

1994

## A study of inclusion program at the elementary level

Sandra Alexander  
*University of Dayton*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/graduate\\_theses](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/graduate_theses)

---

### Recommended Citation

Alexander, Sandra, "A study of inclusion program at the elementary level" (1994). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 74.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/graduate\\_theses/74](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/graduate_theses/74)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu), [ecommons@udayton.edu](mailto:ecommons@udayton.edu).

**A STUDY OF INCLUSION PROGRAM  
AT THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL**

**MASTER'S PROJECT**

**Submitted to the Department of Teacher Education,  
University of Dayton, in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Science in Education**

**by**

**Sandra Alexander**

**UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON**

**Dayton, Ohio**

**April 15, 1994**

95 01550

Approved by:



Signature of Advisor

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE.....	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Problem Statement.....	1
Assumptions.....	1
Limitations.....	1
Definitions.....	2
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
Primary Source: Vermont Public School.....	4
Special Education Action Plan.....	7
III. PROCEDURE.....	9
Subjects.....	9
Setting.....	9
Data Collection.....	10
Teacher Questionnaire.....	11
Semantic Differential.....	15
IV. RESULTS.....	16
Presentation of Results.....	16
Discussion of Results.....	16
V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATION, CONCLUSION.....	22
Summary.....	22
Recommendation.....	23
Conclusion.....	23
Bibliography.....	24
Appendices.....	25

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

#### Purpose of the Study

For years students with disabilities had been isolated from many schools as well as the community for various reasons. The philosophy was that students with disabilities were better educated within their own special environment or school. One school in particular has piloted an inclusion program for 2-1/2 years. Inclusion is a fundamental belief that each person is an important and accepted member of the school and the community.

#### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to evaluate if an inclusion program at the elementary level in an open space was successful.

#### Assumption

In order to carry out this study, the writer must make the following assumptions. First, the Individualized Education Program (IEP) had measured the achievements over the past two years. Secondly, the semantic differential was used to measure the students' attitude toward school. The writer assumes the students had honestly answered the semantic differential questionnaire. Lastly, the writer assumes that the team of staff members participating had answered the survey honestly.

#### Limitations

The writer finds that one of the limitations of the study is the inability to survey other schools. Another limitation of the study is that the study began the program at the third grade level as opposed to kindergarten. Funding might have been more accurate and academic achievement higher.

### **Definition of Terms**

Inclusion is a fundamental belief that considers each individual an important member of the school or community. Inclusion simply means "being included".

IEP - Individualized Education Program. It is a written plan for a particular student intended to be a management tool for ensuring that the education design for an individual student is appropriate.

Mainstream is a legal requirement (P.L. 94-142), a component of the least restricted environment.

Learning Disability is a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, spoken or written, which disorders may manifest themselves in imperfect abilities to listen, think, speak, read, spell, write, or to do mathematical calculations.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

"In earlier times programs for the handicapped were designed for children who had reached the age of six or seven. Research has suggested that there is a great possibility that some children could overcome this educational deficit if addressed before kindergarten or primary grades. Early education experiences have also been found to be effective with mentally retarded children." (Kirk, 1958).

Two court cases were particularly important in establishing the rights of handicapped children to an appropriate education. One of the cases, *Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Children vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 1971, ensured a group of retarded children the right to a free public education. A similar ruling handed down in 1972 in the *Mills vs. Board of Education of District of Columbia* case extended these rights to all handicapped children. Therefore the lack of funds was an unacceptable reason for excluding legislation with the intent to promote education to school-aged handicapped children in appropriate educational placement. During this time a number of states were enacting legislation with the intent to promote education to school-aged handicapped children in appropriate educational placement. The legislation reflected the basic rights of handicapped children and guaranteed due process to the parents. The state also acknowledged the rights of handicapped children to education in the least restricted environment possible, separate from their peers only to the degree that is necessary for educational purpose. (E.D. Pa., 1972)

In Vermont, research showed that students with severe disabilities had been receiving special education support in general education class placement since 1984 (Schattman, 1992; Thousand et al., 1986; William et al., 1986). Most Vermont school districts offered integrated educational programs for persons who were at one time placed in special

classes or special schools (Thousand and Villa, 1990). This study in the Vermont school district examined first-hand experiences and perspectives of general education teachers who have taught students with severe disabilities in their general education classes. (Thousand, J., 1986)

#### Primary Source: Vermont Public Schools

The subjects in this study were nineteen general education teachers who worked in ten of the area schools in Vermont Public Schools, teaching grades through Nine. The selection of teachers was based on three criteria: (1) The teachers had within the last three years students identified as severely disabled in the general education classroom on a full-time basis. (2) Students met the Vermont definition of being dual sensory impaired or "at risk" for dual sensory impairment. (3) These students were served by the Vermont I-Team's Dual Sensory Impairment Project, a statewide service providing training and technical assistance to educational teams serving Vermont students with intensive special education needs. (Vermont Department of Education, 1987.)

Most students within these particular teachers' classrooms had severe orthopedic disabilities (e.g. limited use of hands/arms, nonambulatory) and functioned as though they had severe cognitive impairments. Given these students' sensory and motoric disabilities, it is often difficult to accurately determine the level of cognitive function and determine which impairment is responsible for the students' delayed level of functioning. The majority of the teachers involved in this study were women; only five were men. Their teaching experience ranged from two to twenty-one years; all were certified in general education; and three had certification in special education. Two received prior in-service training to prepare them for inclusion. All nineteen teachers had a teacher aide assigned to their classroom and access to support from district and regional special educators, and related services (e.g. physical therapist, speech/language pathologist) support from team members. (Vermont Department of Education, 1987)



The primary method of collecting data was a semi-structured interview which allowed the teachers to express themselves. The interviewer would have an opportunity to ask follow-up questions. Teachers were asked ongoing follow-up questions providing an opportunity to verify the data being recorded.

In the spring of 1991, teachers were contacted by telephone and asked if they would be willing to be interviewed regarding their experiences, teaching a student with severe disabilities in the general education classroom. In March and June of 1991, forty-five to ninety minute interviews were conducted in private rooms using tape recorders. Each interview began with a review of the purpose of the research and the assurance of confidentiality. Background information about the teacher was given and, followed by initial interview questions, each teacher was given a two-page survey. Two statements that were directly relevant to the questionnaires were: (1) "My attitudes about educating students with significant disabilities in general education have become more positive as a result of teaching of child with significant disabilities." (2) "Given appropriate supports, I would welcome a student with significant disabilities in my class in the future." (Vermont Department of Education, 1987)

The majority of the teachers in this study were asked or volunteered to accept a student with severe disabilities in their classes. Most teachers stated, "If support staff was provided for them (e.g. paraprofessional, consultant, technical assistance), the acceptance of a student with severe disabilities was possible." Most teachers agreed to the placement of a student with the understanding that the placement was not necessarily permanent and could be changed at any time during the school year. Most teachers reacted to the initial placement in a cautious or negative manner despite how the students with severe disabilities were in the general education class.

One common approach used by special educators and administrators to alleviate a teacher's fear or concern was to establish the teacher's role as that of a host. Someone else would have the primary or exclusive responsibility for educating the child. As a result, some teachers initially did not view themselves as the child's teacher in the same way they saw themselves as the teacher for other students in the class. At times, a teacher aide or assistant without training related to inclusionary practices was responsible for decision making and implementation. Having little contact as the host teacher, some teachers expressed greater confidence in their aide rather than their own abilities. (Vermont Department of Education, 1987)

For two teachers the initial experience remained unchanged throughout the school year, characterized by the lack of ownership for the child's education.

"I can't actually say that there were too many times that I sat down with Linda (severe disabled student) and actually did a thing with her; I never specifically worked with her," stated one teacher.

At times lack of ownership was apparent. With twenty-two kids, Linda was often overlooked and sometimes left behind unintentionally. However, seventeen of the nineteen teachers experienced ownership and involvement with the student with disabilities in their class over the year. Of course, transformation varied among teachers. The cautious and negative comments used earlier were replaced by positive comments. Transformations were gradual progressive rather than discrete and abrupt. The teacher's initial expectation regarding the student with disabilities had been based on assumptions. The teachers began regarding the student as a person rather than a disability and further established a personal relationship with the student. Teachers with these experiences came to the realization that they too could be successful and that including the student was not as difficult as they originally imagined. One teacher said, "You don't know until you are

actually in the trenches doing; I just never found it to be difficult." (Vermont Department of Education, 1987)

### A Special Education Action Plan

The term inclusion, like integration and mainstreaming is not used in Public Law 94-142 or the Education Handicapped Act. However, the concept of inclusion has always been reflected in the federal and state requirement for serving students with disabilities in the least restricted environment. The types of services that an individual will receive will be based on the individualized education program (I.E.P.).

To implement inclusion one must understand that special education was never defined as a place, but rather as a specially designed instruction provided at no cost to the parent to meet the needs of a handicapped child. Over the past decade or so, a number of legal decisions have supported mainstreaming and integrating. Now state supported options for including and serving students with disabilities in regular environments are expected to be a part of the new rule. The article, "Highlights in Special Education," states: "New rules governing the delivery of special education services will become effective for the 1994-1995 school year here in Ohio." Rules for elementary or secondary education, early childhood education, gifted education, teacher education and certification are under revision to facilitate the development of a more unified integrated system for educating all Ohio students.

In June 1990, *"Ohio Speaks: Working Together to Shape the Future of Special Education in Ohio (A Special Education Action Plan for the 1990's)"* was published statewide. The implementation of Goal #2 of this action plan was to work collaboratively with regular education personnel to provide educational services to the children who are handicapped or "at risk" and to allow school districts to operate experimental programs

outside existing state rules to better meet the needs of students with disabilities. The experimental model programs make it possible for special and regular education teachers to work together as a team to integrate students with disabilities into a regular environment that is appropriate by parent and school personnel.

The Additional Alternatives Goal #2 experimental Models are listed as follows:

Model #1

Special and regular educators jointly service nonhandicapped students and students with disabilities enrolled full-time in the regular education environment. The educator has full-time responsibility in the classroom in this team teaching model. (Highlight, 1993)

Model #2

Special educators serve nonhandicapped students and students with disabilities in the special education classroom. Services may be provided cross-categorically. A modified and/or functional curriculum should be used. This model does not preclude mainstreaming. (Highlight, 1993)

Model #3

Special educators serve students with disabilities in the special education classroom, using a functional curriculum. Services may be provided cross-categorically. (Highlight, 1993)

Model #4

Special educators serve students with disabilities as needed where needed. Services may be provided in a regular education classroom. The special educator may serve as a consultant, a teacher and/or a tutor. This model provides services based on needs of students and may incorporate components of the other three models. (Highlight, 1993)

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE

#### Subjects

The purpose of this study was to evaluate if an inclusion program at the elementary level in an open space was successful. This study surveyed the opinions of three regular classroom teachers and one special education teacher. A semantic differential was given to the twelve mildly handicapped students, seven boys and five girls whom were involved in the inclusion program. The survey on the students was done to measure their attitudes about school. Approximately two years ago this particular school started it's pilot program for inclusion in third grade, using the large space for the educator and her twelve students. This space was used as if it was another classroom. The third grade areas switched for various subjects just as the classes have in the past. The only way students from other areas or myself knew the classroom was different was the student's physical disabilities. The special educator served students with disabilities as needed where needed. Services may be provided in a regular education classroom. The special educator may serve as a consultant, a teacher and/or a tutor. This model provides services based on needs of students and may incorporate components of the other three models.

#### Setting

School. The setting for this study was a public school in an outlying urban area. This school had a population of approximately six hundred and twenty-five students. The majority of the students were bused to school. Enrollment in this school was extremely high. The structure of the building was open spaced, which played a unique role for our inclusionary classroom. This design meant no walls nor doors to separate classrooms. This building was divided into halves, north and south; nine classrooms on the north side of the building and nine on the south. There was no exclusion in the third grade space, no doors to shut anyone out nor walls to separate, which really benefited inclusion.

## Data Collection

Construction of the Instruments. The writer constructed a questionnaire based on findings in a review of literature and knowledge gained through observation. This was a Likert-type questionnaire which was administered to the teachers and contained a summated rating scale which included four positions: strongly agree, agree, disagree. The students were given the semantic differential and were expected to answer honestly.

Administration of Instruments. Students were identified based on various assessments, data and observation by a school psychologist. Each student was given the semantic differential within their own surroundings. The teachers received their questionnaire through school mail. The IEP's were obtained from the special education teacher.

## TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is completely voluntary. Thank you for your participation. The code for the letter symbols below are as follows:

SA...Strongly Agree

A.....Agree

D.....Disagree

SD...Strongly Disagree

Please mark your responses accordingly. Mark only one box for each statement below.

1. I feel that handicapped students are placed in the regular classroom without adequate preparation of students or teachers.

SA    A    D    SD
  
2. The administration is supportive of teachers who have students with handicaps in their classroom.

SA    A    D    SD
  
3. The integration of handicapped students into the regular classroom can be beneficial to regular students.

SA    A    D    SD
  
4. Material support services (e.g. consultants, resources, teachers) are readily available.

SA    A    D    SD

- |  |    |   |   |    |
|--|----|---|---|----|
| 5. Regular education teachers possess a great deal of the expertise necessary to work with handicapped students. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 6. The integration of handicapped students requires significant changes in regular classroom procedure.          | SA | A | D | SD |
| 7. When a handicapped child is placed in my room, the size of the class should be reduced.                       | SA | A | D | SD |
| 8. Many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate to handicapped students.  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 9. As it pertains to the integration program, I have enough instructional time:                                  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 9.a. <u>Planning/Preparation Time</u>  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 9.b. <u>Consultation Time</u>  | SA | A | D | SD |



- |   |    |   |   |    |
|---|----|---|---|----|
| 10. Placement in the regular classroom<br>will hurt the educational progress of<br>the handicapped student.     | SA | A | D | SD |
| 11. I feel confident with my skills in the<br>following area in relation to handicapped<br>students.            | SA | A | D | SD |
| 11.a. <u>Setting goals/objectives</u>   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 11.b. <u>Measurement of achievement</u>   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 11.c. <u>Behavior management</u>  | SA | A | D | SD |
| 12. The students with handicaps in my<br>class will eventually be successful<br>adults contributing to society. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 13. Handicapped students can work on<br>their own as well as the regular students.                              | SA | A | D | SD |
| 14. Public school should educate handicapped<br>students.   | SA | A | D | SD |
| 15. My opinion toward the integration process<br>is more positive now than when it first started.               | SA | A | D | SD |

16. Inservices regarding handicapped students  
and the integration process have been  
valuable to me.

SA    A    D    SD

## SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

### SCHOOL

TABLE TWO

good	_____:
boring	_____:
easy	_____:
tense	_____:
fun	_____:
successful	_____:
kind	_____:

bad
interesting
difficult
relaxed
work
unsuccessful
cruel

## SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

### ATTITUDE

happy	_____:
afraid	_____:
cute	_____:
serious	_____:

sad
brave
ugly
humorous

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Presentation of the Results

The researcher handed out four questionnaires to the teachers who were presently working with the inclusion program. The twelve students involved in the inclusion program were given a semantic differential questionnaire. (See Table 2.)

The researcher developed a total of sixteen questions/statements based on research to determine the attitude of the teachers toward inclusion. The questions were carefully constructed on a Likert-type scale. (See Appendix A.) All sixteen questions were presented in a positive manner; all four questionnaires were returned.

#### Discussion of Results

The majority of the students felt the inclusion program was a great place to be when compared to their previous schools. The teachers stated that the questions were presented in a positive way that would benefit other inclusion programs. All four teachers were very knowledgeable about inclusion. The teachers believed that having a principle who was concerned that the program got off to a great start was also ready for the program. The team along with the principle toured one Pennsylvania school district to observe their inclusion program which has been in existence for sometime. This particular school has had much success in integrating the program which involved the whole school at all grade levels.

The first question on the teachers questionnaire was stated as follows: "I feel that handicapped students are placed in the regular classroom without adequate preparation of students and/or teachers." The results showed two agreeing, one disagreeing, and the other strongly disagreeing. (See Appendix B.)

Statement number two stated: "The administration is supportive of teachers who have students with handicaps in their classroom." Three out of four strongly agreed with this statement.

The same held true in statement number three: "The integration of handicapped students into the regular classroom can be beneficial to regular students." Three out of four strongly agreed.

Statement four: "Material support services are readily available." Three teachers strongly agreed and one agreed with this statement.

In statement number five, three out of four believed (strongly agreed) that regular education teachers possess a great deal of the expertise necessary to work with handicapped students.

"The integration of handicapped students requires significant, changes in regular classroom procedure." Two disagreed and two strongly disagreed with number six.

"When a handicapped child is placed in my room, the size should be reduced." Three out of four strongly agreed and one agreed with statement seven.

"Many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate to handicapped students." Two strongly agreed and two agreed with statement number eight.

"As it pertains to the integration program, I have enough instructional time in: planning/preparation time and consultation time." All four teachers disagreed with this statement number nine (a, b).

Statement number ten: "Placement in the regular education classroom will hurt the educational progress of the handicapped student." All four disagreed on this statement.

Statement eleven (a, b, c) states: "I feel confident with my skills in the following areas in relation to handicapped students: (a) setting goals/objectives; (b) measurement of achievement, and (c) behavior management." All four teachers strongly agreed.

Two out of four agreed in number twelve that "Students with handicaps in my class will eventually be successful adults contributing to society." The other two strongly agreed.

"Handicapped students can work on their own as well as the regular student." Three out of four strongly agreed and one disagreed in statement number thirteen.

In statement number fourteen: "Public school should educate handicapped students," the teachers unanimously strongly agreed. This was also the case with statements fifteen and sixteen: "My opinion toward the integration process is more positive now than when it first started. Inservices regarding handicapped students and the integration process have been valuable to me."

The researcher was given access to the students' confidential files to better understand each student's case. The files give information on the students' personal background, including family background, various test scores, and medical records. Once a student has been diagnosed as having a learning disability, the team will then set up a meeting to develop his/her IEP. The team developed an IEP which consisted of short- and long-term goals along with objectives. The IEP would explain the current level of performance and a method of evaluation. Over 70% of the students' Wide Range Achievement - R score had improved. The areas measured were:

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1993</u>
Spelling	77	82
Reading	72	77
Arithmetic	71	71

The Vineland Adaptive Behavior also showed progress in the following areas:

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1993</u>
Communication	69	77
Daily Living	64	93
Socialization	79	78

Twelve students at the primary level with mild development handicaps were assigned to and instructed in the general education classrooms at a public school. A teacher certified in developmental handicaps and an instructional aide would join a primary team of teachers at that school. Students would receive identified services through tutoring, small group instruction and/or collaborative instruction. In this model, the special education teacher would: provide individual and small group instruction to special education students; in connection with general education teachers, develop and implement strategies or small group and collaborative instruction of general and special education students; coordinate IEP activities; provide instruction to students with developmental handicaps in areas unique to them (i.e. adaptive behavior); and serve as a resource person to the general education teachers.

Essentially, the program was consistent with the proposal (sans the aide). The twelve identified students spent as much of the day in their regular classes as they are capable of achieving academic success. All of the students were with their regular teachers and classmates for social studies, science, health, art, music, physical education and library, along with beginning and ending of the day exercises, recesses, lunch and all special activities.

A few identified students come to the special educator for all of their academic subjects other than science, social studies, and health. Some came to the special educator only for math, while others came for only reading, and still others for reading and language.

A few of the identified students were in their regular class for all of their academic subjects and came to the special educator after lunch while their class was having silent reading. At this time, the special educator provides academic assistance, going over their

daily work, helping them to complete assignments or projects, and sometimes re-teaching skills. At that time the special class might work on the development of adaptive and daily living skills.

Each day before school begins the special educator checked the three teachers' lesson plans and scheduled activities. The special educator suggested possible adaptations and made modifications to assignments or provided alternative assignments. Throughout the day the special educator spent most of the time in her area working with identified students, and sometimes unidentified students who came to work on a specific skill with which they were having difficulty. Unidentified students also came into that area for silent reading and for buddy activities. Sometimes the special educator went into specific classroom areas at predetermined times to assist identified and unidentified students with special learning activities. Occasionally the special educator taught a lesson to an entire fifth grade class.

Due to the openness of the school, at all times, even when the special educator is working with students, she is able to hear and see what is going on with the identified students while they are in their regular classroom areas. It was possible for her to respond immediately to help or redirect students if they are having difficulties in their regular classrooms.

The openness of the facility had been a positive component of the program. In addition to allowing for the special educator to know what is going on in all of the areas, it allows for the students who spend most of the time with the special educator to not feel separated or isolated from their peers. As a result of the busyness of an open space school, the students' movements back and forth within the fifth grade area go hardly noticed. An open space setting also gives teachers the opportunity to provide constant feedback and support for each other.



Advantages to teachers had mostly to do with the many opportunities to share. In the arrangement, teachers could easily share information, joys and concerns about students. Two heads are definitely better than one when it comes to solving student concerns. There is a wonderful partnership and sharing of students' problems and successes. Especially in the open space situation was there the opportunity for constant feedback and affirmation of teaching strategies and student-teacher exchanges by other teachers. The general sharing of expertise, teaching techniques, resources and materials by all teachers was beneficial to all.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

#### Summary

The purpose of this study was to evaluate if an inclusion program at the elementary level in an open-space was successful. The researcher surveyed the opinions of three regular classroom teachers and one special education teacher. A semantic differential was given to the twelve mildly handicapped students; seven boys, and five girls. The survey on the students was done to measure their attitudes about school. The special educator served students with disabilities as needed where needed. The setting for this study was a public school in an outlying urban area. The structure of the building was open-spaced, which played a unique role for the inclusionary classroom. This design meant no walls nor doors to separate classrooms.

The researcher constructed a questionnaire based on findings in a review of literature and knowledge gained through observation. This was a Likert-type questionnaire with a summated rating scale which included your positions: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree; the questionnaire was administered to teachers. The students were given the semantic differential and were expected to answer honestly. Students were identified based on various assessments, data, and observation by a school psychologist. IEP's were secured for further information by the special education teacher.

The special education students have benefited greatly from this program. Their behavior was improved for they had good role models in their regular classrooms. These special students were not isolated from their peers, but were part of the group. The teachers were excited about this program because they knew the program's potential having observed the Pittsburgh schools success. As a result of the survey, the teachers supported the majority of items listed on the questionnaire. Everyone felt they were well informed prior to the start of the program.

### **Recommendations**

In my opinion in order for inclusion to work we, as educators and parents, must tear down those dividers that separate the normal from the abnormal. Inclusion works in this particular school because it is open-spaced and the staff was not forced into this situation. The only negative thing I found was that testing needs to be tracked quarterly for close monitoring.

### **Conclusion**

The conclusion that was reached as a result of this study was that team collaboration, student motivation, and proper support were the three factors which were key to the success of the particular inclusion program of the elementary level. Having had the principle and the four team members observe other school districts which had experienced great success with their program proved to be a remarkable accomplishment. There is an old saying which states that children learn what they live. By instructing those twelve students in a regular classroom among regular students with good role models, they improved their social skills which strengthened their self-esteem, which increased their knowledge.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bilkin, D. (1985). Strategies for Effective Mainstreaming. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. (1987). The Next Wave. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Division of Special Education (1933, Spring). Highlights in Special Education. 14 (1).
- Erlbaum, Lawrence and Associates, Inc. (1991). Journal of Education and Psychological Consultation. 2 (2), 197-200.
- Giangreco, M., F., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S. Schattman, R. (1993). Exceptional Children. 59 (4), 359-372.
- Kirk, S.A. (1958). Early Education of the Mentally Retarded. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Lerper, Janet. (1993). Learning Disabilities Theories, Diagnosis Teaching Strategies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 318F. Supp. 866 (D.C., 1972).
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (1992, Winter). Counterpoint. 13 (2).
- Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D.Pa. 1972).
- Ross, Robert Gaylord (1989). Integration Strategies for Students with Handicaps. Baltimore, Maryland: Paul H. Brookes.
- Shrybman, J.D. and Matsoukas (1982). Due Process. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Systems Corporation.
- Spodek, B., Saracho, O., and Lee, R.C. (1984). Mainstreaming Young Children. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Stainback, S., and Stanback, W. (1985). Integration of Students with Severe Handicaps into Regular Schools. Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Thousand, J., Fox, T., Reid, R., Godek, J., Williams, W., & Fox (1986, September). The Homecoming Model. University of Vermont.

## APPENDIX A

### Statements as presented in the Teacher Questionnaire

1. I feel that handicapped students are placed in the regular classroom without adequate preparation of students or teachers.
2. The administration is supportive of teachers who have students with handicaps in their classroom.
3. The integration of handicapped students into the regular classroom can be beneficial to regular students.
4. Material support services (e.g. consultants, resources, teachers) are readily available.
5. Regular education teachers possess a great deal of the expertise necessary to work with handicapped students.
6. The integration of handicapped students requires significant changes in regular classroom procedure.
7. When a handicapped child is placed in my room, the size of the class should be reduced.
8. Many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate to handicapped students.
9. As it pertains to the integration program, I have enough instructional time:
  - 9.a. Planning/Preparation time.
  - 9.b. Consultation time.
10. Placement in the regular education classroom will hurt the educational progress of the handicapped student?
11. I feel confident with my skills in the following area in relation to handicapped students:
  - 11.a. Setting goals/objectives.
  - 11.b. Measurement of achievement.
  - 11.c. Behavior management.
12. The students with handicaps in my class will eventually be successful adults contributing to society.

13. Handicapped students can work on their own as well as the regular students.
14. Public school should educate handicapped students.
15. My opinion toward the integration process is more positive now than when it first started.
16. Inservices regarding handicapped students and the integration process have been valuable to me.

APPENDIX B

QUESTION	SA	SA	A	A	D	D	SD	SD		
#	RESP.	%	RESP.	%	RESP.	%	RESP	%		
#1	0	0	2	50	1	25	1	25		
#2	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0		
#3	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0		
#4	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0		
#5	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0		
#6	0	0	0	0	2	50	2	50		
#7	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0		
#8	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0		
#9 A	0	0	0	0	4	100	0	0		
#9 B	0	0	0	0	4	100	0	0		
#10	2	0	0	0	4	100	0	0		
#11 A	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0		
#11 B	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0		
#11 C	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0		
#12	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0		
#13	3	75	0	0	1	25	0	0		
#14	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0		
#15	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0		
#16	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0		
FOUR RESPONSES, ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST PERCENT.										

APPENDIX C

POLAR ADJECTIVE PAIRS	7		6		5		4		3		2		1	
	RESP.	%	RESP.	%	RESP.	%	RESP.	%	RESP.	%	RESP.	%	RESP.	%
GOOD/BAD	5	42	2	18	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8
BORING/INTERESTING	2	18	3	25	3	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8
DIFFICULT/EASY	2	18	2	18	5	42	1	8	1	8	0	0	1	8
RELAXED/TENSE	3	25	3	25	3	25	2	18	0	0	0	0	1	8
FUN/WORK	3	25	4	33	4	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8
SUCCESSFUL/UNSUCCESSFUL	4	33	4	33	2	18	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	8
KIND/CRUEL	9	75	1	8	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8
POLAR ADJECTIVE PAIRS														
HAPPY/SAD	9	83	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8
AFRAID/BRAVE	2	18	3	25	5	45	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	8
UGLY/CUTE	2	18	1	8	8	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8
HUMOROUS/SERIOUS	10	83	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8
TWELVE RESPONSES, ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST PERCENT.														





# INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM—COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

STUDENT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

RELATED SERVICES Check (✓) each that applies	Frequency of Services	Proj Init Date	Anticipated Duration	Comments
Adapted Phys Ed (PE)				
Attendant (AT)				
Audiologist (AU)				
Counseling (CN)				
Educational Aide (EA)				
Guide Serv (GO)				
Interpreter Serv (IT)				
Nursing Services (NR)				
Occupational Therapy (OT)				
Orientation Mobility (OM)				
Physical Therapy (PT)				
Physician Serv (PH)				
Psychological Serv (PY)				
Speech Language Serv (SA)				
Supervisory Serv (SP)				
Transportation (TR)				
Voc Spec Ed Coord (VC)				
Work Study Serv (WS)				
Del Nurse Serv (DN)				
Other				
Other				
Other				
Exceptions to service provision: Provider absence or other unforeseen circumstances.				

PLEASE REVIEW AND LIST THE FOLLOWING—Necessary mechanical supports, adaptive devices, and/or transportation assistance needs:

EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR (ESY) SERVICES AND FREQUENCY

**REGULAR SCHOOL PARTICIPATION—Check (✓) each item below that applies**

Recess, Recreation	Groups, Clubs	PEAK
Sports, Intramurals	Lunch, Meals	Counseling
Nurse, Health Serv.	Industrial Arts	Music
Homemaking	Physical Education	Art
Transportation	Vocational Educ.	Reading
Social Studies	Science	Math
Other	Other	

**TESTING—If not exempted, please specify extent of participation and necessary modifications.**

**EXEMPT**

Yes ☐ No District Wide Testing (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Modifications (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Proficiency Test—Students will participate in the**

Grade Proficiency Test as follows:

AREA \_\_\_\_\_ MODIFICATIONS (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Yes ☐ No Reading \_\_\_\_\_

Yes ☐ No Mathematics \_\_\_\_\_

Yes ☐ No Writing \_\_\_\_\_

Yes ☐ No Citizenship \_\_\_\_\_

Last Multifaceted Evaluation Date \_\_\_\_\_  
**STATE AND FEDERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS MANDATE THAT EVERY HANDICAPPED CHILD BE REEVALUATED AT LEAST ONCE EVERY THREE YEARS. THIS IS TO NOTIFY YOU THAT YOUR CHILD WILL BE PROVIDED THAT MANDATED REEVALUATION PRIOR TO YOUR CHILD'S NEXT PERIODIC REVIEW.**

**Specific Learning Disability**
☐ Suspected    ☐ Reevaluation

The original copy of this report includes attached reports which document evaluation data to support the conclusion recorded in this summary. Eligibility criteria are established by Ohio's Rules for the Education of Handicapped Children.

Questions regarding this report should be directed to:

Case Management Supervisor  
Phone: (614) 263-5102  
2571 Neil Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43202

**IDENTIFICATION**

Last Name \_\_\_\_\_ First \_\_\_\_\_ Student Number \_\_\_\_\_  
Birthdate \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_ Grade \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATIONS**

Each of the following evaluations must be completed. The name or position of the evaluator, whose report is attached to the original ETR, is recorded at the right.

1. General Intelligence measured by a qualified psychologist
2. Academic Performance: including Basic Reading, Reading Comprehension, Math Evaluation, and Math Reasoning
3. Vision, Hearing, and Motor Abilities
4. Communicative Status: including Oral Expression, Listening Comprehension, and Written Expression
5. Social and Emotional Status

Evaluator

**ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**

For establishing eligibility, each of the first six criteria must be met, except that item #1 need not be met if all exception requirements are met in item #7.

1. A discrepancy between ability and achievement, which is not correctable without special education and/or related services, has been calculated to be at least 2z in each of the following areas that is checked (✓):
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Basic Reading Skills, z=_____	<input type="checkbox"/> Reading Comprehension, z=_____	<input type="checkbox"/> Written Expression, z=_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Oral Expression, z=_____	<input type="checkbox"/> Math Calculation, z=_____	<input type="checkbox"/> Math Reasoning, z=_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Listening Comprehension, z=_____		
2. Achievement is not commensurate with age and ability levels in at least one of the areas above.
3. There is evidence that the child has been provided learning experience appropriate for age and ability.
4. A severe discrepancy is due to a disorder in one or more basic psychological processes and is not primarily the result of: (a) vision, hearing, or motor handicap; (b) mental retardation; (c) emotional disturbance; or (d) environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.
5. A report is attached which documents that academic performance in the regular classroom (or comparable environment) has been observed by at least one evaluation team member other than the child's teacher. The report relates behavior to academic functioning.
6. Relevant medical findings, if any are known, are included in an attached report.
7. The discrepancy is believed to be severe (though not 2z) and documentation is attached for each of the following.
  - a. Data including possible deficiencies for all seven areas in item #1 above;
  - b. Recommendation and information from the regular teacher;
  - c. Recommendation and information from the parent;
  - d. Work samples and group test scores;
  - e. Additional supportive data besides standardized data;
  - f. Consideration of the child's age, particularly for young children.

**JUDGMENTS**

Each team member must sign below and record a judgment indicating whether or not criteria for eligibility have been met.

Signature	Date	Title	SLD?			Comment
			1-6	2-7	No	
1. _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
2. _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
3. _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
4. _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
5. _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

**EVALUATION CONCLUSION AND BASIS FOR DETERMINATION**

Eligibility requires: (1) a 2z discrepancy and (2) consensus agreement among teacher, school psychologist, and SLD consultant that all eligibility criteria are documented. If either condition is not met but a majority of the three-member team believes that the child has a learning disability, the child is eligible if criterion #7 activities are completed and at least one concurring opinion is given by either the Program Supervisor or the Psychological Services Supervisor. Based on the above team judgments and federal and state eligibility criteria, the decision is that:

- ☐ A Specific Learning Disability which requires special education is documented in the attached reports.  
☐ A Specific Learning Disability has not been established.

Comment:

The Supervisor's or Team Leader's signature is required if there is a lack of team consensus.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## ABSTRACT

## INCLUSION

Alexander, Sandra J.

An evaluation on the effectiveness of inclusion (27pp.), April, 1994

Faculty Advisor: Gordon E. Fuchs, Ph.D.

**Problem.** For years students with disabilities had been isolated from many schools as well as the community for various reasons. The philosophy was that students with disabilities were better educated with their own special environment or school. Research has suggested that there is a great possibility that some of the children could overcome this educational deficit if addressed before kindergarten or primary grades. The purpose of this study was to evaluate if an inclusion program at the elementary level in an open space was successful.

**Procedure.** Twelve students at the elementary level with mildly developmental handicaps were assigned to and instructed in the general education classroom at a public school. A teacher certified in developmental, handicap and an instructional aide would join the primary team of teachers at the school. The openness of the facility has been a positive component of this inclusion program at the elementary level.

**Finding.** The concept of inclusion has always been reflected in the federal and state requirement for serving students with disabilities in the restricted environment. To implement inclusion one must understand that special education was never defined as a place, but rather as a specially designed instruction provided at no cost to the parent to meet the needs of a handicapped child.

**Conclusions and/or Recommendations.** The conclusion that was reached as a result of this study was that team collaboration, student motivation, and proper support were the three factors which were key to the success of the particular inclusion program of the elementary level. Having had the principle and the four team members observe other school districts which had experienced great success with their program proved to be a remarkable accomplishment. There is an old saying which states that children learn what they live. By instructing those twelve students in a regular classroom among regular students with good role models, they improved their social skills which strengthened their self-esteem, which increased their knowledge.

R009610049