling
the playing field. One High
School's First Attempt
2002
Dr. Ronald Capasso, Ed.D
School Administration

Guidelines for the practice of inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education setting are lacking. Identifying the successful practices is critical to the development of good inclusion programs. Two key factors in the co-taught, inclusion setting: teacher preparation and beliefs results the students benefiting from higher expectations of all students and the innovative techniques utilized.

ABSTRACT

Rebecca Tribbett

Inclusion, a game for leveling the playing
Field. One High School's First Attempt.
2002
Dr. Ronald Capasso, Ed.D
School Administration

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the co-teaching as an inclusionary technique in a high school setting. Co-teaching in this study consisted of a general and special education teacher collaborating in the instruction of a group of general and special needs student.

The participants included 140 students, the general education and special education teacher. The teachers completed an Inclusion Survey that contained a twenty-item, four points, forced-choice Likert Scale. The survey measured the teacher's beliefs in four domains: Teacher training, Academic Content/Teacher Effectiveness, Social Atmosphere (students) and Academic Climate.

Interviews of the teaching staff and administration were conducted at the start of the school term and at its conclusion. The results of the interviews were compared to identify alternate perspectives and perceptions of co-teaching and the practice of inclusion.

The use of direct observation was included to provide data regarding the techniques employed by the co-teaching staff. It documents the dynamics between the instruction and the success or failure of the techniques that were utilized. This first-hand information from the direct observation allowed the intern to view the instruction and the reaction of the students along with allowing the observation of events occurring during the lesson,

such as interruptions, that may have had an affect on the learning process. The success as

measured by the evaluation at the end of the lesson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following persons for their assistance in completion of this thesis, my husband for being patient and our two daughters for always encouraging me to continue with my education.

Table of Contents

Chapter I

Introduction

Focus of the Study

Inclusion, broadly defined is the placement of students with disabilities in classrooms with typical-age peers. New Jersey Administrative Code calls for the students to receive a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) within the least restrictive environment. The educational philosophy behind inclusion education has two themes: the first is to move students with disabilities into general education classrooms. The second theme calls for providing the students with special education support services, such as speech/language therapy, in these same classrooms (National Association of State Board of Education, 1995). Least restrictive environment guarantees that to the maximum extent possible special needs students shall be educated with non-disabled peers. Inclusive classrooms are one placement option for students with special needs. Deptford High School initiated inclusive classrooms as a placement option for Deptford students eligible for special education for the 2001-2002 school year.

Inclusion as an educational concept has had a history of presenting as a topic of debate from 1975 as mainstreaming and Least Restrictive Environment to the Regular Education Initiative in the 1980's. The research findings looked at the perceptions and attitudes about inclusion, the teacher preparation and the general educators' ability to address the needs of special education students enrolled in their classrooms.

The questions continue to be raised and discussed and debated. Which method serves the special education population with the most service? Which method is more

successful? Is it the general education program or should the students be instructed away from the general population with other students who also require a special education setting?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the instructional and social impact of inclusion for classified and non-classified students who attend Deptford High School, and who were participants in an inclusive setting for the 2001-2002 school year. In addition, the intern wanted to learn the perceptions of the instructors regarding the effectiveness of this method of instruction. This study collected data to describe and evaluate the effectiveness of co-teaching as a tool for learning in the efforts to create an inclusive educational high school setting. To review the pedagogical techniques and modifications employed within the co-teaching settings. The intern wanted to evaluate the effectiveness of various methods of instruction and create a teacher's reference guide of instructional modifications and strategies.

This study looked at the attitudes of those involved in the inclusion at the Deptford High School regarding the preparation and implementation of co-teaching as an avenue through which the school would be become more inclusive. Jenkins and Pious (1991) stated that in successful inclusive settings, the distinction between special education and general education staff diminished, and the understanding that teachers have responsibility for all students increased. With the increased responsibility comes a

renewal or return to the belief that all students can learn and it is the task of those in education to bring this concept into fruition.

The goal of this study was to identify teacher attitudes toward inclusion. The study looked at the realistic challenges facing teacher initial challenges, how teachers as they reviewed approached co-teaching and their recommendations for co-teaching technique models they found useful.

This study provided answers to questions concerning the impact of the inclusive classes on the general and special education students. It gave insights into the effectiveness of the program as viewed by the teachers and students.

The results of the study were shared with participating teachers, the administration and School Board Officials. The utilization of co-teaching offered the students identified as having special needs the opportunity to be instructed at the same academic standard as their non-classified peers. Modifications and accommodations in instruction and assessment made this possible in a general education setting. It also afforded the opportunity for non-classified students and classified students to gain a better understanding of each other.

All students learn differently. Instructional accommodations and adaptations can facilitate the learning to all students, both classified and non-classified. The final benefit of the co-teaching method of instruction is the collaboration of ideas and concepts by the practioners that were derived from the actual implementation of the theories. These theories composed the start of a bank of strategies and techniques to be considered for utilization in delivering and evaluating instruction in an inclusive classroom setting.

Definitions: Inclusion

Co-teaching as defined in this study consists of one regular or general education teacher and one special education teacher, who together plan, instruct, and evaluate students in a classroom that contains both classified and non-classified students.

According to New Jersey Administrative Code (NJAC) the classification "Specific Learning Disability" (SLD) corresponds to the term of Perceptually Impaired and means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations. It is characterized by a severe discrepancy between the student's current achievement and intellectual ability in one or more of the following areas:

(1) Basic reading skills;

(2) Reading comprehension;

(3) Oral expression;

(4) Listening comprehension;

(5) Mathematical computation;

(6) Mathematical reasoning; and

(7) Written expression

"Behavioral Disabilities" (BD), corresponds to the classification of Emotionally Disturbed. It has been defined as a condition exhibiting one or more of the following

characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree that adversely affects a student's educational performance due to:

      a. An inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factor;

      b. An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers;

      c. Inappropriate types of behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances;

      d. A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or

      e. A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems.

Limitations of Study:

This study was limited to the following six classes that were offered at the Deptford High School:

- English for tenth grade students.

- English for the eleventh grade students.

- U.S. History II for tenth grade students.

- World Cultures for eleventh grade students.

- Earth Science

- Math I

Additional limitations were the curriculums in the above listed classes, the teachers and the time of day in which the classes were held. Another limitation was the lack of a control group. The study did not judge the progress with students who were not in an inclusive setting to determine which was more successful. The final limitation of the

study was that it was conducted after one year of implementation. Teachers new to this arrangement may need a few years of working together before they are able to identify and solve problems effectively. The conclusions of the study should not be generalized to any other facility.

Setting of Study:

The township of Deptford has a population of 25,000 residents. It is one of the oldest communities in Gloucester County and has its third largest educational system. From its very beginnings in 1793, it was predominately a farm community. Today it is a part of a major northeastern metropolitan region.

The community's governing body consists of a mayor, deputy mayor and council who are elected to term by the township residents. Deptford's population is 80.86% Caucasian, with 13.38% African-American as the second largest ethnic group. Over the years an increase has been noted in its population of 3.6% Hispanic, 1.8% Asian and .36% other citizens.

More than 40% of the people over the age of 25 are high school graduates and another 24% have experienced some portion of a college education. The average household income is $35-40,000 dollars. These demographics are contained in the PSE&G Area Development demographic report for the year 2002.

Deptford offers a diverse public school system that contains seven elementary schools, one middle school and one high school. The schools provide a strong, quality

education and serve students from the ages of 3-21 years old. Its curriculum ranges from special education to advanced placement, with gifted and talented courses for enrichment.

Administrative Hierarchy

Deptford's governing body of the educational system consists of a nine-member Board of Education, which is elected by the residents of the township. The administrative body consists of a superintendent, assistant superintendent, and the administrative officers. The board is responsible for employing the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent.

The revenues to fund the educational programs are contributed to by local, state and federal sources. Table 1 contains the percentage of funding received by Deptford for both the 1999 and 2000 school year. Table 2 shows the average dollar amount spent to educate each student in Deptford during the 1999 and 2000 school year. This figure was compared to the average cost to educate a student spent in the state of New Jersey.

Over the last several years the district's budgets have passed. This has aided the district in providing increasing competitive educational programs. Within the high school a technology rich learning environment has been established. Every classroom is equipped with a television set, VCR, and an overhead projector. The school is networked to provide Internet access to every classroom, office and the Media Center computers.

In New Jersey the governing and administrative public education system consists of several governmental levels: local, state, and federal. Federal agencies promote educational policies and programs. The state legislature enacts legislation, determines

state school taxes and financial aid to local school districts, sets minimum standards for the training of personnel, decides on curriculum, and makes provisions for accrediting schools. The governor is charged with making educational budget recommendations to the legislature. State courts, the governor and state legislature provide direction for the state board of education, which serves as an advising function for the legislature. The state department of education is administered by the chief school officer who is under the direction of the state board of education. All work with the local governing body of Deptford.

Administrative and faculty academic degrees in the school for the `97/98 and `98/99 school years were:

Degree	BA/BS	MA/MS	PH.D/ED.D
97/98	62%	37%	1%
98/99	62%	34%	1%

Median salary and years of experience of the administration and faculty of Deptford High School for the 1998/99-school term were:

	Salary	Years of Experience
Administrators		
District	$80,260	26
State Median	$86,805	26
Faculty		
District	$50,029	17
State Median	$50,967	15

Deptford salaries and years of experience of the district's administrators and faculty are close to the median levels of the state.

Deptford High School

Deptford High School is equipped with a physics lab and several computer labs. Its chemistry, industrial arts, and business classrooms are also provided with computers to assist in classroom instruction.

Curriculum offerings include honors and Advance Placement (AP) courses. AP Literature and Composition and AP American Government and Politics have been added to supplement the current classes in AP Chemistry and Calculus. In addition, the county college has accepted the results for students who have been successful on AP exams. Ninth grade students are provided with a study skills course designed to show each student how to maximize his/her potential.

Graduation requirements consist of the students earning 120 credits, including 4 years of math and 3 years of science. These requirements exceed those established by the state. The average class size is 25 students as compared to the state average of 20.9. The drop out rate at Deptford is 5% as compared to the state average of 2.9%. The student faculty ratio in Deptford High School is 12.4 to 1. The state ratio is 11.6 to 1.

The High School Proficiency Test is given to all students in the state of New Jersey. Successful completion of the test indicates that the student has mastered the minimum proficiencies set by the state for the graduation from the high school. A

9

comparison of the average High School Proficiency Test scores for Deptford and the state

of New Jersey for the 1998/99-school term can be found in Table 3.

The Deptford scores were from the 213 students eligible to take the HSPT:

	Reading	Mathematics	Writing	HSPT (All Sections)
Deptford	93.4%	93.4%	96.7%	87.3%
State Avg.	89.4%	92.0%	93.1%	85.1%

Deptford's student population consists of 3,800 students, 1,150 of whom attend

the high school. The population represents diverse levels of abilities that require varying

level of support to successfully master the skills taught to them. Within the 1,150 high

school students, there are 185 identified special needs students. The students' disabilities

include mild learning disabilities, behavioral disabilities and multiply disabled students.

To serve the diverse population the school has programs that range from self

contained programs to co-taught or inclusion general education classes. This study

focused on the seven co-taught classes. The targeted classes' total population was

approximately 20 students per class. Each class contained no more than 8 students who

were identified as special needs students. Each class contained and one general one

special education teacher, who both employed the various techniques.

Significance of the Study:

In an effort to place students with special needs in the least restrictive

environment, inclusive settings are becoming increasingly important as an equitable

educational setting. Finding ways to meet the increasingly diverse needs of all students continues to challenge special and general educators and administrators.

Elementary teachers frequently employ a variety of teaching techniques to reach their students. In the secondary level however, teaching frequently consists of lectures, note taking and examinations. How can students who struggle with these techniques become successful? How do we in education provide an education for all students? By becoming an inclusive school we can address the needs of all of our students.

Braaten, Kauffman, Braaten, Polsgrove & Nelson (1989) stated that the emphasis on enhanced academic performance for all students increases the pressure for schools to boost overall achievement levels. The emphasis on performance, as well as on high-order thinking skills, poses a potential problem for students with disabilities. Welch (1989) pointed out that teachers concerns about the implementation of changes must be taken into consideration. Both Coates (1989) and Semmel, Abernathy, Burtera, and Lesar (1991) found that general education teachers did not seem ready for inclusion. Additional support of this idea was given by Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996), who concluded that teachers did support inclusion, but felt a lack of necessary time, skills, training, and resources to implement inclusive factors.

Finally the significance of this study can be found in the review of the case of Oberti v. Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon. The judge deciding the case concluded, "Inclusion is a right, not a special privilege for a select few. All students deserve to be educated to the fullest extent of their capabilities. Inclusion is based on this premise. Co-teaching is but one method through which this goal can be achieved." This

study provided an example of how one public high school developed programs that addressed the needs of its students to receive a Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment to ensure that all of its students were equally serviced. As more and more demands occur that call for any student who presents as being disadvantage to be given assistance, studies like this one offer suggestions and insights for others who are embarking on altering educational programs to meet these demands. "Experts agree that full acceptance of students with disabilities will happen only after long-term modifications in attitudes," reported (Beattie, Anderson, and Antonak (1997). The concept of inclusion brings with it many concerns. The legislation has for some time been in place in support of inclusion of special needs students into general education programs. Legislation can be mandated, but acceptance can not. Meaningful compliance will require removing attitudinal barriers along with physical, employment, and educational barriers, stated (Beattie, Anderson, and Antonak,1997). Research such as this present study can provide teachers with valuable data on the successes and pitfalls of teaching strategies that their colleagues found as they experienced inclusion and the day to day demands it presents.

A study found that the attitudes of teachers before P.L. 94-142 did not change significantly after the law's passage. Findings indicated that placement of students with disabilities in regular classrooms was not sufficient in itself to alter perceptions of the teachers. This disclosure supports the need for understanding teachers' perceptions so as to develop methods that will foster positive attitudes about inclusion, (Horne, 1985). Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996), who completed research on the perceptions of teachers

on inclusion from 1958 to 1995, found that special education teachers were more supportive of inclusion than regular education teachers. Teachers in general seemed more willing to accept students with mild disabilities than those with severe disabilities in a general education classroom. Finally, the teachers felt that they required a great deal of support for any integration to be successful, (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Studies that contain reviews of literature of what experts in the field are saying, coupled with the employment of the information in the field, can provide the beginning of understanding for teachers. Understanding can aid the teachers in formation of the positive attitudes.

The focus of Chapter Two is the literature review. Within the literature review the historical basis and philosophy behind implementing inclusion is examined. The intern addresses the problems and benefits of inclusion. The final portion of this chapter is dedicated to reviewing the attitudes of the stakeholders of the project, the teachers, students and administrators.

O'Neil, 1994-1995 stated, the movement toward greater integration has resulted in a significant change in the structure of special education, but questions remain about the success of special education. Empirical evidence about the efficacy of special education continuous to be equivocal, and this has resulted in discussion being increasingly fuelled by political and ideological concerns. These differences have often resulted in contentious discussion about how and for whom the inclusion of students with disabilities should be accomplished.

The final concern brought out in the literature review suggests that the attitudes about inclusion were at its inception and continue to be today, a culmination of a variety

of factors. Larrivee and Cook (1979) identified these factors as: academic concerns - the possible negative effects of integration on general academic progress; socioemotional concerns - the negative aspects of segregating students with disabilities; administrative concerns; and teacher concerns – issues about support, experience, and training necessary to work with student with disabilities. The research is clear that there has been no definitive answer to the placement or program question for students of special needs.

Chapter three, Design of the Study, centers on the qualitative method of using observations, interview, and surveys of the teachers, students and administration who were involved in the co-teaching inclusion program. The surveys were conducted at the start of the school year and near its conclusion to compare the instructional experiences. The interviews provide individual attitudes and perceptions of both the general and special education teachers. They also afford the opportunity to obtain specific insight of the individuals as they relate to individual classroom settings. The observations create an opportunity to witness direct social interaction of the students, student to student, and student to teacher.

Chapter four of this thesis reviews the perceptions of the teachers and administration on their beliefs regarding the impact of the co-teaching model of inclusion employed at the Deptford High School. The study provides a list of common techniques and practices utilized in the co-taught classrooms. It provides the intern with the opportunity to promote the success of all students by advocating, supporting, and nurturing a school culture that is conducive to student learning. The intern identifies

barriers to student learning and provides avenues by which the identified barriers can be addressed.

As a result of the study, communication between student teachers and administrators was increased. The study provided direct feedback regarding the co-teaching model and it was employed in the classroom as opposed to suggestions based on literature or theory only. This resulted in practical data that was relevant to the current practices.

This study addressed the seven co-taught inclusion classes that were conducted at the Deptford High School. It can be generalized to other classes. It offers possible solutions and approaches for inclusive classrooms. The study has many variables, including the subject matter, class size and teaching experience. The focus of the study is to look at co-teaching as a method of instruction from the teachers who employ the method. Limited research has been completed on inclusion, especially in the secondary level. Each study that is completed contributes to the knowledge base. Further research will help improve the techniques and approaches and provide a start for others who are considering implementing the co-teaching model of inclusion.

Chapter II

Historical Evolution of Special Education Placements

In 1954, the United States ruled that the doctrine of "separate but equal" was not acceptable. The famous case of Brown vs. Board of Education, a landmark case on racial segregation, is often viewed as the start of the right to education movement for children with disabilities, (Tumball 1973) as reported by Petch, 1999.

"The movement to abandon the concept of segregated placements, for students with disabilities was further supported by the Normalization Principal (Wolfensberger, 1972) in the late 1960's," stated Chronis and Ellis (2000). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) (1975) also called Public Law PL 95-142, which followed Wolfensberger, required that children with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment in which their IEP could be implemented. Advocates and parents began to challenge the schools to provide this "least restrictive environment."

What constituted the "least restrictive environment" remained an issue of debate. "The special class was viewed as possessing the following advantages: low teacher-pupil ratios, specially trained teachers, greater individualization of instruction in a homogeneous classroom, and an increased curricular emphasis on social and vocational goals cited," (Johnson, 1962). For many, settings of this nature were the least restrictive. The thinking of others in the field of education cited these same reasons as the basis for students not receiving an equally compatible academic education as their non-classified peers.

The 1968 article by L.M. Dunn, questioned whether separate special needs classes are justifiable. It supported the need for least restrictive placements. This attitude encouraged that students in special education classes be given access to the general education setting. These sentiments were part of the strong social anti-segregation feelings of the 1960's.

The debate over integration of special needs students culminated with the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act, which gave every child with a disability the right to a free and appropriate education, FAPE. To bring about these principles the Regular Education Initiative, REI, was developed. The rational was based on the premise that all students have some degree of intellectual, physical, or psychological differences. REI proposed a merger between the general education and special education bureaucracies. Its purpose was to end the classification and subsequent separate placements of students. Reynolds, Wang, and Walberg (1987) noted that the labels given in the special education system often stigmatize pupils. These labels affect how they perceive themselves. It results in feelings of inadequacy, which contribute to the development of negative behaviors that affect their interaction with their peers and teachers. Stainback, Stanback and East (1994), (as cited in Petch-Hogan & Beverly, 1991) stated, "that when students of unique characteristics are taught together, they learn to accept differences."

Although it was generally agreed upon that inclusion was beneficial to special needs students, many of the early mainstreaming programs were not successful. The

services provided to the students with disabilities were fragmented. "Mainstreaming, placing special needs students with their non-classified peers, was difficult to define operationally," (Kaufman, Agard, & Semmen, 1986) as cited in Kavale & Forness, 2000.

The legal ruling focused on what mainstreaming was theoretically, rather than on stipulating that students should be moved and placed in separate classes or schools only when the nature or severity of their disability was such that they could not receive an appropriate education in a general education classroom with supplementary aids and services (Bateman & Chard; Osborne & DiMattia, 1994) as cited in Kavale & Forness, 2000.

In response to the need for successful mainstreaming, Congress in 1990, amended and renamed EAHCA as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The amendments consisted of six goals:

(1) All children with disabilities have a right to an education.
(2) Each child will be provided an appropriate education unique to his or her strengths and weaknesses.
(3) Each child's right to develop to his or her potential will be enhanced.
(4) Each child will be provided the right to associate with his or her non-disabled peers.
(5) Every child will be given the opportunity to develop an awareness of individual differences for successful integration into society.
(6) The social states of the disabled child will be enhanced by decreasing stigmata related to labeling and placement.

These six goals once mandated became the Full Inclusionist Movement (FIM).

The rationale for the FIM was clarification of the EAHCA's "least restrictive environment" and emphasis on "the maximum extent appropriate" placement. There were two lines of thought coming from the law revision. First, the advocates believed that the students' civil rights were being violated through peer segregation. The second

concept contests that programs were not beneficiary to the students either academically or socially nor were vocational skills being provided. "Advocates of full inclusion proposed that full inclusion (1) allows students with disabilities to take part in the heterogeneous world, (2) teaches social skills (3) fosters independence, and (4) provides opportunities to build friendships with non-disabled peers" (Fuchs and Fuchs 1994), as cited in Petch-Hogan & Haggard, Kappa Delta Pi Record.

Opponents of REI and FIM focus on maintaining the special education continuum. To them, the purpose of REI and FIM is clear. It is to (1) expand general education services, (2) provide a continuum to meet those needs, (3) promote equity and access to all students, (4) increase integration opportunities, and (5) focus on outcomes and benefits of placement options. The debate continues much as it began with both sides, supporters and opponents of inclusion firmly supporting their views.

Implementing Least Restrictive Environment

School administrators and teachers find that determining which educational placement constitutes the LRE for any given student with a disability remains a tremendously difficult task. Since its passage in 1990, IDEA has had several amendments. The most recent was passed in 1997, PL 105-17. It places responsibility on the educators to involve students with disabilities in the general education curriculum, and to consider supplementary aids and services as part of the IEP process in order to accomplish inclusion. It identifies a clear role for the general educators in planning and implementing IEP's.

Despite the clarification of the regulation, disputes continued to arise. When such disagreements cannot be settled between the parties, courts may ultimately be called upon to settle the issue. Questions regarding educational placements in LREs have been a frequent source of litigation in special education.

In these LRE cases, the US Court of Appeals has provided guidance to lower courts and school districts to determine the appropriate and least restrictive placement for students with disabilities. There are four acknowledged tests for determining LRE placement: (1) the Roncker Portability Test, (2) the Daniel R.R., Two-Pronged Test, (3) the Rachel H. Four-Factor Test, and (4) the Hartmann Three-Part Test. These federal appellate cases are important to understand because they provide guidance for school districts and they are the controlling authority in their respective circuits. They guide lower court decisions by providing precedents.

The Roncker Portability Test is used to determine if the services that make the segregated setting more appropriate can be transported to the non-segregated setting. "If the services can be transported to an integrated setting, then the modification is required by the LRE mandate,") (as cited in Yell & Drusgrow (1999).

The Daniel R.R. Two-Pronged Test is used to guide the court in determining whether or not school districts have complied with the least restrictive environment requirement of the IDEA. In applying this test the courts are reviewing the following:

1. Whether education in the regular education classroom with the use of supplementary aids and services, can be achieved satisfactorily.

2. If it cannot, and the school intends to remove the child from regular education, whether the school includes the child to the maximum extent appropriate, as cited in Yell & Drusgow (1999).

Rachel H. Four-Factor Test relies on the Daniel R.R. Two-Pronged Test. It considered four factors:

1. Educational benefits of the regular classroom with supplementary aids and services, balanced with re-educational benefits of the special educational environment and on the other children in the classroom.

2. The non-academic benefits of integration with students who are not disabled.

3. The effect of the student's presence on the educational environment and on the other children in the classroom.

4. The cost of including the student in the regular classroom (Yell & Drusgow 1999). The final test, the Hartmann Three-Part Test reviews the following to determine if inclusion is required:

   (1)   Whether the disabled child would not receive educational benefit from the mainstreaming into a regular class.

   (2)   Any marginal benefit from mainstreaming would be significantly outweighed by benefits which could feasibly be obtained only in a separate instructional setting.

   (3)   If the disabled child is a disruptive force in the regular education classroom setting (Hartmann V. Loudoun County, 26 IDELR 167 4th 1997) as cited in Yell & Drusgrow, Preventing School Failure (1993).

When society changes it brings change into the educational setting. "Modern society in the United States held conservative social values, if clearly articulated sexual and occupational roles and its spatially and temporarily defined activities" stated Elkind, D., 2 vol. In contrast, in our post modern society, it is characterized as a combination of blended sexual and occupational roles, liberal cultural values, and overlapping activities. Carter (1998) described the United States as "having a common ethos, or set of values, different from and superior to all others," as cited in Elkind, (2000). The cultural assimilation became known as the melting pot. Our educational system also employed the melting pot concept bringing middle class values to the entire country, whatever their ethnic, racial, or religious background of the people. The post modern period has resulted in a challenge of the concept of common values and specific rules. The civil rights and women's rights movements have revealed the prejudice in our society ethos and the need for equality in education and occupational opportunities. These coupled with the valuation of minority achievement and acceptance of diversity have contributed to a society which calls for educational change and for less rigid roles. Parents have transformed many of their roles to the educational setting. Teachers now engage in much more socialization of their students. Innovations such as inclusion, all-day kindergarten, character education, and multiculturalism have arisen out of the changes in our society. Inclusion of students with special needs is also a concept that stems from societal changes. Elkin (1998) stated inclusion "stems directly from broadening our national social ethos to acknowledge and appreciate those who are physically and mentally challenged. Inclusion, however does not arise from any new theories or research

regarding the educational effectiveness or value of this practice," Elkind 2000. It is this concept of social acceptance that is the theoretical basis for inclusion.

Theoretical Frameworks and Social Implications

Inclusion, from its inception, remains one of the most controversial issues currently facing educators. The attitudes about integration have historically been multidimensional and indicative of a variety of underlying factors. Larrivee and Cook (1979) identified the following factors as contributors to the multidimensional state: "possible negative effects of integration on general academic progress; socio-emotional concerns; negative aspects of segregating students with disabilities; administrative concerns; and teachers concerns, such as issues about support, experience, and training necessary to work with students with disabilities, as cited in Kavule & Forness 2000. Cornoldi, Terreni, Scruggs & Mastropieri, (1998) stated "that these concerns appeared to be long-maintained, even after 20 years of the inclusion experience," as cited in Kavule & Forness 2000. Questions about the integration of students with disabilities have been steady over the past 25 years. The difficulties come from the interpretation of LRE as only being the general education classroom, regardless of the type and level of disability. Data from the Annual Reports to Congress reveal that trends in inclusion vary dramatically from state to state. McLeskey & Henry, (1999), list the District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York and New Mexico as the states with the highest number of restrictive practices. Vermont, North Dakota, Idaho, and South Dakota lead the 50 states in having the less restrictive practices. Several authors concluded that the above

data from the Reports to Congress are difficult to interpret (Danielson & Bellamy, 1988; McLeskey, Henry & Hodges; 1998; 1999; McLeskey & Pacchino, 1994; Sayer, McLaughlin & Winglee, 1994), as cited in McLeskey & Henry (1994). Danielson & Bellemy (1989) have pointed out that "the variability in placement rates in general education classrooms across states in a function of both the states' placement practices and overall identification rates," as cited in McLesky & Henry (1999).

One of the unique theoretical frameworks for perhaps "the most comprehensive, inclusive, and humane practice of special education in the 20th century," comes from Lev S. Vygotsky Gindis (1999). His work is based on a theory of a connecting link between socio-cultural processes taking place in society and mental processes taking place in the individual. His theory supports the concept that inclusion is a social activity that allows for education to take place.

Other authors such as Elkin Vygotsky share this idea. Vygotsky argued that a disability is perceived as an abnormality only when and if it is brought into the social context. The human brain, eye, ear, and limb are not just physical organs. Impairment of any of these "leads to a restructuring of social relationships and to a displacement of all the systems of behavior," (Vygotsky (1999), as cited in Gindis (1997).

Vygotsky pointed out that from a social perspective, the primary problem of a disability is not the sensory or neurological impairment itself, but its social implications; any physical handicap not only alters the child's relationship with the world, but above all affects his interaction with people. The teacher must then deal with the social consequences. Vygotsky (1995) stated that changing negative societal attitudes toward

individuals with disabilities should be one of the goals of special educators as cited in Gindis (1999).

Vygotsky supports the idea that the "mainstream socio-cultural environment is the only context in which the strengthening of intact psychological functions in a setting that is close to normal as possible," Gindis (1999). This idea lends support to the premise that inclusive settings will serve the needs of the special education population as well as establish an arena in which the general education population can learn acceptance and understanding of the special needs population. "Inclusion is intended to create schools and other social institutions that are based on acceptance belonging amid community," Salend (1998), as cited in Duhaney (1999), and is "perceived as a place where everyone is supported by each member of the school community in the course of having his or her educational needs met," (Stainbuck & Stainbuck, 1990) as cited in Duhaney (1999).

General and special educators have thought of the concept of inclusion as a viable educational concept. The questions, however, continue to arise. Genevieve Manset & Melvyn Semmel (1997) investigated the academic achievement gains of students with mild Learning Disabilities in a variety of inclusion programs. They found that inclusive programming effects were not impressive. The findings of Spencer, Saland & Laurel Gormick-Duhaney (1999) found that inclusion programs effectively meet the education needs of only some students with mild disabilities. Holloway (2001) collected data on more than 8,000 students with disabilities in grades 7 through 12, as part of the National Longitudinal Transition Study. He addressed the impact of, access to, and time spent in

inclusive settings on secondary students with disabilities (SRI International, 19893; US

Department of Education, 1995). "These data revealed that many secondary students with

disabilities especially the ninth and tenth grades, experienced high rates of failure,"

Salend (1999). This study also showed that secondary students with disabilities,

particularly with physical disabilities, who took a greater number of GE courses were

more likely to (a) attend post-secondary academic higher programs; (b) obtain

employment and earn higher salaries; (c) live independently; (d) be socially integrated

into their communities; and (e) be married or engaged.

Martson (1996) used curriculum-based assessment measures to compare the

reading progress of 240 elementary-level students with LDs who were educated in three

different institutional models. The findings revealed that the students in the combined

services program had significantly greater gains in their reading performance than the

students who received instruction in either the inclusion-only classroom or the pull out

only program.

Similarly, Manset & Semmel concluded that "the programs for some students

with mild disabilities can be an effective means of providing services, but the evidence

clearly indicates that a model of wholesale inclusive programming that is superior to

more traditional special education service delivery models do not exist at present,"

(p178), as cited in Salend & Duhaney (1999).

The answer to the question of when and how to employ inclusive techniques has

no set group of answers. The research data suggest that the use of inclusion is beneficial.

The data, however, does not support that any specific method of implementation is

correct for all students. The individualization employed in preparation of the IEP should be utilized in determining the individual benefits of the use of inclusionary methods of instruction.

In a review of three different inclusion programs, Zigmond, Jenkins, Denu, Fuchs, Baker, Jenkins & Coutinho (1985) "reported that approximately 50% of the students with disabilities in these programs failed to show evidence of increased academic performance," as cited in Salend & Duhaney (1999). The findings of Carlson and Parshall (1996) contrast the findings of Zigmond et al (1995). Using data collected by the Michigan Department of Education from 1989 to 1996 and interviews with teachers and counselors, Carlson and Parshall studied the academic adjustment of 51,624 students with disabilities who were reintegrated into general education classrooms. "The findings indicated that (a) most of the reintegrated students received good grades: (b) 11% of the reintegrated students needed to continue to receive special education services; and (c) 4% of the reintegrated students did not succeed in the general education setting and returned to special education," as cited in Salend & Duhaney (1999).

In addition to the academic benefits of inclusion, the social impact of inclusion should be considered. The non-educational and self-concept outcomes of students with disabilities educated in inclusive settings were reviewed by Evan, Salisbury, Palombaro, Berryman, & Hollowood (1992). They used classroom observations, sociometric analysis, and social competence ratings to study the peer interactions and social acceptance of eight students with severe disabilities and eight randomly selected general education students who were educated together in elementary classrooms. The findings

indicate that the acceptance of students with disabilities was not associated with either their social competence or the number of social interactions initiated or received. This caused the researchers to conclude that "students with severe disabilities may be judged differently than their peers without disabilities," as cited in Dalerd & Duhaney (1999). Banerji & Dailey (1995) also examined the impact of placement in an inclusion classroom on the affective performance of 13 elementary students with learning disabilities and 17 of their non-disabled classmates. "The findings revealed that the two groups of students did not noticeably differ in terms of the affective outcomes surveyed," as cited in Salerd & Duhaney (1999). Sale & Corey (1995) had similar results. They employed a positive and negative peer nomination strategy to assess the sociometric status of students with disabilities who attend an inclusive elementary school. The findings revealed that the currently eligible and likely eligible students were less, likely to be nominated as most liked and more likely to be nominated as least liked when compared to their peers. "Roberts & Zubrick (1992) used a correlational design to compare the social status of 97 elementary students with mild disabilities who were either partially or fully integrated into general education classes and 97 general education students without disabilities who were their classmates" as cited in Salend & Duhaney (1994). Their findings like that of Sale & Corey (1995) revealed that both groups of students exhibited equal levels of disruptive behavior. The students with mild disabilities were less often accepted and more often rejected than their classmates without disabilities.

Interviews with secondary level students with disabilities regarding socialization that occurs as a result of inclusive practices suggest that special education students had negative experiences in both general and special education settings. Negative experiences in general education setting related to the failure of their teachers to adapt instruction to meet special students' needs, and to the fear that special accommodations for those students results in their being stigmatized in the presence of their peers.

"Negative experience in special education includes receiving low level, repetitive and unchallenging academic instruction; being concerned about their status and the loss of their friends and feeling stigmatized," reported Salend & Dehaney (1999). Like their elementary counterparts, the special needs students in the secondary level also did not consistently do better socially in or out of an inclusive setting. They noted more negative experiences associated with being in a special needs program than did the special needs students at the elementary level.

"Throughout the discourse among educators, the meaning of the term "inclusion" is ambiguous and vaguely defined. Too often the individual needs of the special education child are over looked in an attempt to implement the inclusion model of education," (Huey 2000). Differing methods of implementation contribute to the ambiguity of the term "inclusion." Some models support the inclusion of all students with disabilities, as full inclusion. Other models employ placement of special needs students in a regular setting on a part time basis as full inclusion. Still others propose the inclusion for those special needs students for whom it is appropriate, or "even suggest that separate special schools are part of their inclusion plan" (Crockett & Kauffman,

1998) as cited in Huey (2000). In education the meaning of inclusion is ambiguous. One definition that returns to the original intent of the model states that, "inclusion is the commitment to educate each child, to the maximum extent appropriate, in the school and classroom he or she attends," Roach (1995). Support services are brought to the child, rather than moving the child to the services, and requires only that the child will benefit from being in the class, rather than having to keep up with the other students. Chow, Blais & Hemingway (1999) stated that "the best educators can do is to provide students with school environments that are conductive to learning as well as having adequate resources for them to maximize their individual development" (p3). Zirkel & Gluckman (1996) agree that "what is appropriate placement may vary from child to child, depending on the individual needs of the child."

To interpret "equal" as meaning "the same" can be harmful to any student, but particularly so for students with special needs who require more individualized attention. The principle of equifinality (Saldov & Chow, 1994) "is consistent with the desirable goal of making sure that all students have an equal opportunity of accessing education in an environment conducive to learning so that they can have equal opportunity of maximizing their individual development. (Saldev & Chow (1994), as cited in Chow, Blais & Hemingway 1999.

"One of the philosophical underpinnings of the education policy is that all children of school ages are guaranteed equal access to education, regardless of their sex, color, religion, or nationality" (Chow, Blais & Hemingway, 1999). Zimond, Jenkins, Fuchs & Fuchs (1995) "agree that each and every student must benefit meaningfully from

the education they are receiving," as cited in Chow, Blais & Hemingway (1999). They also suggested that the aim is not to minimize between-group differences but to maximize individual potential socially, emotionally, intellectually and physically. "Clearly, inclusion is not simply a place or a process of educating students, it embodies an attitude which fully accepts all children into schools and communities," (1994), New Jersey Department of Education.

The ambiguity regarding defining the term inclusion clearly and how it should be implemented remains undecided. Perhaps understanding what inclusion intends to accomplish and offering suggestions for its implementation will aid in defining LRE. How is the correct service delivery model for inclusion determined and what are its components? The National Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices (1996) "developed a framework that corresponds with the prevailing reform paradigm that focuses on a students based systematic reform across six major policy areas: curriculum, student assessment, accountability, personnel development and professional training, finance, and government." Grosenick, George & George (1986) supports the findings of the CISP in their model for planning an inclusive program. "They list the following components: (a) the program philosophy, (b) student needs and identification procedures, (c) program goals and objectives, (d) instructional methods and curriculum, (e) community involvement, (f) program design and operation; (g) procedures for program exit, and (h) program evaluation," as cited in Guetzale (1999). A curriculum, and the content of what is taught, vary from district to district. It is determined by the guidelines adapted by the individual states and their local school districts. Determining how to

teach the content of the curriculum is essential to implementing inclusive practices. Sizer (1992) identifies the three types of skills that all students need to learn: (1) dispositions and habits of mind (such as inquisitives, diligence, collaboration, work habits, tolerance, and critical thinking); (2) content area knowledge (in science, social studies, language arts, computers, the arts, etc.); and (3) basic academic skills such as reading, writing, and mathematics, as cited by Jorgensen (1997). Lewis (1992) describes curriculum as a "potent tool for reform when it integrates and interrelates subjects and disciplines in a manner that makes learning experiences meaningful within and between grades and subjects." With those facts in mind, it suggests that creating learning experiences and practices that are student-centered and meaningful, and should be included in the curriculum design in planning for the inclusion program.

Another key component to establishing an inclusive setting is the collaboration between the general and special educators participating in the program. "Teacher expectations influence student achievement, behavior, and self-esteem." (Braphy & Good, (1974); Conway, (1989); Fuchs & Norris, (1994); Kornblau & Koegh, (1980), as cited in Duane, Bierne-Smith & Lathem (2000). If teacher perceptions of students with disabilities are negative then including such students in general education classrooms may not result in a beneficial experience for the students, according to Duane et al, (2000). General education teachers frequently question if they are prepared to teacher special needs students. The skills in teaming and collaboration, necessary in inclusive settings, are often lacking in both general and special education teachers. The third key component to successful implementation of an inclusion program is the administrators.

Ayres & Meyers, (1992); Gameros, (1995) "suggest that the administrators' attitudes toward students with disabilities are especially critical for schools." Phillips, Alfred, Bruelle & Shank (1990) found "that teachers believed that the guidance and positive support of the principals was critical as teachers began to implement inclusion," as cited in Duane (2000) et al. Vam-Reusen, Soho & Barker (2000), in their study on the attitudes of high school teachers toward inclusion, support the argument that successful inclusive education, to a degree, is dependent upon the attitudes of teachers and the support they receive in the implementation of inclusion.

Guetzloe (1999) looked at what she termed "ownership" of students with disabilities, as a way to obtain the commitment that all educational professionals need for inclusive practices to be successful. In 1994, Guetzole suggested that schools offer specific training in team building to assist in the facilitation of inclusion in the general education curriculum and to increase collaboration. She urged the use of in-service training that would focus on the following topics; (a) student files; (b) functional behavior assessment; (c) avoiding power/control issues; (d) crisis intervention (including both verbal de-escalation and physical restraint); (e) regular school curriculum, policy and procedures.

What are the benefits of the professional preparation for pre-service teachers as well as those teachers currently facing the challenge of providing instruction in an inclusive setting? Many classroom teachers are facing new professional challenges as they encounter an increasingly diverse student population (e.g. Student whose first

language is not English, "at risk" students with a history of educational failure, and students identified with disabilities who require modification of the general education curriculum. Cole (1995), as cited in McGregor, Halvorsen, Fisher, Pumpian, Bhaerman, & Salisbury (1998). Current efforts to address this concern are frequently met by having workshop-based approaches to training about issues that are of concern to the school facility. This type of approach is usually presented separately to the general and special education teachers. This approach is insufficient in equipping teachers with the skills necessary to successfully address the changing needs of today's diverse student population. "Just as we strive to be inclusive in our instructional practices, so too must our professional development efforts include both a broader array of participants and a greater range of staff development strategies," McGregor et al (1998).

The benefits of participating in an inclusive environment for the students are both academic and social. Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis, & Goetz (1994) compared students in eight special education class programs. "They found significant differences for students in general education classes in overall quality of individualized education plans (IEPs), overall engagement and time in integrated school activities, and levels of reciprocal social interactions," as cited in Agran & Alper (2000). Kennedy & Itkonen (1994) also reported that regular class participation increases students' social contacts with peers without disabilities both in the regular class as well as in other settings; the overall quality of these contacts was more positive and, in some classes, more durable. Vaidya & Zaslavsky (2000) also found benefits to inclusive teaching techniques. They listed the following positive changes: "(a) reeducated fear of human differences

accompanied by increased comfort and awareness; (b) growth in social cognition; (c) improvement in self-concept of non-disabled students; (d) development of personal principles and ability to assume an advocacy role towards their peers and friends with disabilities; and (e) warm and caring friendships".

"While early studies on inclusion have focused predominately on the academic performance of children with disabilities, there has been increased interest in an attention to the social adjustment and social functioning of children with disabilities in inclusive settings," (Vaughn, Elbaum & Schumm, (1996); Vaugh, Elbaum, Schumm, & Hughes (1998), as cited by Pavri & Lufting (2000). Odom, McConnell & Chandler (1994), as cited by Pavri & Lufting (2000), noted that "students with disabilities often demonstrate delays in development that parallel delays in their academic performance and achievement." Some students lack skills in initiating and sustaining positive social relationships and in appropriately interpreting social cues (Gresham, (1997); Heiman & Maragalit, (1998), Itrn & Herris, (1993) as cited by Pauri & Lufting, (2000)". "Often these behaviors result in students with disabilities having fewer friends than their peers without disabilities as well as their being actively rejected by peers," Farmer & Rudkin (1996), as cited by Pauri & Lufting (2000). Ferguson (1994) echoed concerns regarding the successfulness of inclusion. Results of her study show that only exposing regular education students to inclusion does not change their attitudes toward inclusion over time. Placing students in an inclusive class does not guarantee interactions; peer appreciation of diversity must be nurtured, Ferguson (1999).

The perspectives of typical students about inclusive education are still not well represented in the professional literature, Fisher (1999). This is especially true at the secondary level. Ferguson's 1999 findings support this concept. She noted that, in spite of various studies, no one has yet examined, in-depth, the attitudes of regular education students, particularly those in a high school setting. This study focused on the perceptions of both the general and special education students. The findings suggest that the students' attitudes were not clearly definable along the lines of special education students' attitudes or general education students' attitudes. The feelings varied from individual to individual. Fisher (1999) suggests that "inclusive education appears to add value to the educational experience of students without disabilities as their experiences have encouraged them to examine their values, beliefs, and behaviors." "If we consider students' responsibility for their own learning an essential factor in accounting for learning then students' perceptions of teaching practices should also be discerned." The perceptions of all of the students as cited by Klinger & Vaugh (1999), in the inclusion program at the Deptford High School contain valuable information necessary for structuring, evaluating and restructuring the co-teaching model of inclusion employed there.

Conclusion

In the early years special education was thought to be best provided in a separate arena than that of the general education population. With the passage of mandates like the Education of all Handicapped Children Act (EHCA) which was later renamed Individuals

with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1990 and its later amendments, came a push to provide special needs students with Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE), in what was termed the least Restrictive Environment (LRE). The LRE as described by Lipsky & Gartner (1992); Skartic (1991); Stainback & Stainback (1992), as cited by Hamill & Denver, (1998), states "students with disabilities are placed in general education classes and have special education-services brought to them rather than have the students brought to the services."

Over the years the process of providing special needs students with access to the general education curriculum and social arena has been called integration, mainstreaming and most recently inclusion. What inclusion is and how to provide it has various meanings across the field of education. The term inclusion or inclusive education does not appear in the federal law, which contributes to the confusion surrounding the term and its implementation. Another source of confusion is that inclusion has its origins in a philosophy or set of values about the rights of children with disabilities, Power-defur & Orlore (1997). These multiple interpretations have resulted in continuing debates by the pro-and anti-inclusionists.

The practice of inclusive education is based on the philosophy that all children, special and general education, can work together and learn from each other. The success of an inclusive education depends greatly on well planned and implemented procedure. A review of the literature supports this belief. As schools institute inclusion programs, teachers will not only have to change the way they teach but also what they teach (Heron & Jergensen (1995), as cited by Hamil & Denver (1998). At the secondary level, not

only will teachers have to provide instruction that addresses the general education curriculum, but they also will have to include instruction that addresses transition to adulthood in order to make the general education curriculum relevant for students with disabilities, Amith & Puccini (1995), as cited by Hamill & Denver (1998).

The high school setting has multiple options in its goal to prepare its students for job skills, college preparation or a mixture of the two. This is unlike the elementary setting, which identifies a specific curriculum for all of its students. There is individualism to high school that is designed to meet the individual goals of its students. This individualism lends itself to inclusion.

Studies like the one that was completed at the Deptford High School provide information about how to make inclusionary practices adaptable in the high school setting. It gives the practicing classroom teachers practical direction for how to become an inclusive school and offers suggestions on what worked and what did not work.

The size of most high schools of today lends itself to presenting its teachers with diverse population. In an attempt to meet the needs of the student population, the teachers assume much of the day-to-day decision making within their classrooms. The teachers' expectations vary from period to period based on the needs of the class composition. In the high school setting there is flexibility for designing the IEP and creating a personalized course of study. Some uniformity may be helpful at times, but the range of approaches is a high school's true strength, Montogmery, J.K., as cited in Power-de Fue & Ordove (1997).

Co-teaching, is one of the most effective strategies for inclusive schools Dalheim (1994), as cited in Power-de Fur & Orelove (1997). This technique was employed at the Deptford High School. The students benefited from the instructional expertise of the special educator and the discipline expertise of the general educator. This resulted in all of the students receiving instruction.

The future implications of studies such as the one completed at the Deptford High School suggest that there is a continued need for research to investigate the culture of high schools and the impact of inclusion on its curriculum and population. The nature of this work provided insights that allowed the practioners to gain practical information for many inclusive settings. The limitation of this study is that it provided a view of only one group of teachers and students which may limit the generalizability of the findings to different professional situations. In addition, the study was concluded during a school year where inclusion was relatively a new concept and it was the first year of implementation.

This chapter reviews the literature on inclusion and finds that there is still a great deal regarding inclusion that is not known. What has been established is the belief that further studies need to be conducted. The implementation of inclusive practices requires planning, supported by research that is tested and reinforced in the actual classroom.

Chapter III

To assist special needs students in meeting the New Jersey Core Curriculum Standards and to provide them with the opportunity to be successfully taught in the general educating setting, an inclusion program that employs the co-teaching method of instruction was introduced to the Deptford Township public school district at the high school level. The program was presented in six classes for the 2001-2002 school year. Deptford High School had previously utilized mainstreaming special needs students into general education settings, placing them in resource centers, or in small self contained special needs classes to meet their educational needs.

What differs in this approach from the mainstreaming that had been used, is the amount of time in the setting and the addition of a special education teacher working with the general education teacher to provide the instruction. Previously if students were mainstreamed, or placed in a general education program, any modifications to the program were handled by the teacher. This was done in conjunction with this teacher providing the instruction for the entire class. What often resulted was a reduction in the expectations or course requirements to address the special needs students' learning disability. What was being attempted in the co-taught, inclusion classes was to provide the special needs students with the opportunity to master the same quality and quantity of material that was being presented to their nonclassified classmates. Mainstreaming special needs students into general education settings, placing them in resource centers or in small self-contained special needs classes were the three options previously utilized to meet their educational needs. Some of the practices used by the teachers centered around

grouping strategies, employing study guides, incorporating computers and assistive technology, as well as cooperative learning and peer tutoring.

The resource centers which continue to be used to meet the needs of some of the special education students, allowed the students to be instructed in a small group setting with other special needs students by a special education teacher. This approach presents the opportunity for the students to be given the general education curriculum that was modified by the teacher to meet their needs, at a pace that varies with the ability level of the other students. Self–contained classes provide support for the special needs student by employing small class size and a learning atmosphere that allows the teachers to adjust, the curriculum, rate of introduction and the expectations to meet the needs of the students based on their IEP's. Because the educational needs of classified students vary, all three options were made available. In maintaining all three settings, the district was able to meet the educational needs that were called for in the students' Individualized Education Plans.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the effects of this first attempt on educating students identified as having special needs in the least restrictive environment, the general education setting. The opinions and attitudes of those involved with the co-teaching were sought, to ascertain if they viewed the approach as valuable. In September of 2001, the teachers and students were surveyed to determine their views on employing the co-teaching method of instruction. Near the end of the study the students and teachers were again surveyed to determine if their views remained the same or had changed following their participation in the co-taught classes. During the period in which

the study was conducted, observations were completed and interviews with the teachers were held. The observations focused on methodology, how the instruction occurred, student interaction, which included student to student and student to teacher, student mastery of the subject matter as demonstrated by grades, and classroom atmosphere. The observations were accompanied by interviews with the teachers. The interviews with the teachers were used to obtain clarification of specific questions regarding the lessons. They were also used as a question/answer period during which specifies of the co-teaching were reviewed or questions about the educational profiles of the students were discussed. This two-way communication assisted the teachers in determining successful applications and techniques and modifying or deleting those practices that were felt not to be beneficial to the practical day-to-day educational process. A list of the techniques and strategies utilized in the classrooms can be found in Table 4. The following comments were made by teachers during interviews:

"No common time for teachers to talk and discuss students or assignments."

"This is working well".

"Concern with keeping the cap on class size to twenty as presented at the start of the project."

"Having the special needs teacher readily available also helps with the non-classified students who are struggling."

"Not enough notification of the program given before the start of the school year."

"Though it is going well, there are still feelings of uneasiness learning the roles of becoming a teaching pair."

"Initially it is going well, but we're not sure of the capability levels of the special needs students."

"No time to meet after school due to other responsibilities and no common prep time together to review concerns."

"Inclusion workshop was helpful, but it emphasized the need for planning time, which we don't have."

"Workshop had some good suggestions, but it was mostly geared for the elementary level."

"Having the special needs teacher is an extra plus. It lets us provide help when it is needed by any of the students, not just the classified students."

Subjects of the Study

Ninety-nine students who attend one of the six co-taught classes in the Deptford High School participated in the study. Thirty of the students were classified and sixty-nine were non-classified students. The students were given the surveys while in attendance of one of the co-taught classes and requested to complete the form in the time given at the end of the class. The fourteen teachers who participated in the study were also surveyed at the start of the school year, then again at the conclusion of the project. The levels of expertise with working in an inclusive setting varied. The teachers were asked to rate their responses to the statements on the survey by employing the following scale: Agree, Strongly Agree or Disagree. All of the teachers involved in the study did not respond to the survey. The results were based on the total number of responses for

each item. Table 5 contains the results of the teacher survey and Table 6 contains the results of the student survey.

To compare the success of the special needs students to that of the non-classified students in the classes, the first quarter report card grades were reviewed. The class grades were compared to other class sections taught by the same teacher. Tables 7-12 contain the mark distribution within the classes. Grading was a composite of test scores, homework, and class participation at a ratio of 50% test scores, 40% homework and 10% for class participation. Numerical and corresponding letter grades are as follows:

- A   93-100   Exceptional

- B   92-86   Above Average

- C   84-75   Average

- D   74-68   Below Average

- E   67-0   Poor Performance

Data Collection

The students were given the survey at the start of the school year in each of the respective co-taught classes. They were asked to complete the form and return it to the teachers at the conclusion of the period. It required approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. The survey contained questions that inquired about the students' perceptions on the co-taught inclusion class. The surveys were collected and tallied. The total number of raw scores was then utilized to determine the perceptions of the students. These results were then compared to the survey given to the students at the conclusion of the study to determine if their attitudes toward the value in their participation in the co-

taught classes increased or decreased when compared to the results received at the start of the school term.

Surveys and interviews were also conducted with the general and special education teachers who provided the instruction in the co-taught classes. The survey was conducted at the start of the school term and at the end of the study. The interviews were conducted throughout the period that the study was being administered and were conducted as part of the observations. The surveys were employed to gain insight into the experience level of the teachers, their familiarity with inclusion, and their opinions regarding the utilization of the co-teaching method to bring about the inclusion of special needs students into the general education setting. The interviews were designed to gain specific first hand knowledge of the demands of the daily functioning within the co-taught classes. The observations provided the opportunity to witness the various teaching methods and strategies, and the impact of these strategies and methods on the learning process. The teachers' survey took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. The interviews varied in length depending on the topic and individuals involved. The observations lasted for one class period, which is equal to forty-two minutes. They were scheduled in a random order but the teachers were notified in advance when the observations would occur. A written request was given to the teachers that identified the date and time of the observation. This was done as a courtesy and to ensure that the period did not contain examination periods. This procedure decreased the effect of the intern's intrusion in the class on the evaluation procedures.

Interviews with the teachers provided an opportunity for questions regarding specific instruction. These questions centered on subject matter, instructional approach or were in relation to a specific student. It also afforded the intern and teachers time to become acquainted on a social and professional level.

Data Analysis

The education of special needs students within the general education curriculum has been attempted via various methods including mainstreaming; resource centers and by placing them in separate small group settings that was instructed by a special education teacher. All of these approaches serve to meet the educational needs of the students. With the passage of mandates that require special needs students to be educated in the least restrictive setting, varying approaches are being employed in an attempt to meet the educational needs of these students. One such approach or method is co-teaching, which is one general education and one special education teacher working together in a general education setting to provide instruction for all of the students in the class. This concept has been utilized predominately at the elementary school level. The secondary level with its additional demands for credit hours, core subject completion and graduation requirements all have an affect on how and when strategies such as co-teaching, are attempted. Studies such as this one provide information on how the approach was used and its effect on the students and their learning. The project value is in offering others who are responding to the need to provide all students with an equal success to a quality education in the setting they would attend if they were not identified

as having special needs. The expectation for learning would be the same as, instead of equal to, that which is required of the general education population. Studies like this one would provide information regarding inclusion that could answer questions such as, which students would best benefit from this type of placement, and what methods of teaching are the most successful. When is inclusion the right choice, how do we prepare the teachers, what effect does placement of special needs students in the general education setting have on both classified and non-classified students? What other supports are necessary to make co-teaching method of instruction successful?

The attitudes and beliefs of teachers and students involved in this co-teaching, inclusion project, are valuable. The review of their responses on the survey at the start of the project compared to their responses at the end of the study, indicate whether or not the participants felt the project was a success. The grades earned by the students are another way to ascertain if the project met its goals and accomplished what is was designed to do. This coupled with the observations and interviews can be used by others who are considering or in the process of trying to provide an education for special needs students. The results can not be readily generalized to other schools but it can be looked at as an example of how one high school incorporated co-teaching into their curriculum.

Chapter IV

Co-teaching was used as a method to create an inclusive educational setting at the Deptford High School. It provided special needs students with the opportunity to receive their education in the least restrictive environment. Co-teaching was one of several programs that were utilized at the Deptford High School to provide students with the educational support needed to successfully master the curriculum presented.

This study was employed to examine the progress toward mastery of the skills taught. The study looked at the levels of mastery for both the classified and non-classified students during the first year of implementation of the project. The students and teachers participated in a survey at the start of the school year and in February to compare their attitudes toward the project. Observations of the participating classrooms were completed to observe the teaching strategies and the responses of the students. Conferences with the teachers were held to illicit additional information on techniques, strategies, positive and negative outcomes of the use of the varying teaching techniques and strategies. A review of the marking period grades was done to evaluate the success of the use of co-teaching when compared to the grades given in a similar class that were taught by the subject certified secondary school teachers.

Results of the initial survey of the students suggested that slightly over 75% of the group believed that co-teaching would be helpful. Less than 10% of the students identified any difficulty with being able to complete both the class and homework assignments that were given them by their teachers. Socialization within the classrooms

was also positive. Less than 5% of the students cited interacting with the students in the co-taught classes as presenting a problem or area of concern.

What impact will the co-taught inclusion classes have on the learning of the classified and non-classified students in the Deptford High School and how effective was the inclusion? In four of the six classes the percentage of students who earned A, B and C's remained equal to or surpassed the percentages of the students who earned A, B and C's during the first marking period in the co-taught classes. Tables 13 through18 on the following pages contain the mark distribution for the second marking period by teachers. Table 19 contains the comparison of the percentages of students who earned A, B and C's, with grades in the ranges of >92 to 85-75 for all of the teachers.

Students' responses to the survey administered in the spring of the school term can be found in Table 21. The responses indicate that they viewed the inclusion classes from a positive perspective. Most felt that the classes were supportive. They received enough support to assist them in meeting both the class work and homework demands. Very few of the students indicated that they experienced difficulty socializing with their classmates in the inclusion classes or that they preferred being instructed in a smaller group setting.

How did the selection process of the participants affect the success of the program?

During the interviews with the teachers, it was reported that formation of the inclusion co-taught classes took place during the summer, shortly after the end of the previous school term. No specific training for the co-taught classes were given, prior to the start of the school term. It was offered as an option for an in-service during the

school year. This coupled with the lack of the availability for planning during scheduled portions of the day, reduced the opportunity for the teachers to communicate ideas and teaching strategies. Much of the success of the program was the result of the abilities of the teachers to provide quality instruction to all of their students. The willingness of the teachers to work equally with all of the students resulted in classrooms where any student who encountered difficulty was readily addressed in a supportive manner by both of the teachers in the classes. The use of multi-servicing approaches to teaching, combining visual, auditory, tactile and multimedia technology to enrich learning, resulted in the teachers being able to utilize methodology that met the students at their varying levels of ability.

The students were given the opportunity to learn through whatever personal learning style they preferred, thereby reaching them through their areas of strength and providing support to improve their areas of weakness.

Table 1

Origins of Revenues for Educational Cost

Source	1999	2000
Local Tax	49%	41%
State Tax	42%	52%
Federal Tax	3%	2%
Other	6%	5%

Table 2

Per Pupil Expenditures for 1999 and 2000

Source	1999	2000
District	$9,341	$8,665
State	$9,872	$9,656

Table 3

High Proficiency Test Average Scores

	Reading	Mathematics	Writing	HSPT (All Seasons)
Deptford	93.4%	93.4%	96.7%	87.3%
New Jersey	89.4%	92.0%	93.1%	85.1%

Note: Deptford's score is based on 213 students who were eligible to take the test.

Table 4

Instructional Techniques and Strategies Observed in the Classroom

Technique/ Strategy	Description
Visual Assistance	Providing a written explanation or visual example of a term given in a lesson.
Redirection	Providing redirection or explanation flowing an unscheduled interruption to a lesson.
Restatement	Restating or re-emphasing an explanation or statement.
Verbal Praise	Giving a verbal praise to a student following the student giving a response to a question.
Outlining	Having a prepared outline of a lesson which demonstrates the significance and connection to topics in a lesson.
Cooperative Learning	Establishing small groups of students within the class to work together.
Peer Tutoring	Having only two students work together to complete a task or assignment.
Technology-Enhanced Instruction	Employing the use of technology, computers, televisions etc. as instructional aids.
Modeling	Teacher or student models the desired behavior.
Organizing Activities	Activities and teaching strategies designed to help students learn self organizing skills. Examples are notebooks, study guides and teacher routines.

Use of Realistic Examples	Using concrete examples from everyday life to present vocabulary terms.
Questioning	Teacher using questioning effectively to ask why, how and what.
Meta-cognition	Asking questions during oral review to help the students become conscious of their own thinking processes.
Open-Book Review	Students utilize, textbook, and class notes to obtain answers in a question answer period on the days prior to a exam being given.
Enrichment Activities	Students engage in reviewing lesson data through game approaches and competitions.

Table 5

Results of the Teacher Survey- Fall 2001

Question	Responses			

Question				
Years of teaching experience	0-4 1	5-10 3	11-15 1	>15 3
Level of expertise in Spec. Ed.	None 2	Minimal 2	Average 1	High 4
Comfort level with co-teaching	None 0	Minimal 0	Average 4	High 5
Better academic achievement in general setting	Agree 3	Strongly Agree 2		Disagree 3
Improved socializing in general education	Agree 7	Strongly Agree		Disagree 1
Curriculum modification acceptable	Agree 3	Strongly Agree 2		Disagree 2
Enough support by administration for inclusion teachers	Agree 2	Strongly Agree		Disagree 6
Adequate time for professional teaching	Agree 1	Strongly Agree 0		Disagree 7

Note: All teachers did not respond to the questionnaire. Results are reflective of total raw score responses for each item.

Table 6

Student Survey Results from Fall of 2001

Questions		Responses		
	None	3-5	>5	Omit
Years in Special Education	64	17	7	6
	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Omit
Co-teaching class is helpful	57	16	23	3
I receive enough help in class	68	23	6	2
I am able to complete assignments	70	22	5	2
I am able to complete homework assignments	68	17	13	1
I get along with the students in class	61	32	5	1
I would prefer a smaller class setting	4	0	74	21
	<14	15-16	16-17	>17
Age of students	3	50	30	16

Table 7

First Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher #1

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
English 9 CP	0.0	11.8	29.4	41.2	17.6
English 9 CP	9.5	42.9	28.6	14.3	4.8
*English 10	0.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	10.0
English 10	0.0	6.7	60.0	20.0	13.3

Note: The percentages indicate the percent in that class that fell within the identified grade range.
* -Identifies the class in which the co-teaching was conducted.
CP - indicates the academic level of the class as College Preparatory.

Table 8

First Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher #2

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
English 10 CP	4.8	47.6	42.9	4.8	0.0
English 10 CP	18.2	18.2	63.6	0.0	0.0
*English 11	18.8	75.0	6.3	0.0	0.0
English 11	5.6	66.7	16.7	5.6	5.6

Note: The percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in the class.
* - Identifies class in which co-teaching was employed.
CP - indicates the academic level of the class as college preparatory.

Table 9

First Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher #3

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
Earth Science	5.3	42.1	21.1	15.8	15.8
Earth Science*	10.5	31.6	42.1	10.5	5.3
Earth Science	22.2	38.9	33.3	5.6	0.0

Note: The percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in that class.
* -Identified the class in which co-teaching was employed.

Table 10

<u>First Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher #4</u>

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
World Cultures	53.8	19.2	11.5	0.0	15.4
*World Cultures	31.6	15.8	26.3	15.8	10.5
World Cultures CP	65.4	11.5	11.5	3.8	3.8
World Cultures CP	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
World Cultures CP	91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

<u>Note:</u>   The percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in that class.
*Identifies the class in which co-teaching was employed.
CP --indicates the academic level as college preparatory.

Table 11

First Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher #5

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
US History II	0.0	11.1	55.6	33.3	0.0
US History II	3.7	37.0	44.4	11.1	3.7
*US History II	32.0	32.0	36.0	0.0	0.0
US History II CP	13.8	13.8	51.7	20.7	0.0
US History II CP	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0

Note: The percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in that class.
* -Identifies the class in which co-teaching was employed.
CP –Indicates the academic level as college preparatory.

Table 12

First Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher #6

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
Math I	0.0	33.3	57.1	4.8	4.8
Math I	5.6	27.8	55.6	0.0	5.6
*Math I	0.0	21.1	68.4	5.3	5.3

Note: The percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in that class.
* -Identifies the class in which co-teaching was employed.

Table 13

Second Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher #1

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
English 9CP	5.6	22.2	50.0	11.1	11.1
English 9CP	0.0	40.0	55.0	5.0	0.0
*English 10	5.6	16.7	55.6	16.7	5.6
English 10	6.3	43.8	31.3	6.3	12.5

Note: The percentages indicate the percent in that class that fell within the identified grade range.
* -Identifies the class in which co-teaching was employed.
CP –Indicates the academic level as college preparatory.

Table 14

Second Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher #2

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
English 10 CP	9.5	42.9	38.1	9.5	0.0
English 10 CP	18.2	27.3	54.5	0.0	0.0
*English 11	6.3	62.5	31.3	0.0	0.0
English 11	21.1	26.3	42.1	5.3	0.0

Note: Percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in that class.
* -Identifies the class in which co-teaching was employed.
CP –Indicates the academic level as college preparatory.

Table 15

Second Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher #3

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
Earth Science	16.7	38.9	22.2	5.6	16.7
*Earth Science	5.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	10.0
Earth Science	0.0	52.6	42.1	5.3	0.0

Note: Percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in that class.
* -Identifies the class in which co-teaching was employed.
CP –Indicates the academic level as college preparatory.

Table 16

Second Quarter Mark Distribution for Teacher#4

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
World Cultures	64.0	20.0	12.0	4.0	0.0
*World Cultures	78.9	10.5	0.0	0.0	5.3
World Cultures	33.3	18.5	22.2	11.1	14.8
World Cultures	80.0	8.0	8.0	0.0	0.0
World Cultures	80.0	16.0	4.0	0.0	0.0

Note: Percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in that class.
* -Identifies the class in which co-teaching was employed.
CP –Indicates the academic level as college preparatory.

Table 17

Second Mark Distribution for Teacher #5

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
US History II	11.1	48.1	37.0	0.0	0.0
US History II	0.0	30.8	46.2	23.1	0.0
*US History II	28.0	16.0	40.0	16.0	0.0
US History II	41.4	31.0	27.6	0.0	0.0
US History II	34.5	17.2	41.4	6.9	0.0

Note: Percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in that class.
* -Identifies the class in which co-teaching was employed.
CP –Indicates the academic level as college preparatory.

Table 18

Second Quarter Mark Distribution Teacher#6

Course Title	Grade Range				
	<92	92-86	85-75	74-68	<68
Math I	4.5	9.1	27.3	9.1	0.0
Math I	13.3	13.3	26.7	13.3	0.0
*Math I	11.1	11.1	44.4	27.8	0.0

Note: Percentages are reflective of the percent of students that fell within the identified grade range in that class.
* -Identifies the class in which co-teaching was employed.
CP –Indicates the academic level as college preparatory.

Table 19

Comparison of Grade Percentages for Fall and Spring

Teacher	Fall 2001		Spring 2002
	<92	92-86	85-75
#1	20%		25.9%
#2	33%		33%
#3	28%		28%
#4	24.5%		29.8%
#5	33.3%		28.0%
#6	29.8%		22.2%

Note: The percentages indicate the percent of students in the co-taught classes that fell within the given grade range.

What are the perceptions of the teachers, students and administrators regarding using the co-teaching method of instruction? The results of the surveys completed in the fall and spring of the year 2001-02 by the teachers indicated that 100% of the teachers were comfortable with instructing in the co-taught class. Most felt that the students would receive better academic achievement in a co-taught class and that the students had greater opportunities for socialization. The majority of the teachers felt that they were not afforded adequate time for professional planning. Similar results were obtained regarding the teacher's views of their receiving adequate support from the administration.

Table 20 contains the raw data received from the inclusion survey that was completed by

the teachers in the spring of the 2001-02 school year.

Table 20

Results of the Teacher Survey- Spring 2002

Question			Responses	

	None	Minimal	Average	High
Level of expertise in Spec. Ed.	0	2	2	8

	None	Minimal	Average	High
Comfort level with co-teaching	0	0	4	8

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree
Inclusion resulted in improved academic achievement	6	2	4

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree
Social skills improved in general setting.	11	0	1

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree
Curriculum modification acceptable	6	4	2

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree
Enough support by administration for inclusion	2	0	10

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree
Adequate time for professional teaching demands	2	0	10

Note: All teachers did not respond to the questionnaire. Results are reflective of total raw score responses for each item.

Table 21

Student Survey Responses from Spring 2002

Question		Responses		

	None	3-5	>5	Omit
Years in Special Education	72	17	7	3

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Omit
Co-Teaching is Helpful	60	19	20	0

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Omit
I received enough help in class	72	22	4	1

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Omit
I am able to complete assignments	69	20	10	0

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Omit
I am able to complete homework	79	8	10	2

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Omit
I get along with the students in class	60	33	4	1

	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Omit
I would prefer a smaller class	4	1	90	4

Note: All students did not respond to the questionnaire. Results are reflective of total raw score responses for each item.

Chapter V

Introduction

Inclusion is a method of providing students with special needs the opportunity to be educated with their non-classified peers. They are given equal access to the general curriculum. Inclusion allows for all students to be educated. Those students who need support are able to receive support that has been tailored to meet their individual needs. Co-teaching is a process by which two teachers work together in one classroom to provide the resources that enable the students to learn. It is one method through which inclusion can be accomplished. In the co-teaching model one teacher provides the direct instruction, while the other supports the students while they are working. Co-teaching can also be accomplished by the parallel or station approach. With this approach, groups of students work on topics or projects while the teachers walk about the room to provide assistance. Another approach is to teach side-by-side in the classroom. This method provides instruction for the entire class. Whichever the method chosen, the students are able to benefit from the expertise of both of the educators. In the co-teaching project at the Deptford High School, the instructional teams consisted of one subject certified secondary teacher and one special educator. The class size was approximately 20 students, 6 to 7 of whom were special needs students.

In all of the co-teaching formats, there needs to be an equal willingness to share the control of all aspects of the classroom including instruction, discipline, grading and preparation. When this occurs, modifications to the curriculum and modeling of

alternative methods of instruction can occur. The end result is that the teachers learn from each other as the students learn from them. An additional benefit from the use of co-teaching is that the curriculum remains the same for all of the students. The combination of the expertise of the subject certified teachers along with the special educators' knowledge of alternative strategies creates an atmosphere in which all of the students benefit.

The inclusion that was addressed through the co-teaching model that was conducted at the Deptford High School for the 2001-02 school year yielded a positive response. The results of the surveys that were given in the fall and in the spring of the school term indicated that despite the absence of training prior to the start of the school year, the teachers' positive view of co-teaching supported their interest and determination to make the project a success. Though they had a limited availability of common planning time, the teachers employed good communication skills to help them share their ideas and concerns. The teachers' perspectives remained consistent throughout the length of the project. Their responses indicated that they believe that the students benefited from the opportunity to work together with students of varying levels of ability. The greatest concern that became evident through the survey, centered on the belief that they were not given enough planning time during the year. This was felt to have a negative impact on the success of the project.

The following suggestions are recommended to address this concern:
First of all, formation of the inclusion classes should be done by the case managers from the Department of Special Services in conjunction with the guidance department. The

case managers have valuable data on the educational profiles of the students under consideration. This information can assist the guidance department in the placement of the students. This data should also be provided to the teachers in the perspective classrooms, along with any special accommodations for the students that exist as part of their IEP's. Sharing of this information, better equips the teachers in the fall with their interaction with the students.

Once the classes have been established, it is imperative that the teachers be given some inservicing during the summer months. Presentations by guest speakers and Learning Disability Teacher Consultants (LDTC) would be invaluable. One in-service should be designed to review the concerns of the first year. Another should be to discuss the up coming year's curriculum. This time should be devoted to the co-teachers working on determining what modifications may be needed, and creating ways to address these modifications. Inservicing during the year should be considered to allow for brain-storming by the teachers, case managers and LDTC's to discuss progress to date and to identify any unanticipated programmatic concerns. This also gives the case managers an opportunity to update the teachers on changes in the students' educational profiles and/or their IEP's.

Common planning was identified as an important element that contributes to the success of any inclusion project. It affords the participants the opportunity to identify those strategies that prove to be useful, and the time to restructure or dismiss techniques that are unsuccessful. This also creates opportunities to address unplanned program changes such as the addition of new students through the year. Scheduling is a function

of the guidance department, which supports the importance of their involvement in the program. The final programmatic consideration should be a culminating meeting near the end of the school term. It was suggested that along with the teachers, case managers and guidance department, participation from the central office curriculum department also be included. This would ensure the utilization of any new district programs by the teams in determining the procedures for the upcoming year.

The students, like the teachers supported the project. The results of the surveys given to them indicated that the students felt that participation in the co-teaching or inclusion classes afforded them the ample support necessary to complete both their class and homework assignments. A review of the grades earned in the classes demonstrated that the students were capable of achieving passing grades for both the first and second marking periods. This suggests that the techniques employed resulted in providing enough educational support to assist the special needs students in mastering the skills taught to them at the same level of mastery as their non-classified peers.

A review of the question of socialization and acceptance within the classroom by the special needs students, indicated that the students felt that they are able to interact positively with their classmates. There was no negative change in the perceptions of the students when the surveys were administered for the second time. The inclusion classrooms had an arena in which the students were given the opportunity for academic and social growth.

Observations of the actual classroom revealed a number of strategies that were being instinctively employed by the teachers. These techniques and strategies assisted all

of the students in the classes. The multi-sensory approach to teaching emphasized the strengths of the students while supporting the areas of weakness. The use of the visual and auditory approaches, the application of technical assistance, reviews of assignments, and study guides all provided the students with opportunities to learn. This increased the likelihood that the students would master the newly introduced concepts as well as helped them to recall previously taught concepts. The teachers employed peer tutoring, small group instruction, outlining, oral reviews, maps, hands on activities and reteaching to list a few of the techniques. The students responded positively to the general atmosphere and culture of the classrooms that addressed each student as an equally valuable member. The observations completed in this study also provided the intern with first hand knowledge of the classroom dynamics. The interviews that were conducted as part of the observations worked to establish dialogue for suggestions and modifications to the instruction being provided. This dialogue improved the intern's ability to utilize effective communication.

Teachers using this technique for the first time acknowledged their beliefs that the next year would demonstrate improved dialogue between the co-teaching partners due to the increased familiarity with their partners' teaching style. They, however, maintained their level of caution and concern for the project should they not be afforded the opportunity to experience common planning times.

Implications for further study

Teaching by design has been one teacher responsible for the education of those assigned students within his or her classroom he or she had been assigned to. This individuality resulted in the teachers working independently, and attempting to meet the needs of all of the students. The passage of laws and the call for placement of special needs students to be educated in the Least Restrictive Environment, challenges the teachers to work with an increasingly diverse population while meeting the demands of an ever changing curriculum. One concept employed to assist the teachers is the co-teaching method of instruction. Co-teaching combines the skills of the two teachers to present varied techniques and strategies as tools to impart knowledge to all students in the classroom.

Co-teaching as it was employed at the Deptford High School is one of the ways in which the education of the special needs students was met. The program helped the students to meet both the educational and social challenges that are a part of the student's high school career. The major limitations of the study included its limited duration, the scope and size of the sample, and the curriculum. Implications for further study include a longitudinal study of the same group of students for the remainder of their high school career.

Co-teaching is an excellent method of providing teaching instruction that varies in its method and strategy. It is best employed when pre and post planning are utilized, to develop the curriculum. Another major component is the need for the co-teaching partners is to give time during the course of the program to work together in formulating the daily plans and the yearlong scope and sequence of the curriculum. When all of those

things occur, what develops is a well-organized teaching tool that provides instructional support for all of the students in the program. Though it is often thought of in conjunction with special needs students, all students who are given the opportunity to experience this method of instruction benefit.

References

Agran, Martin & Alper, Sandra (2000) "Curriculum and instruction in general education; implications for service delivery and teacher preparation." <u>The Journal of the Association or Persons with Severe Handicaps</u>. Vol. 25, No.3, Fall 2000 (167-74).

Chow, Peter; Blais, Lynn & Hemingway, James (1999) "An outsider looking in; total inclusion and the concept of equifinality." <u>Education</u>.Vol. 119, No. 3, Spring 1999 (459-64).

Chronis, Terry G. & Ellis, David M. (2000) "Issues facing special educators in the new millennium". Education. Vol. 120, No. 4, Summer 2000 (639-48).

Daane, C.J.; Beirne-Smith, Mary; and Latham, Dianne. (2000). "Administrator's and Teacher's Perceptions of the Collaborative Efforts of Inclusion in the Elementary Grades." <u>Education</u>. Vol. 121, No. 2, Winter 2000 (331-9).

Education Week. (2001) "Inclusion" http://www.edweek.org/context/topics/ issues page.cfm.

Elkind, David. (2000) "The Cosmopolitan School". <u>Educational Leadership</u>. Vol. 58, No. 4, Dec 2000/Jan. 2001 (12-17).

Ferguson, Janet M. (1999) "High School Students Attitudes Toward Inclusion of Handicapped Students in the Regular Education Classroom". <u>The Educational Forum</u>. Vol. 63, No. 2, Winter, 1999 (173-9).

Fisher, Douglas. (1999) "According to Their Peers; Inclusion as High School Students See It". Mental Retardation. Vol. 37, No.6, December 1999. Dec. 1999 (458-67).

Garrick Duhaney, Laurel M. "A Content Analysis of State Education Agencies Policies/ Position Statements on Inclusion". Remedial and Special Education. Vol. 20, No.6, Nov/Dec. 1999 (367-78).

Gindis, Boris. "Vygostsky's Vision; Reshaping the Practice of Special Education for the 21st Century". (1999). Education. Vl.20, No.6, Nov/Dec. 1999. (333-40).

Grove, Kathleen A. & Fisher, Douglas. (1999) "Entrepreneurs of Meaning; Parents and the Process of Inclusive Education". Remedial and Special Education. Vol. 20, No.4, July/Aug 1999 (208-215).

Guetzlue, Elenor (1999) "Inclusion: The Broken Promis". Preventing School Failure. Vol. 43, No.3, Spring 1999 (92-98).

Hamill, Lee B. & Dever, R. B. (1998). "Preparing for Inclusion; Secondary Teachers Describe Their Professional Experience". Education. Vol. 27, No.1, Fall 1998. (18-28).

Holloway, John H. (2001) "Inclusion and Students With Learning Disabilities". Educational Leadership. Vol. 58, No.6, March 2001. (86-88).

Huey, Susan (2000) "Inclusion: Making It Work For The Whole Community". The Delta Kappa Gamma Bullentin. Vol. 66, No.3, Spring 2000 (9-16).

Jorgensen, C; Fisher, D. & Roach, V. (1997). "Curriculum and Its Impact on Inclusion and the Achievement of Students With Disabilities". <u>Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices. CISP Publications and Resources</u>. Brief 2. July, 1997.

Kavale, Kenneth A. & Forness, Steven R. (2000). "History, Rhetoric and Reality; Analysis of the Inclusion Debate". <u>Remedial and Special Education</u>. Vol.21, No.5, Sept/Oct 2000. (279-296).

Klinger, Janett-Kettmann & Vaughn, Sharon. (1999) "Student's Perceptions of Instruction in Inclusion Classrooms: Implications for Students with Learning Disabilities". <u>Exceptional Children</u>. Vol.66, No.1, Fall 1999 (23-37).

Mallory, William W. (19996) "Essential Schools and Inclusion; A Responsive Partnership". <u>Educational Forum</u>. Vol. 60, Spring 1996 (228-236).

Mamlin, Nancy (1999). "Despite Best Intentions; When Inclusion Fails". <u>The Journal of Special Education</u>. Vol. 33, No. 1, Spring 1999. (36-49).

McCregor, Gail; Halvorsen, Ann; Fisher, Douglass; Pumpian, Ian; Bhaerman, Bob; and Salisbury, Christine. (1998) "Professional Development for all Personnel in Inclusive Schools". Consortium on Inclusive Schooling Practices. (Issue Brief 3 (3)). CISP Publications and Resources. Nov. 1998. (1-11).

McLesky, James & Henry, Daniel. (1999). "Inclusion: What Progress is Being Made Across States?" <u>Teaching Exceptional Children</u>. Vol. 31, No.5, May?June 1999. (56-62).

Montgomery, Judy K. (1997). "Inclusion in the Secondary School." In Lissa A Power-deFur & Fred P. Orelove, <u>Inclusive Education: Practical Implementation of the Least Restrictive Enviroment.</u> (181-194). Aspen Publishers, Inc. Gaithersburg, Maryland.

Pavir, Shireen & Lufting, Richard. (2000). The Social Face of Inclusive Education: Are Students With Learning Disabilities Really Included in the Classroom?" <u>Preventing School Failure</u>. Vol. 45, No.1, Fall 2000. (8-14).

Petch-Hogan, Beverly & Hagard, Diane. (1999) "The Inclusion Debate Continues." <u>Kappan Delta P. Record</u>. Vol.35, No.3, Spring 1999. (128-131).

Power-deFur, L.A. & Orelove, F.P. (1997). "Inclusive Education: The Past, Present, and Future." <u>Inclusive Education: Practical Implementation of Least Restrictive Environment</u>. Aspen Publishers Inc. Gaithersburg, Maryland.

Salend, Spencer J. & Garrick-Duhaney, Laurel M. (1999) "The Impact of Inclusion on Students With and Without Disabilities and Their Educators." <u>Remedial and Special Education</u>. Vol. 20, No.2, March/April 1999. (114-1126).

Separate and Unequal: The Education of Children with Disabilities in New Jersey." <u>The 1994 Report of the New Jersey Developmental Disabilities Council</u>, (1-18).

Smith, M. Gwin. (2000). "Secondary Teacher's Perceptions Toward Inclusion of Students With Severe Disabilities." <u>NASSP Bulletin</u>. Vol. 84, No. 613, Feb. 2000 (54-60).

Vaidya, Sheila R. & Zaslavsky, Hallee, N. (2000). Teaching Education Reform Effort of Inclusion Classrooms: Knowledge Versus Pedagogy." <u>Education</u>. Vol. 121, No.1, Fall 2000 (145-152).

Van-Reusen, Anthony; Shoho, Alan R. & Barker, Kimberly S. (2000). "The High School Journal." The High School Journal . Vol. 84, No.2, Dec. 2000/Jan. 2001. (7-20).

Yell, Mithchell, L. & Drasgow, Erik. (1999) "A Legal Analysis of Inclusion'" <u>Preventing School Failure</u>. Vol. 43, No.3, Spring 1999. (118-123).

Teacher Survey

Appendix A

Research Instruments

Inclusion Survey

This survey is being done to gather data on the opinions of teachers regarding in the inclusion of special education students into the general education program. Please take your time in responding to the questions. To ensure anonymity, please do not write your name on the survey. Each survey has been given a number. If you would like to obtain the results of the survey, place a check next to the appropriate response at the end of the survey form. This data is being collected as part of a master's thesis. Thank you in advance for your participation.

Part I

1. Years of teaching experience:____ 0-4 ____ 5-10 ____ 11-15 ____16-20

____21+

2. Gender: Female____ Male____

Part II

3. Certification: (A) General Education _____

(B) Special Education_____

(C) Both A + B _____

4. Level of expertise in Special Education: ____None ____Minimal ____Average

____High

5. Comfort level with collaborating in coteaching: ____None ____Minimal

____Average ____High

6. Agree that students with disabilities achieve more academic success in the general education setting. ____Agree ____Strongly Agree ____Disagree

7. Students with disabilities achieve more socially in a general education setting.

   ____Agree _____Strongly Agree ____Disagree

8. Modifications and adaptations to the curriculum are acceptable. ____Agree

   ____Strongly Agree ____Disagree

9. Adequate educational support is given to the teachers of the inclusive classrooms.

   ____Agree ____Strongly Agree ____Disagree

10. Adequate time is allotted to address the professional demands of teaching a

   inclusive classroom setting. ____Agree ____Strongly Agree ____Disagree

   I would like to know the results of the survey. ____Yes ____No

Student Survey

Appendix B

Research Instruments

Student Survey

This survey is being completed as part of a Master's Thesis requirement at Rowan University. Please answer each question. Do not write your name on the survey. Return your completed survey to your teacher. Thank you for your assistance.

1. Your current age: _____ 15-16 _____16-17 _____17+

2. Your current grade status: _____Tenth _____Eleventh _____Twelfth

3. Number of years in a special education program: _____None _____3-5 _____more than 6 years.

4. Gender: _____Male _____Female

5. My placement in the co-teaching class is helpful: _____Agree _____Strongly Agree _____Disagree.

6. I am receiving enough support in the classroom: _____Agree _____Strongly Agree _____Disagree.

7. I am able to complete the daily assignments. _____Agree _____Strongly Agree _____Disagree.

8. The support allows me to complete my homework assignments. _____Agree _____Strongly Agree _____Disagree.

9. I get along with the students in the inclusive class. _____Agree _____Strongly Agree _____Disagree.

I find placement in the co-teaching class uncomfortable. I would prefer a placement in:

_____general education class _____ smaller special education class

Classroom Observations

Appendix C

Research Instruments

Subject:_____

School: _____

Lesson Type: _____

Date:_____   Time: _____

Room Diagram:

OBSERVATION

Opening Activity: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Narrative: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

II   Instructional Modification/ Strategies Utilized

a.   _____ Textbook

b.   _____ Written assignments

c.   _____ Length or the assignments

d.   _____ Modifications of time

e.   _____ Testing and assessment modifications

f.   _____ Modifications of behavior and/or expectations

g.   _____ Alternative directions (modifications of directions)

h.   _____ Small group instructions

i.   _____ Manipulatives employed

j.   _____ Other

Observation rate is:	2a	2b	2c	2d	2e	...
Highly Utilized	Hu	Hu	Hu	Hu	Hu	
Moderately Utilized	Mu	Mu	Mu	Mu	Mu	
Not Very Utilized	Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu	

III   OBSERVATION

Student participation

a.   _____ Active participation

b.   _____ Individual assistance

c. _____ Verbal redirection requested

d. _____ Off tasks behavior exhibited

e. _____ Other

Observation rate is:	3a	3b	3c	3d	3e
Highly Utilized	Hu	Hu	Hu	Hu	Hu
Moderately Utilized	Mu	Mu	Mu	Mu	Mu
Not Very Utilized	Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu

OBSERVATION PROFILE

Instructional Modification:	a	b	c	d	e	f
1. _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Student Participation

1. Verbal Participation

2. Individual Assistance

3. Verbal Redirection

4.

5.

Summary:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Request to Complete Classroom Observation

Appendix D

Research Instruments

To: _____

From: _____

Date: _____

     As part of the research necessary for a thesis, I am required to complete several observations in various classes. I am requesting your permission to complete one of the observations in your classroom during your ____ period class on _____. Please indicate if this is acceptable to you.

____ yes ____ No

Thanking you in advance for your assistance.

Rebecca Tribbett

Biographical Data

Name   Rebecca Tribbett

High School   Deptford Township High School
                                            Deptford, NJ

Undergraduate   Bachelor of Arts
                                            Teacher of the Handicapped
                                            Glassboro State College
                                            Glassboro, N.J.

Graduate   Master of Arts
                                            Student Personnel Services
                                            Rowan University
                                            Glassboro, NJ

Present Occupation   Guidance Counselor
                                            Deptford Township High School
                                            Deptford, NJ