Education Theses, Dissertations and Projects   School of Education

2009

An Analysis of the Perceived Effects of the Welsh Inclusion Model on the Academic Growth of Special Needs Learners in a North Carolina Elementary School

Stephen Ray Pickard
Gardner-Webb University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/education_etd

Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, Educational Leadership Commons, and the Special Education and Teaching Commons

An Analysis of the Perceived Effects of the Welsh Inclusion Model on the Academic
Growth of Special Needs Learners in a North Carolina Elementary School

by
Stephen Ray Pickard

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Gardner-Webb University School of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Gardner-Webb University
2008

Approval Page

This dissertation was submitted by Stephen R. Pickard under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to the Gardner-Webb University School of Education and approval in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Gardner-Webb University.

_____   _____
Jack A. Kaufhold, Ed D   Date
Committee Chair

_____   _____
Victoria F. Ratchford, Ed D   Date
Committee Member

_____   _____
Gail D. Stowe, Ed D   Date
Committee Member

_____   _____
Jackson Rainer, Ph D   Date
Dean of the Graduate School

Acknowledgements

One of America's early educational pioneers of the last century once said that we "touch the future, we teach." Christa McAuliffe's impact on this country and the world left an indelible mark as to her mission in life. The same can be said of this journey! The conclusion of this study, I pray, will only mark the beginnings for others to follow and to take their moments in our earthly eternity to "touch the future." My journey began almost sixty years ago where my parents Jim and Boots Pickard instilled in me a love for others woven within the fabric of a strong work ethic surrounded by a strong Faith. I want to thank my wife, Doris, whose thirty-two years of working with exceptional children has given her the strength to help her husband through challenging times during this voyage. In addition, I want to thank my only brother, Jim Pickard, who always believed in me no matter what roads I traveled. My two sons, Chris and Kevin Pickard have always been an inspiration to me as we survived life's many challenges. My childhood friends, Dr. Don Cherry, DDS, and Mr. Randy Cherry, MBA, modeled for me with their own lives that nothing in life should deter you from reaching for the stars. My beloved friend, Dr. Jeff Church, has been an inspiration to me during this journey and has helped me overcome many obstacles in our mission. My deep appreciations to Dr. Doug Eury, Ed D, for opening the door and helping me achieve a life-long dream and to Dr. John Kaufhold, Ed D, for his academic insights into the creation of this study and for his hours of preparation. And my thanks to Dr. Gail Stowe, Ed D, for her contributions to this study along with my deepest appreciation to Dr. Victoria Ratchford, Ed D, in helping us keep our focus on our goals and for providing such an inspiration to so many along the way. I love you all!

Abstract

An Analysis of the Perceived Effects of the Welsh Inclusion Model on the Academic Growth of Special Needs Learners in a North Carolina Elementary School. Pickard, Stephen R., 2008: Dissertation, Gardner-Webb University, Inclusion Model/Meanings-Based Approach/Skills-Based Approach/Case Study/Title I

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine the implementation of the Welsh Inclusion Model at a Title I elementary school in grades 4 through 5 in the Piedmont area of North Carolina. The researcher visited the Title I school, which was embarking in only its second year in the implementation of the Welsh Inclusion Model. During these visits, the researcher interviewed the principal, the Director of Elementary Education, and two inclusion teams. The entire group participated in a focus group interview. The surveys, interviews, ITTAP, and Co-Teaching rubric provided data that were triangulated to determine how well the school was implementing the Welsh Inclusion Model.

The conditions of the school caused school leaders to focus attention on students with disabilities (SWD) because the school failed to meet federal standards and was given "school of improvement" status in an attempt to meet those standards. The implementation of the Welsh Inclusion Model was to assist the school in meeting those standards.

The conditions of the targeted school warranted a new approach to increasing the academic gains of their special needs students. The school made a commitment to address this concern by implementing a new approach to teaching special needs children. The survey results indicated that the participants in general agreed with the format and the implementation of the Welsh Inclusion Model and that it was meeting the objectives for which the program was intended. The findings of the study confirmed that the inclusionary teams, as well as the administration of the targeted school, were making strides towards meeting the federal mandates of NCLB. However, from the data analysis the researcher observed that more financial support for both training and the use of materials was needed in order to continue to meet the needs of identified students at all levels.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction and Problem Statement

Introduction

Since the inception of the Accountability Basic Skills Mastery and Control

(ABC's) of North Carolina, which began in 1996, and the No Child Left Behind Act of

2001 (NCLB), public education has had to reassess its mission by utilizing various

measurements incorporated at both the state and national levels to gauge and evaluate

student achievement. While testing students has long been a hallmark of public

education, the standards movement has created an increase in the practice of standardized

testing which has heightened the consequences for both students and schools who fail to

live up to those standards (Leif, 2001).

National Problem

This increase in accountability has made it difficult for schools to ignore large

numbers of students who continue to fail at meeting standards, especially those children

who fall into categories of special needs learners. The issues of accountability have

increased the demand for student success requiring a higher level of academic

achievement for all students regardless of academic or social status. Since the passage of

the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975), in addition to the Individual

with Disabilities Education Act Amendment of 1997, federal mandates have guaranteed a

free and appropriate public education for students attending public institutions. This

federal legislation has required that all children have access to a free and appropriate

public education, and that every effort is made to insure their academic success

(Individual with Disabilities Education Act, 1997).

According to the United States Department of Education, in 2001, with all fifty states being assessed on the NCLB mandate, only nine states nationwide reported any measure of academic achievement for special needs students as it related to Category 10, Students with Disabilities (SWD) (US Department of Education, 2001). This information demonstrates the need for states to refocus their efforts to increase the scholastic achievement of academically disabled children. School districts across the nation are being held accountable for educating, with demonstrated success, each identified or special needs student within their respective schools.

State and Local Problem

In North Carolina, the academic picture for demonstrating success for special needs students also shows no improvement. According to the North Carolina School Report Card, of the ten categories that are depicted in the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), only 30.8 % of students with disabilities passed both the reading and math sections of the End-of-Grade Tests in Grades 3 through 8 in 2005-2006. In comparison to the other nine categories, the grouping for Students with Disabilities (SWD) continues to fall behind, which is indicative of a national trend. In fact, every other category in the NCLB Act exceeds the passing rate of the category of special needs children. Students that fall in the Hispanic category held a passing rate of 49.3%, while the other minority students in the other categories averaged over a 57% passing rate combined (North Carolina School Report Card, 2005-2006).

The inclusion of special needs children in the regular classroom is not new, and there still is no concrete evidence to demonstrate that this may be a panacea for raising the academic standards for all special needs children. However, there is a strong

indication that the elements of the inclusive concept may have merit in improving student performance among special needs learners. In her article "The Coexistence of High Standards and Inclusion" in the *School Administrator*, Donna Lipsky (2003), Director of the National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion at the University of New York, draws a picture of the conflicting mandates from the federal and state governments as they revolve around academic standards for special needs students. Her studies give clear evidence whereby the exclusion of identified students from the regular classroom creates both an academic label of cognitive deficiency as well as increasing the likelihood of lowering a child's self-esteem; the basic intent of special education, she states, is a service and not an assignment to a place, a curriculum, or a classroom (Lipsky).

The Goal of Special Education

The goal of special education is to create a blueprint of academic accomplishment for all special needs children by incorporating elements that have proven to be successful in an inclusion model. One of the key ingredients is to involve special needs students with their non-identified peers in the regular classroom via an academic project. This strategy assists identified students in recognizing successful academic role models in addition to connecting with behaviors that are reflective of a modern society. The key to a child's academic success, according to Lipsky (2003), is for identified students to be a part of the society they will someday serve without the incumberment of academic or behavioral labels by the public school systems. While the federal law does not require the placement of special needs children in a general education environment, it presumes an inclusionary paradigm, justifying the authorization of the least restrictive environment.

Although there are many models of inclusion, evidence shows that there are core

elements of inclusionary practices that have continued to incorporate the best practices available to allow for academic achievement for identified children involved in special education. This practice includes the development of teaching teams that assume the role in planning and implementing practices that ensure academic success in the regular classroom for all children with a special focus on identified students (Validya & Zaslavsky, 2002).

Other strategies, which are successful in inclusion models, are the involvement of peer learning and interaction, as well as cross-age tutoring. Research studies have demonstrated, to some degree, the effectiveness of the utilization of the sharing of ideas among peers. While the idea of cooperative learning may have its critics, the research has shown this to be an effective strategy in enabling students to extend and process concepts in various curricular areas (Strong, Silver, & Perini, 2001).

Purpose

The purpose of this study examined the effects of the Welsh Inclusion Model for the inclusive classroom and its impact on academic growth for special needs learners. The focus of the study involved an analysis of (a) teacher collaboration, (b) instructional practices of team-teaching, and (c) grouping students into "pods" according to their preferred learning modality. The underlying principle for the analysis is to describe what occurs in public schools as educators and school administrators move towards inclusive educational practices. The Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP) was utilized to describe the perceived strength of the inclusionary team relationship by incorporating an examination of twenty team-teaching behaviors that influence the instructional delivery to students in the inclusion setting. In addition, an *Inclusion/Co-Teaching Survey* was

incorporated into the study as a vehicle for providing a deeper analysis of individual team members for purposes of reflection and self-assessment as well as implications within the inclusion classroom. This movement evolved from the paradigm of providing students with educational opportunities in the least restrictive environment to providing them the full provision of inclusive services (Idol, 2006).

This study focused on the effectiveness of the inclusion model as to its impact on student achievement as measured by state and local standards. The study analyzed three aspects of the model utilized at the targeted school: (a) teacher collaboration, (b) instructional strategies utilized by the team, and (c) teacher dispositions about the inclusion model. In addition, the study examined the grouping of students into "pods" according to individual learning modalities and the impact, if any, on student retention. More commonly referred to as the SILK grouping method of spatial, linguistic, and kinesthetic modes, this strategy grouped students, both regular and exceptional children, through assessments of their preferred learning styles. This method insured academic group diversity by allowing students to utilize their individual learning modalities in the teaching-learning process. The information that is ascertained through this procedure is vital to the development of the "pods," which encourage the concept of utilizing academic diversity whereby students are exposed to various peers who process information differently (Welsh, 2001).

The Development of Knowledge

Annas (2004) purports that one of the more powerful strategies in the teaching process is to organize learning to allow students to engage in the creation of developing personal meaning of knowledge by utilizing not only their own academic strengths but

also the diverse experiences of others. According to Sousa (2000), when students are allowed to investigate information, engage in discussion with their peers, and debate the validity of the information, knowledge takes on a personal meaning whereby comprehension is retained longer and the learning is more relevant to the student's understanding.

Student Grouping

Classroom teachers have utilized student grouping for the sole purpose of exposing each individual learner to the academic diversity and experiences of others, especially during instructional time within the classroom. This concept has encouraged students to accept both educational and social differences among their peers that are inherent in our society. In addition, this technique has been instrumental in raising achievement among diverse groups of learners (Johnson & Johnson, 1986).

Setting

The elementary school targeted in this study is a Title I school and is located in a rural setting in the Piedmont of North Carolina. The school consists of Pre-K through Grade 5 and is home to approximately 595 students with 27% of the student body qualifying for free and reduced breakfast (30%) and lunch (40%) with 18% identified as special needs learners. There are 45 classroom teachers within the individual school.

The study employed three instruments in the assessment of the effectiveness of the inclusion model and its practices as to its impact on student achievement as defined by both state and local standards.

The Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP) is an internal descriptive instrument designed to measure two elements of this inclusion model. It measured the

effectiveness of the teaching team by the analysis of 20 Team-Teaching Behaviors and the development of improved instructional delivery to students. This instrument is composed of two forms: Form A is for the general education teacher and Form B is for the special education or support teacher. This instrument is designed to evaluate the external relationship between team members as they progress throughout the academic year and the relationship's impact on the instructional process. Each team member completed this analysis independently. Data from this instrument was indexed to seven ITTAP domains: (a) educational philosophy, (b) administrative time and scheduling, (c) joint ownership of the teaching environment, (d) professional growth of the teaching team, (e) the level of communication within the team, (f) status of individual members of the team as it relates to professional experience and expertise, and (g) team-teaching mechanics, which describes the behaviors that guide the function of the team. The data was placed into three categories of Emergent, Needs Improvement, and Functional for measuring each team's instructional effectiveness.

As part of this self-analysis, the inclusion teams evaluated the external elements of the teaching team by examining the disposition of the each team member concerning their perception of the on-going effectiveness of the inclusion team as to its instructional and managerial impact on student growth.

Another instrument is the Co-Teaching Rubric, which assessed four components of team-teaching with the last element divided into three categories. This instrument was utilized by the researcher as an analysis of the inclusion team, then as an on-going component for examining specific areas of the inclusion process as well as examining ways for improving the effectiveness of the teaching team. The components utilized in

this assessment tool included (a) teacher-engagement, (b) instructional analysis, (c) degree of student engagement, and (d) analysis of classroom routines. This analysis-utilized four steps that ranged from one to four where one is Weak and four is Strong. The researcher then analyzed the four areas according to his observations as an on-going examination of the effectiveness of the teaching-team.

A final instrument consisted of two individual surveys, Survey I and Survey II. Survey I was taken from the research base of Melissa Deuchmann from the Massachusetts school system and was based on the effective elements of inclusion practices. The second survey focused exclusively on the Welsh Model but was woven within the fabric of the key elements of Survey I.

Research Questions

The guiding question for this study is: Does the Welsh Inclusion Model and its practices positively affect student achievement as defined by state and local standards? This study investigated research questions to support or nullify the guiding question:

1. What are the perceived effects of the Welsh Model on academic achievement as it pertains to both classroom academics as well as demonstrated growth on End-of-Grade Tests for exceptional children during the course of the academic school year?

2. What instructional practices are team members utilizing in the inclusion model?

3. What are teachers' dispositions about the team-teaching approach utilized in the Welsh Inclusion Model?

4. To what degree are the perceived effects of the SILK (Spatial, Linguistic, and Kinesthetic) grouping of students into "pods" impacting academic growth?

Limitations

      Limitations represent issues of an internal validity and may have an impact on the outcome of this study.

      1. Data recorded on the ITTAP Teacher Observation Interview measured individual teacher dispositions indexed to the seven ITTAP domains, the result of which was analyzed according to those individual dispositions.

      2. Time constraints of an 18-week investigation placed limitations on this study. It was conducted with a limited perspective of the inclusion paradigm as it was being carried out in a narrow academic environment comprised of only two classrooms.

      3. The implementation of the inclusion model was limited to 60 minutes per day.

Delimitations

      Delimitations represent issues of internal and external validity that can limit this study from the perspective of its effectiveness in other circumstances.

      1. This study was conducted in one elementary school in piedmont North Carolina. Therefore, the results can only be generalized to the school in which this study was carried out. However, the results of this study can be pivotal in providing evidence for or against the Welsh Inclusion Model and its impact on student achievement in schools with similar demographics.

      2. There are a number of inclusion models utilized within the public school spectrum. This study encompasses only one model within one county in piedmont North Carolina.

Definition of Terms

     Co-Teaching Rubric. An assessment tool utilized to evaluate the six components of teacher engagement, instructional analysis, student engagement, classroom routines, grouping of students, and classroom arrangement.

     Inclusion/Co-teaching Survey. An instrument that analyzes a number of elements within an inclusion model focusing on areas of support, student assessment, and instructional strategies.

     Interpersonal abilities. Identifies a student who has an ability to communicate well with others. A team leader who possesses strong communication skills and has the ability to understand and interpret the temperaments, motivations, and moods of others. This group component is critical to establishing leadership and group cohesiveness.

     Kinesthetic abilities. Involves students who process information via physical movements incorporating the manipulation of physical objects for establishing a harmony between the mind and the body.

     Linguistic abilities. Identifies a student who has the ability to clearly use the day-to-day operations of oral language, incorporating the elements of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. This component is critical to effective communication among groups.

     Spatial abilities. The capacity by a student to perceive his environment from a visual perspective revolving around the ability to see shapes, colors, and various forms from a cognitive point of view and be able to transfer such information in artistic form.

     ITTAP. Inclusion Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol is a descriptive instrument designed to measure two factors: 1) To determine how well inclusion and in-class

support teams perceive that they are functioning effectively and 2) to assist teams in improving instructional delivery to their students.

ITTAP matrix. This assessment tool is composed of twenty instructional behaviors divided into seven categories for assessing team-teaching performance within the ITTAP domain. The seven categories include educational philosophy, perceptions of administrative support, joint ownership of instructional responsibility, professional growth, communication among teams, team-teaching mechanics, and teacher status.

Pods. A strategy utilized to create groups of 3-4 students within the inclusive classroom where each student in the pod has a different learning modality. This process is formulated by an in-class evaluation based on a learning styles inventory assessment component.

Welsh Inclusion Model. An instructional model incorporating key elements of teaching practices including the integration of four learning modalities (spatial, interpersonal, linguistic, and kinesthetic). In addition, the incorporation of the team-teaching approach to implement instructional strategies serves as the foundation of this model.

Summary

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the magnitude of the accountability for public schools and the continued level of assessments for all children at all levels as described by the No Child Left Behind (2001) mandate. The evidence presented on the national level is that our identified children, as described in category ten of the NCLB mandate as Students with Disabilities (SWD), continues to be the weakest area in demonstrating continued academic progress for special needs students.

Chapter 2 includes a literature review that encompasses several key theories as they pertain to addressing the academic needs of identified students in the public schools. The chapter opens with a discussion of the history of the inclusion movement coupled with the design of the inclusive classroom. The chapter continues with an overview of research supporting the need for placing a higher concentration or focus on the inclusion development in addition to identifying instructional practices that are incorporated within inclusion models. The chapter concludes with brief a description of various studies conducted in the area of brain research and the cognitive impact on student retention and its relationship to academic achievement.

Chapter 3 presents a detailed description of the research questions, participants, research design, procedures, and instruments utilized in this study. The chapter concludes with the researcher's limitations, delimitations, assumptions, and barriers of the study. In addition, the use of a triangulation assessment component will be implemented to insure the element of objective accountability.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Overview

The literature review provides an overview of the inclusion concept coupled with what research is advocating within school organizations and the impact on classroom management and teaching practices. Topics discussed in this chapter include (a) history of the inclusion movement, (b) the design of the inclusive classroom, (c) the various teaching practices that are utilized within diverse inclusive models, and (d) the impact of grouping students based on their preferred learning modalities woven within the fabric of the cognitive sciences.

History of the Inclusion Movement

In the late 1700s, physician Benjamin Rush introduced the idea of educating people with disabilities, but it was not until 1817 that the first educational program for individuals with disabilities was established, leading to the creation of the American Asylum for the Education and Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb in Connecticut by Thomas Gallaudet. By the early 1900s, almost every state had some form of education for people with disabilities. Soon a movement to establish special classes evolved, not for humanitarian reasons, but because educating handicapped children was not wanted in the public schools (Chavis, 1977).

Changes in Special Education

As the United States entered the 1960s, there were a number of international and domestic challenges facing the country. With the sweeping implications of the Supreme Court's 1954 *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka* decision, along with developments in social policy, law, and public education, the federal government began to stimulate

political actions, especially as they pertained to civil rights, in fulfilling its promises of

meeting the heightened demands of public schooling. After the launch of Sputnik in

1957, reform efforts in public schools took on a new meaning as they pertained to the

teaching of content and subject matter, especially in the areas of mathematics and

sciences. Tied in to the new changes, the United States began revisiting the classification

and categorization of public school students. From 1960 through 1968, the country began

its dramatic evolution in the areas of special education as the expansion of the numbers of

programs as well as the numbers of students began escalation. The introduction of the

term "learning disabilities" began to emerge on the scene as the category recognized for

assisting students with special needs; the linking of disability with the elements of

minority status, cultural deprivation, and poverty began its attachment to this stigma and

began to alter the views on etiology and the diagnosis of disability (Morrison & Cosden,

1997).

Federal Legislation

With the continued involvement of the federal government on educational issues,

in 1966 President Johnson established a permanent Committee on Mental Retardation

(CMR) along with strong support from the federal government in backing the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This new federal mandate supported the inclusion

of grants to states to support the education of children with disabilities along with

financial backing for research and projects in the area of special education. As a result of

federal intervention, public sympathy, and a desire for action in support of disabled

students, special education began to take on a heighten status within the public domain

thus expanding national awareness of special education (Morrison & Cosden, 1997).

On a national scale, increased recognition for the dignity of all citizens evolved. Within the context of the American society, parents and national organizations such as the National Association for Retarded Citizens (now known as the ARC) began to raise awareness by advocating for the rights of students with disabilities (Stainback, 2002). Residential institutions, which for decades had been the locus of education and treatment for individuals with the most serious disabilities, came under intense scrutiny by both the federal government and the American public. The number of these institutions had grown dramatically since the 1940s and, as more families began to institutionalize the severely disabled, it became a common practice by physicians to recommend this type of service to families. However, with intense investigations into the living conditions of these institutions, national leaders such as Robert Kennedy, along with Burton Blatt and Fred Kaplan's photographic essay "Christmas in Purgatory" (Blatt &Kaplan, 1974), called for dismantling the dependency on segregated institutions. In its place, there was a call for a more normalized, community-based approach to caring for and educating this particular population which gained significant federal and state support rendering the institutions more manageable populations thus reducing the crowded conditions and improving the status of those individuals housed in these institutions (Scheerenberger, 1983).

As the sweeping developments in the practice of special education, evolved, important elements begin to emerge on the national scene. The nationwide media, as well as government interventions, began to lay the groundwork for massive changes in the special education circle as to the development of new understandings and changes in the taxonomies of the term disability – changes that brought about open forums in educational research, policy, and teaching. Two key elements evolved from this

development: (a) the advent of learning disabilities as a national term for identifying

children attending public schools, and (b) the connection of special needs students with

social conditions of poverty, cultural deprivation, and minority status (Franklin, 1994).

The continued increase in social awareness of special education began to have its

impact on the increase of children identified as special needs learners. The American

societies, along with federal and state legislation, were important factors in the increase

in the identification of children with disabilities. More children became identified

utilizing new benchmarks at both the state and national level for identifying special needs

learners, and as a result their numbers increased. Society now wanted these children to be

brought to school and accommodated in special programs underlying an increased

tolerance and understanding of a child's restricted capability as well as the willingness of

families to acknowledge a child's disability and to seek assistance for them (Mackie,

1963).

Even with the increase in the numbers of children being identified as special

needs learners within the public school sector, special education professionals remained

convinced that the numbers were insufficient in relation to need and demand. According

to a national study by the State Department of Public Instruction in Virginia, only 35% of

children requiring special education services were actually receiving it according to

national enrollment figures. Romaine Mackie (1963), an analyst of special education

statistics, stated:

> It has been demonstrated that most handicapped children can have satisfying,
> productive lives if they receive appropriated education, training and care. Thus,
> America cannot afford to ignore the gap that remains. (p.77)

Because of this study, special education became further entrenched as a unique and separate entity in public education and one that was gaining increasing recognition by legislators, educators, and the American public.

The continued increase in federal legislation, coupled with a keen sense of public awareness for special needs children, moved focus more on the integration of identified children to be placed within classrooms with their non-disabled peers. According to new federal mandates, as well as the latest court rulings of *Oberti vs. Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon School District* involving special needs and identified students, the call for mainstreaming special needs students in regular classrooms was now becoming a new requirement; school districts were being forced to utilize all of their resources to determine the best placement for identified children.

However, it is important to note that the Supreme Court has yet to rule on the inclusion issues. The circuit courts struggle to identify a clear assessment in determining when the placement of an identified child into the mainstream of the educational environment and culture is suitable. While most of the circuit courts hold that a presumption toward inclusion should apply to special needs children, they differ on the interpretation of the word "appropriate" and its implications towards the placement of children in the most advantageous settings (Crossley, 2000).

Shortly after the passages of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (1975) and the 1990 reauthorization of IDEA, which required the placement of students with disabilities to be based on identified needs rather than categorical labels, the accountability for public schools rose to new levels. Soon after the passage of the Educate America Act of 1994 and subsequent IDEA amendments of 1997, federal mandates emphasized that

educational goals must apply to all children regardless of their disabilities.

However, some scholars and researchers argue against the inclusion movement stating that grouping students with disabilities together allows for instruction that is more efficient and less disruptive to the general education classroom. James Kauffman, a prominent figure in the area of special education, states, "The ideology of full inclusion ignores or distorts the responsibilities we have to construct the most habitatively restrictive environments we can for all of our students" (Kauffman, 1995, p.8-9, 14).

Such arguments have done little to slow down the inclusion movement and the overall recognition with which the inclusion paradigm is progressing. The inclusive standard has also gained prominence outside educational circles. *USA Today* and *The Wall Street Journal* have all published articles within their professional publications sharing the results of studies and proposed resolutions and policy changes supporting inclusion in the educational arena (Villa & Thousand, 2000).

Design of the Inclusion Classroom

In the early twenty-first century, educators began moving from the concept of a physical location as it relates to serving special needs children to a closer analysis of pedagogy and the overriding priority of understanding how to teach all children without regards to their social or cognitive disability. In an academic climate in which Local Education Agencies are developing inclusive plans, schools are being guided to view this paradigm as an integral aspect of the assurance that all children will have unlimited opportunities to be successful by incorporating those teaching elements that have been demonstrated to be useful tools in the classroom (Corbett, 1999).

In their research in the area of inclusive education, Corbett and Norwich (1999)

state in their article, "Inclusivity and School Culture," that an inclusive school is one that

values all of its learners and ensures that teaching practices are appropriate for the diverse

range of students and that the responsiveness to academic needs meets the collective

requirements of the students they serve. The design of this teaching approach

encompasses two critical elements of the teaching process, which includes the

incorporation of learning styles and the connection of the student to the curriculum via

the interconnection with their peers (Corbett & Norwich).

Inclusion Philosophy

With the emergence of the inclusion concept, there are various opinions as to the

diverse types of inclusive models, specifically, what type may be more appropriate for a

particular school environment. Wayne Sailor (1990), a researcher for the California

Research Institute, states that the context with which the idea of the "full inclusion"

model was created was simply an extension of the integration imperative implicit in the

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) paradigm contained in the interpretative language

of Public Law 94-142. In addition, as the mandate stated, the reauthorization of PL 94-

142 was to allow for full participation of all handicapped students in the social milieux of

the regular classroom to the fullest extent possible (Sailor).

With this event shadowing the inclusive movement, Forest, Stainback, and

Stainback (1989) designed a program in which nondisabled students and students with

special needs characterized the key component of the full inclusive model where students

spent more time building critical peer relationships that are inherent to the success of

exceptional children. Her research bears out that the development of sustained

relationships with their peers created a self-dignity, and the creation of respect for peers aided in social development that is critical to the success of developing a productive citizen in post school years (Forest, Stainback, & Stainback).

Teaching students to interact with their peers when faced with an academic challenge is not a social skill that is developed naturally. Wade (2000a) stated in his research involving the study of inclusive models, discovered that the development of shared inquiry by students is a skill that can be taught. In their findings they discovered, according to Freirean pedagogy, students could be taught the art of active inquiry within a group setting if students have had the opportunity to create a bond of trust coupled with the opportunity to develop a mutual acceptance prior to being involved in any shared academic task. In essence, what they stated was that students will learn the development of mutual understanding via a process of shared inquiry and not simply the transmission of unquestioned truths from an expert to passive students.

Foundations of Inclusive Practices

Traditionally, special education is seen as a separate educational system credited with teaching basic skills to students who have specific learning deficiencies and usually involves the removal of special needs learners to a self-contained classroom to be taught a curriculum that lacks both rigor and content (Validya, 1997). In her study of inclusive classrooms, Dorothy Lipsky (2003), Director of the National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion, has created a scaffolding of several elements that build key elements into the fabric of the inclusion philosophy and have shown to be effective practices in various inclusion models.

Leadership of any entity has always provided the foundation on which any successful movement or program is established. According to Lipsky (2003), in order to assure the successful transition from a traditional school responsible for teaching special needs learners, principals and superintendents must assume responsibility for the planning, implementing, and monitoring of the established programs. Without the direction and supervision necessary to support any program, it is doomed to failure regardless of the quality or philosophy behind it because there is nothing to assure its implementation and its success.

A second element necessary for the effective implementation of an inclusive philosophy in a public school is organization. According to Gartner and Lipsky in *Inclusion: A Service, Not a Place,* both the district and the school are key elements in the organizational process and serve as the foundation in implementing an effective inclusive philosophy. The establishment of a school-planning group who oversees the inclusive program is necessary in order to evaluate and monitor student progress within the program. This faction should include all stakeholders including parents as well as teachers, administrators, and teacher assistants (Gartner & Lipsky, 2007).

A third component that Lipsky and Gartner list is to focus on instructional strategies that are congruent in meeting both the needs of identified students in the inclusion program as well as measuring their impact on school improvement measures. The key to understanding this component is to broaden one's vision as to what elements create an effective teaching strategy (Gartner & Lipsky, 2007).

In the article "Moving Toward Inclusive Practices," Burstein, Cabello, Sears, Spagna, and Wilcoxen (2004) suggest several strategies for implementing the changes

necessary to provide the foundations of successful inclusive practices. The monitoring and evaluation of these elements by a separate entity is necessary to assure the success of the curriculum (Burstein, et al).

Building a commitment for change is necessary to ensure that all stakeholders of any program are committed to the goals and objectives of the program. Because teachers, parents, and school leaders by their very nature are guided by their core values and beliefs, they must be convinced that this change is worth the efforts that will be required for successful implementation of a program (Burstein et al, 2004).

Planning efforts are critical in the management of any program and require, especially in the early stages, an on-going effort to monitor the elements of the program, thus ensuring that students are successful in the inclusive classroom. It is critical that all of the components of the program are built on the strengths and characteristics of both the teachers and the students and is not solely an autocratic approach (Burstein et al, 2004).

Finally, the establishment of support via financial resources and school district personnel provides the necessary foundations on which to build a successful inclusive program. Teachers have consistently reported that the lack of support is the key barrier to the success of any program, regardless of its origin (Burstein et al, 2004).

Types of Inclusion Models

One type of inclusion model that is utilized in public schools is Wang's Adaptive Learning Environment Model (ALEM). This model combines a prescriptive learning element, which is hierarchically organized into varying learning activities with an added exploratory learning component with an emphasis or goal on increasing a student's independence and self-confidence. It is designed to create an active learning environment

by which students can acquire basic skills while increasing their abilities to cope with various academic demands. The instruction is individually planned and each student is expected to move through the academic goals and objectives at his or her own pace. The classroom is organized to facilitate movement through various academic activities, which allows the teachers to circulate freely about the room to provide instruction as well as feedback to individual students. In addition, students within this model are taught to plan and monitor their own learning as well as to be responsible for managing individual tasks within certain time limits (Wang, Rubenstein, & Reynolds, 1985).

In addition to the program, Wang designed an assessment tool utilized to facilitate and maintain as well as evaluate the ALEM model. The Data Based Staff Development Program was designed to assist teachers to improve their knowledge and skills in creating instructional experiences that are adaptive to individual student differences. In their evaluation and assessment of this model, Daniel and L.S. Fuchs (1998) reported that the ALEM model improved relations between both the regular and special education teacher. The study showed positive effects of non-handicapped students serving as role models for the identified children and increased the capacity of handicapped students to work more independently (Fuchs & Fuchs). However, in another independent study of this model, Zigmond and Baker (1996) stated through their empirical reviews that the program did not provide enough intensive teaching for the learning-disabled student and that the services provided through this model did not have a lasting effect on long-term achievement.

A second representation of an inclusion program is The Team-Teaching Inclusionary Model. This program incorporates both a special education and regular

education teacher joining to teach one set of students during the course of the school day. In this model, the key element for success, as it pertains to both the teaching element and those students involved in this program, is that both teachers are equal partners. They both contribute to every phase or component of the instructional day including planning, assessment, and the equal sharing of materials and instructional time. According to Walther-Thomas, Bryant, and Land (1996), effective team-teaching occurs when both classroom teachers have equal ownership of all aspects of the instructional day, including assessments, resources, and communication. In their studies, they found that effective team-teaching incorporates the need for the team to adjust schedules, assessments, and resource materials as dictated by individual and group needs (Walther-Thomas et al.).

According to Walther-Thomas (1996) and her research team, in her longitudinal study she found that the co-teaching learning experiences enhance the self-esteem of special needs learners as well as increase their academic performances and social skills. In addition, their research revealed that the teaching team benefited by having increased job satisfaction and their instructional knowledge was broadened. However, the study also uncovered that the team-teaching model required vital and key components to increase the success of its objectives. Those included district and building level planning times, administrative support and leadership, and balanced classrooms with a limited number of special needs students in relation to the total classroom enrollment (Walther-Thomas et al.)

A third inclusion program is the Strategies Intervention Model (SIM), which is based on the premise that all students should develop their potential as independent and strategic learners across several key areas including academics, social skills, and intrinsic

motivations (Tralli, Columbo, & Deshler, 1996).   While this model mainly focuses on secondary students, the program encompasses a three-step strategy-intervention curriculum. The model serves as a support that assists identified students into the transition of the secondary academic culture. This process of transition requires a strong collaboration component on the part of both regular and special education teachers.

One of the first steps in this program is for the teaching team to outline the curriculum elements along with a set of special goals and objectives outlined in the curriculum. Coupled with this outline, students are taught specific learning strategies for acquiring content objectives via comprehension strategies that allow for long-term retention of content objectives. This objective allows identified students to develop a coping technique or skill by utilizing a combination of identified strategies which include graphic organizers, connecting information to students' prior knowledge on the subject, and previewing content prior to instructional presentations by the teacher. In addition, students are taught social interaction skills as well as motivational techniques that increase their interactions with their peers as well as positive connections with their teachers.

In his study, James Lerner (1997), a research analyst, concluded that instruction within this model does improve learning for identified students at the secondary level. However, he cited the need for classroom teachers to have time to plan and implement the strategies inherent within this model and be able to assess, teach, and monitor student progress during the course of the year (Learner).

An inclusion model that focuses on the education of very young children, birth to age eight, is the Circle of Inclusion Model. This program is one of the most personnel-

intensive inclusion models as it is primarily utilized in serving the very young. One of the key components of this program is that it is utilized to transition very young children to other educational programs and environments. A combination of staffing, parental involvement, and the incorporation of qualified professionals provide the foundation of this model.

A strong monitor element is part of this program as frequent meetings are held to review and assess the progress and needs of each student within this program. Key stakeholders include the classroom teachers, parents or guardians of the children involved in the program, medical and psychological practitioners, along with therapists, teacher assistants, and others involved in the education of the individual child as well as those instrumental in writing and implementing a child's Individual Education Plan.

According to a study by Fisher, Pumpain, and Sax (1998) as it relates an assessment of inclusion models for early childhood students, a major concern for parents, as well as other caregivers for special needs children, is the quality of services and staff that are provided for identified children at this level. By participating in meetings which open the lines of communication between all parties involved in the education of the very young, the concerns raised by parents and/or guardians are resolved long before they affect the instructional program or the student themselves (Fisher et al.)

Another key component of this model includes the opportunity for the development of social, emotional, and interpersonal skills of the identified child. According to J.M. Ferguson (1999), a researcher who completed a study on the personal interactions of identified students with their non-disabled peers, stated that when students are encouraged to work together and interact both verbally as well as emotionally, bonds

begin to form as the foundation becomes established in understanding the cultural and academic differences in each other. Simple exposure to disabled students is not sufficient to build understanding and acceptance by non-disable peers; there has to be an actual emotional interaction and involvement before social bonds can be developed (Ferguson).

The element of "active participation" is the foundation behind this model as it allows students to become fully engaged in the teaching-learning process. Based on the "High/Scope" method which comes from the research findings of Piaget's stages of emotional development, each learner that is actively engaged in the learning process absorbs new information quickly as the child develops an ownership or attachment to the information being presented in the lesson. The core of this premise is that children learn best when they are self-directed, allowed to choose their own method of learning, and given guidelines and firm schedules with which they are to complete the task. In this model, teachers act as facilitators and do not dictate how the child will learn a given lesson. Acknowledging this fact, a student within this model obtains a variety of learning techniques created out of his/her own imagination thus establishing a foundation of self-confidence and an enthusiasm for learning (Cross & Walker-Knight, 1997).

The Impact of Inclusion

The inclusion concept continues to remain a controversial model in the field of education because it encompasses social values and presents an academic vehicle by which we teach children within the public schools. Today, there is no comparative data available in the field of special education that advocates can point to as having had a positive impact as it pertains to academics, graduation rates, preparation for higher education, or involvement in community or social issues. Therefore, currently a

comparison between educational integration and inclusive programming cannot be done.

While there is no concrete evidence that the inclusion movement is influencing academic gains by special needs children placed in those programs, there are over 50 studies comparing the academic performance of mildly handicapped students with regular education students within the public schools. According to Robert Weiner (2007), a research analyst, there is evidence of academic growth for those identified students in various inclusion models where the mildly handicapped children performed at the 80th percentile while other identified students who were segregated scored at the 50th percentile on state and national assessment (Weiner, 2007).

A key study, as it pertains to the effectiveness of inclusion, was completed at John's Hopkins University involving a school-wide restructuring program. The program of study involved a comprehensive effort to involve family support teams, professional development on behalf of classroom teachers, special reading and tutoring programs, and eight-week assessments. In assessing the impact of the program, a control group was compared to the inclusion model in several areas including language proficiency, reading analysis, student retention, and attendance. While the assessments showed growth in reading performance for all students in both groups, the most dramatic improvements occurred among the lowest achievers in the inclusion model. The fourth graders involved in this study showed dramatic changes as it pertained to student retentions. In the control schools, fourth graders had a 31% retention rate while the inclusion model or experimental group showed only a 4% failure rate. In addition, there were similar findings in the attendance rates when the study compared both the control groups and the

experimental groups together (Slavin, 1998).

While researchers are cautious in their conclusions, this analysis of an inclusion model did uncover some positive results from inclusion programs when compared to the segregation of special education students. Some of these findings included a reduced fear of human differences on the part of both identified students and their non-disabled peers (Peck, Carlson, & Helmstetter, 1992). In addition, the study demonstrated growth in social cognition on the part of both groups of students in the inclusion model as well as improvement in self-concepts of the regular education students (Murray-Seegert, 1989). The development of personal principles and the ability to assume a supportive role toward their fellow peers as well as an increase in creating warm and caring friends were all key elements formed within the inclusion curriculum (Bogdan & Taylor, 1989). As a final issue shared by the proponents of the inclusion paradigm, a 1989 study found that over a fifteen year period (1973-1987), the employment rate for high school graduates previously identified as exceptional students involved in various inclusion models was 73% verses the employment of those students involved in the segregated programs which was 53%. In addition, the study pointed out that the cost of educating students in the "pull-out" programs was nearly twice as expensive as educating them in the academic participation inclusion classes (Piuma, 1989).

In her article, "Everyone Learns From Inclusion; Specially Designed Instruction Puts Students with Disabilities in Regular Class Environments," Flemming (2002) states that the philosophy behind an effective strategy is to first measure its impact on how it addresses the needs of the students. From her studies, she discovered that teacher collaboration, cooperative learning, and modality grouping were all effective elements of

the inclusive classroom and have shown to be key ingredients in directing both special needs learners as well as regular education students to successful academic levels (Flemming).

Typically, students with learning disabilities have varying academic strengths and weaknesses. Within the inclusive model, research is connecting an integrative approach to teaching which entails having a theme linking different academic areas. This approach incorporates the utilization of individual learning styles, as dictated by the utilization and incorporation of a learning styles inventory, thus creating the opportunity for students to cognitively make the connection to various elements of the curriculum and enhance curricular meaning by allowing students to move at their own pace (Vaughn & Schumm, 1995).

Teacher Collaboration

As mentioned earlier, teacher collaboration in an inclusive model, which consists of both a regular education and a special education teacher, is the foundation upon which all other elements of an inclusive model succeed. According to a study by Welch and Sheridan (1993), collaboration is a process that must occur when two teachers are working together to reach a common goal or objective for a student in a classroom setting. This critical element of communication is an innovative way that professionals incorporate new instructional strategies that assist in the academic success of all students and is driven by the attainment of academic goals within the inclusion team. Underlying this component, the context of inclusion is to allow identified students the opportunity to be in the least restrictive environment as meaningful and productive members of the academic community while maintaining high academic standards within the inclusive

setting (Welch & Sheridan).

Due to the reciprocal nature of the concept of collaboration, it is important to understand, within the context of the inclusive model, that collaboration requires parity or an open and equal sharing of information. The individuals who make up the professional teams share not only knowledge as it revolves around their students, but also material resources, which will be utilized in assisting students to reach and interpret an academic goal. It does not imply that each member shares equal levels of skills and experience, quite the contrary, it means that there is established an understanding that, as a professional team, collaborators are working together for the common good and success of students (Wade, 2000a).

Elements of Inclusion

Another element of teacher collaboration involves a decision-making process that is common to all types of collaboration. Inherently, this process involves two sub-components or skills that are embedded in this feature: problem solving and communication.

Because the goal of collaboration is sharing the responsibility of resolving problems as it relates to students within the inclusive structure, it often becomes necessary, in order to move students forward, to generate possible solutions to academic or behavioral concerns. The scaffolding of a plan of action, implementing a possible solution, and then monitoring its progress are the cornerstones of the collaborative structure. It is imperative that all stakeholders are involved in the creating of a solution, if the situation merits it, in uncovering a constructive action plan to resolve the concerns as it relates to a student's success (Walter-Thomas et al., 1996).

Benefits of Inclusion

Working successfully with others in solving problems or concerns as they relate to students involved in the inclusive classroom requires effective interpersonal communication skills. The key to effective communication is that the messages that are conveyed are interpreted from the proper perspective. In other words, the parties involved in this process must be open and honest about the elements of the dialogue in question with no biases or unforeseen barriers that can cause communication gaps or misinterpretations of the conversation. Oftentimes, it may be necessary to repeat back or paraphrase the interpreted dialogue to the other person to ensure that both individuals, or in this case classroom teachers, understand exactly what the conversation is about and how the professional team is going to approach a solution for a particular student (Ware, 1994).

The adopting of cooperative learning and the incorporation of modality grouping lays the foundation for two key and effective teaching components within the inclusive classroom. In their article, "Making Differences Ordinary in Inclusive Classrooms," McLeskey and Waldron (2007) paint a clear picture of the inclusive philosophy as it revolves around instructional practices. They state that successful inclusive classrooms are dynamic and change according to the needs of the students including the content being covered as well as the exchanging of available resources. It is important that students with disabilities are provided the support that is as unobtrusive as possible and that the rhythm of the school day is much like that of other students. In essence, this provides the foundation for building inclusive classrooms (McLeskey & Waldron).

The affective domain, a key element in the instructional realm and the foundation of cooperative learning, incorporates the component of emotion. Research has continued to show that emotions have always played a key role in the cognitive processes of retention and academic ownership and aid in the promotion of socialization; this effort increases positive student interactions and aids in the social acceptance of children with disabilities by their non-disabled peers. When a common bond of working towards mutual goals holds children together, they develop an understanding of the unanimity of purpose, both for the group and for themselves. This increases their cooperation, not only among their peers, but also with their teachers, in addition to improving attitudes towards the teaching and learning process (Fox, 1989).

The results of a study by Gilles and Ashman (2000) clearly demonstrated that students with special needs benefited both academically and socially when they were provided the opportunity to work in a structured cooperative learning environment. Interactions with their classmates as well as their teachers supported their efforts in solving problems as well as the construction of new understandings from an academic perspective (Gilles & Ashman).

Supporting this same approach, the Kaufholds (2006), in their book *The Psychology of Learning and the Art of Teaching,* share similar findings by stating that full inclusion provides students the opportunity to prepare for the real world in which they will live. The partnership between special education and general education serves in helping break down the barriers between the identified students and their peers as well as aiding classroom teachers in gaining a respect for the learning differences in their students (Kaufhold & Kaufhold).

Classroom teachers have always been encouraged to employ pedagogical practices that promote active involvement of students within the teaching environment. One of those strategies often utilized by classroom teachers is the incorporation of grouping students by various methods. Over the years, the concept of ability grouping was commonplace among classroom teachers whereby students were grouped by academic ability according to various academic assessments. While that practice may have been useful at the time, research now shows that ability grouping is much like the pullout programs involving exceptional children where students are grouped and taught with like peers who possess the same academic skills. According to Kulik and Kulik (1991), this methodology was utilized to increase the compatibility of the group so they can move together at the same rate of speed.

Arguments Against Inclusion

Paul Tornillo (1994), president of the Florida Education Association, believes that the inclusion paradigm is all too frequently forced on classroom teachers ill-prepared to deal or work with special needs children - teachers who do not have the resources, training, and other supports necessary to teach identified students appropriately. Consequently, the special needs children are not provided the appropriate attention and care needed to become academically successful in the regular classroom. In addition, Tornillo argues that the increased pressure of federal and state legislatures, as well as the public domain, to raise standards for all students, regardless of their handicapping condition, does not make sense in forcing inclusion on classroom teachers not prepared to work with these children (Tornillo).

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) in recent years urged a moratorium on the national rush towards full inclusion because many of its members were concerned that many of the special needs children who were being served in the regular classrooms were monopolizing an inordinate amount of time, as well as resources, from the regular education students. Additionally, more evidence was being produced that, in some cases, the creation of violent classroom environments began to emerge on the academic scene (Sklaroff, 1994).

The Council for Exceptional Children, during their 1994 national conference, issued a statement that began with an endorsement for a continuum of services to be available for all special needs children, including various placement options outside the regular classroom, and that these services should be tailored to serve individual student needs regardless of their identified status.

The inclusion movement in public schools also sparked concerns about parents of identified students. According to Thomas Skrtic (1991), Professor of Education at the University of Kansas, many parents were concerned that the primary responsibility of teaching their identified child was now becoming the legal responsibility of regular classroom teachers. As Skrtic pointed out, their concerns were forged out of their struggles to obtain appropriated services for their children and to have someone not trained as a special education teacher would bring about a loss of advocacy (Skrtic).

In addition, two groups of special needs students, which were also concerned about the advent of full-time inclusive services within the public school domain, were the deaf children's advocates as well as the parents and guardians of the gifted students. O.P. Cohen (1994), administrator for the Lexington School for the Deaf, in his studies in the

area of special education, points out that inclusion is inappropriate for most students with

hearing impairments. While communication among peers is critical to the cognitive and

social development of all students, most deaf students cannot lip-read effectively in the

regular classroom setting. Backing his concerns with quantifiable research findings, he

points out that the greater intellectual gains made by deaf children, where a common

language and culture abide, includes the utilization of sign language. Even with

educational interpreters, students identified in this category miss many of the experiences

that are part of the inclusive environment. Consequently, the most appropriate academic

setting for the hearing-impaired student is a residential school within a community of

students possessing the same handicapped condition (Cohen).

The question of inclusive practices as it pertains to other special needs children is also a

concern of parents in the area of the gifted programs. The issue is still one that revolves

around appropriate services provided to identified students. Advocates, with research

support, believe that gifted students are better served in an academic community of other

gifted children while others promote that gifted children should be a part of a classroom

where students are heterogeneously grouped with their peers who have various academic

abilities. However, as previously mentioned, parents and advocates of special needs

children, regardless of their identification, believe that providing specialized services that

meet special needs are paramount to aid in the success of exceptional children and that to

move away from that concept is a step backwards. Parents are reticent to allow that to

happen to their children (Thompkins & Deloney, 1994).

What Researchers Say Regarding Inclusive Practices

Over the course of the past three decades, few issues have given rise to more

discussion and apprehension than the topic of inclusion. It is an issue that can be argued

from both sides, but the overall rationale and benefits of the inclusion movement have

more roots in moral and civil rights issues than in an educational paradigm. Though

written within the Constitution of the United States, individual rights issues hung in the

balance of the American culture long before the inclusion movement. The launch of

Sputnik, the beginnings of the Cold War, and the Civil Rights movement were all

international issues that played a part in opening the doors to individual rights issues as

they pertained to both academic and social affairs (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch,

1989).

Legal Issues

On the heels of these events, Congress, in 1975, passed the groundbreaking Public

Law 94-142, or more appropriately called the Education for all Handicapped Children

Act. This law mandated appropriate education for all students attending public schools,

regardless of their handicapped conditions, and required that they be placed in the least

restrictive environment for educational purposes. The law further provided the wording

that disabled children would be afforded a free and appropriate education and that the

education should be taught within the confines of a regular classroom to the fullest extent

possible (Public Law 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975).

Then in 1990, Congress passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act,

which updated PL 94-142 and further strengthen the two elements of a free and

appropriate education coupled with the placement of identified children in the least

restrictive environment. A key to understanding these laws is that while the law lends

itself to a strong accountability component as it pertains to the public school's

responsibility in teaching the special needs children, it does not abolish all settings except the regular classroom. While the law is clear in providing more alternatives that are restrictive when the regular classroom has been shown to be inappropriate, the focus then falls on searching for a continuum of placement options in order to provide the right assignment for those students identified with special needs. In plain language, the mandates are requiring the schools to make a significant effort to find an inclusive solution for the special needs child. However, the question comes into to play: How far are schools required to go to find the correct placement for exceptional children requiring special services (Rogers, 1993)?

Over the course of the past several years, the courts have considered the inclusion of children with even the most severe disabilities in the mainstream of public education. However, none of the decisions handed down by the courts have required full inclusion with some decisions indicating that mainstream education may not be appropriate. Today, the courts are leaning heavily on the decisions handed down in the case of Daniel R. R. verses State Board of Education (1989) in regards to making decisions on the inclusion of exceptional children in the mainstream of education.

Daniel was a six-year-old boy who had been identified for receiving special education services because of his moderate mental retardation. Given his developmental age of two to three years, he was placed in a pre-kindergarten classroom for a half day and then placed in a special education classroom for the remainder of the school day. After consulting with the pre-kindergarten teacher who reported that Daniel was not mastering the necessary skills and, in addition, was taking up inordinate amounts of the teacher's time, the school decided to place him full-time in the special education

classroom at which his parents protested. The case was taken to the district court, which

affirmed the decision of the school. The parents then appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court

of Appeals, which developed a two-pronged test to determine if the school district's

action complied with the spirit of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The

test asked whether the child, with supplemental materials and services, could be

successful in the regular classroom. The second part of the test asked that if a child

cannot be mainstreamed using services and supplemental aids, has the child been

mainstreamed to the maximum extent possible. The court found that the district had tried

several alternatives to assist this child and therefore determined the school had complied

with the mandates of IDEA. It was the outcome of this case that the courts now follow

the two-prong test in answering the question as to a district's attempt at meeting the

requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Daniel R.R. v. State

Board of Education, 1989).

Levels of Inclusion

Another area of debate is the issue of greater versus lesser inclusion. Jay Heubert

(1994), Professor of Law and Education at Columbia University, points out there are

several critical points upon which both proponents and opponents of the inclusion

movement can find common ground. First, there is a consensus that with appropriate staff

development more students could be better served in the regular classroom depending

upon their specific disabilities. Second, it is also generally accepted that better research

along with improved coordination of services between special education and general

education would improve both communication and the quality of services provided to

exceptional children. In addition, Heubert also underscores the inherent need for strong

administrative support on part of both the local school as well as from central office

personnel.

In contrast to the commonalities between both groups of inclusionary researchers,

there are major philosophical assumptions from both the proponents of inclusion as well

as those favoring segregated education. Those professionals who favor greater inclusion

practices within the public schools believe labeling and the segregation of disabled

students promotes a lower self-concept within the student and attaches low academic

expectations. Proponents also believe that children who carry the disability label are not

truly disabled but are only limited in certain abilities and that everyone has their own

strengths and weaknesses that vary from one individual to another. Along with this

paradigm, proponents of inclusion also believe that classroom teachers who have only

low-ability children tend to have lower expectations of their students. In addition, they

also believe that the exceptional children's curriculum is watered-down and does not

represent a quality, standard-based curriculum. It is also their belief that students who are

in segregated classes tend to stay in segregated programs while attending public schools.

However, perhaps the strongest element within their philosophy is that federal and state

laws support inclusionary practices based on the outcomes of previous cases citing

mainstreaming practices (Heubert, 1994).

In contrast to this philosophy, there are a number of professionals and researchers

who maintain that special education students are better suited for academically

segregated practices within the public schools. They believe that students who have

disabilities are different from their non-disabled peers and are better served within pullout

programs that meet their individual needs, which are identified within their Individual

Education Plans (IEP). Individuals who do not favor inclusion programs also have a fear that inclusion programs will increase the allotted budgets for both local education agencies as well as individual states. As part of their philosophy favoring segregated education, they believe special education teachers do have high expectations for their students and that the special education programs are appropriate for the students they serve. In addition, they believe that more individualization takes place within the pullout classes as teachers have fewer students and can spend more time meeting the academic needs of each student (Heubert, 1994).

Implications for School Leaders

The support for implementing any type of inclusion program within public schools needs to address various issues facing both school leaders and classroom teachers. There is no doubt that the inclusion concept brings to the forefront basic human values such as academic equality, educational freedoms, and the right for students to be immersed in an environment of social egalitarianism. However, key issues must be adequately addressed in order to bring to the surface those matters that inhibit academic and social opportunities. Shirley Hord (1992), Scholar Emeritus at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Texas and a leader in promoting educational change among school leaders, suggests that public schools address fundamental issues that are vital for successful change within the inclusion paradigm. Those issues include quality staff development for teaching teams thrust into the inclusive movement without an adequate background in teaching special needs children. In addition, schools must incorporate value-laden educational services to all students within any inclusion model and be able to provide adequate and quality materials that will address each individual

student's needs including both regular and special needs children (Hord).

Before any school plunges into any major restructuring program as it revolves around the inclusion movement, school leaders must incorporate a careful and thought-out time element and move slowly in the direction they feel they need to go. It is imperative that each school district articulates a clear vision of their mission and that this is shared and accepted by all key stakeholders. In addition, it is also critical that each school identify and provide quality staff development that will enhance quality instruction for all students and provide for their staff the skills needed to support and carry out the intended changes. An on-going monitoring system is also a key element of any successful program as well as providing timely assessments to insure that all goals and objectives of the program are being met. Finally, school leaders must keep in mind that changes often bring about issues and concerns among their staff and that their ability to address concerns adequately will be critical in implementing a successful inclusion program (Hord, 1992).

The Welsh Model

The Welsh Model is an inclusion program that is divided into four phases with each phase incorporating elements of inclusionary practices that integrate various components of team-teaching coupled with an array of instructional strategies. In addition, the program also presents, within the instructional component, different character elements for modeling positive human interactions.

Phase I is Large Group Training, usually consisting of no more than sixty staff members. The large assembly consists of classroom teachers, administrators, and curriculum coordinators from the same school system. In this phase, individuals will gain

knowledge of team-teaching theory and principles of instructional modification via highly interactive sessions. This phase presents the first opportunity where teachers are introduced to the team concept whereby they will teach a lesson with another team member. The goals of this phase are to teach the participants that there is an inclusion model and give them the opportunity to teach with another individual as part of a teaching team. This phase of training can be extended to three days to incorporate specific examples of grade level/core content curriculum adaptation. It is from this experience that all participants learn the meaning of failure, a planned component of this phase, as they attempt to respond to a teaching experience guided and manipulated by the presenter.

For example, the group receives an assignment disguised as a simple sing-a-long and all participants fail at this task as they attempt to meet the goals and objectives set out prior to the assignment. The leader or presenter then uses a pre-selected volunteer to record and direct the group responses to the activity. As the responses are collected from the group, they begin to find themselves responding from the perspective as a teaching team. The observers, which include central office personnel and administrators, observe the group's responses and evaluate the lesson presentation as to how effective it was in reaching pre-established goals and objectives. Participants will create a visual organizer, which is utilized as a response sheet. An explanation of the teaching model is presented and participants indicate their varying comfort levels with the model on the sheet. The presenter illustrates key instructional and philosophical points throughout the instructional period by carefully manipulating the responses of the participants (Haines & Donaldson, 2001).

Another pre-selected volunteer then reteaches the lesson with the presenter incorporating the suggestions of the group and utilizing a team-teaching approach. It is within this specific activity that observers and participants begin to discover how instruction can be modified to fit various student leaning modalities and how all students within the group can benefit from the instructional modifications (Welsh, 2001).

A third team-teaching demonstration is conducted, but this time with the goal of presenting the theory of multiple-intelligences. The presenter teaches a concept seven times, each time highlighting one of the various intelligences. From this perspective, each of the participants rate their level of comfort as well as their level of comprehension and how they feel this element fits within their academic and professional culture. The participants then evaluate all three team-teaching demonstrations utilizing a list of behaviors exhibited by successful team-teaching teams from across the country (Welsh, 2001).

Near the end of Phase I, participants then begin to work in groups of two. Existing teams who are attending the session will work together to compare and contrast the various intelligences that they feel will be utilized within their own classrooms during the coming school year. Other participants will create temporary teams for the purpose of gaining experience in working with and designing various instructional approaches for classrooms. In addition, a discussion of group dynamics within a classroom utilizing only the verbal-linguistic intelligence is demonstrated showing the participants the frustration of some students who have weak language skills and how different instructional approaches are key to assisting all students, especially special education children, how to succeed within the classroom (Haines & Donaldson, 2001)

Phase II is the Demonstration Phase where demonstration of various lessons are presented within the classroom with students using a lesson plan generated by the regular classroom teacher and modified by the trainer. During the course of the lesson, observers, including special education teachers, are in the classroom watching the lesson being presented to a class consisting of both regular education and special education students. Both the trainer and the regular education teacher teach the lesson together. Following the lesson, all stakeholders meet, discuss, and evaluate the lesson presentation. This component or phase of the model is carried throughout half of the school day, which can incorporate two to three different lessons being taught in several classrooms (Haines & Donaldson, 2001).

Phase III is the Deep-Training Cycle whereby six teachers are chosen from individual schools to be trained for three days in various aspects of the inclusion model. This phase includes three separate teams being trained simultaneously consisting of three regular classroom teachers and three special education teachers. Each of the following should precede this phase of training:

Pre-training observations - Staff members who are selected for this training must have completed both Phase I and Phase II.

Completion of the *Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol* (ITTAP) – Each member of the teaching teams completes a confidential, 20-item questionnaire. Perceptions of the teams are analyzed and a pre-training report is generated from this data.

Baseline observation by the trainer – Each group team-teaches a lesson together; the trainer observes and collects baseline data and then sets goals for the team based on

the observation and the data analysis.

During *Phase III*, six lessons will be planned, taught, and evaluated by the observer. Each general education teacher teaches two lessons, one with the trainer and one with their special education teacher. During the training, the participants will do the following:

Reorganize the classroom to facilitate multi-modality teaching

Learn to trust their teaching partners

Implement diverse instructional strategies

Incorporate both teachers into the instructional process

Emphasize student-centered instruction

Communicate with administrators

Assist other team teachers with planning and preparing all lessons

Following each lesson, the teachers who taught the lesson will assess themselves by using a rubric, which was developed by the trainer. Both team members will discuss the response of their students to the various instructional modifications along with their shared responsibilities during the presentation of the lesson. All teams receive a formal assessment by the computer-assisted observation software designed by the trainer (Welsh, 2001).

An action plan meeting involving all classroom teachers concludes this part of the training. During the conference, the outcomes of the training are discussed as well as various issues that may have arisen during the course of the training and the classroom presentations. A plan of action is created to implement positive changes that may be needed for individual teams as well as individual teachers (Welsh, 2001).

To reiterate several previously mentioned components of this phase, each regular classroom teacher will submit lesson plans to the trainer who will then take the course objectives and incorporate a number of different teaching strategies into the lesson format. The day prior to the lesson, the trainer asks the regular classroom teacher to place her students into pods consisting of the three learning modalities of linguistic, spatial, and kinesthetic. These individual groups or "pods" will now be referred to as the SILK groups (Spatial, Interpersonal, Linguistic, and Kinesthetic). The goal of the SILK grouping strategy insures group diversity and allows each student to contribute from his or her own learning strength. The color-coding of students facilitates this grouping strategy with nametags utilizing a specific color code for each identifying modality. The following day the trainer will then meet with one of the three regular classroom teachers and together they will plan the presentation of the lesson. During the actual presentation of the lesson, the other two teams will be observing inside the classroom while the regular classroom teacher and the trainer are conducting the lesson. In addition to the other two teams, curriculum coordinators and school and county office administrators are present during the course of the lesson presentation (Welsh, 2001).

Phase III also encompasses two key elements that are critical to the foundation of this particular phase of this model. In this stage, teachers are taught dozens of instructional strategies with which to teach various elements of the core curriculum. In addition, all members of the team are taught key elements of successful team-teaching and are given the tools with which they can assess their team's daily progress. This assessment tool is given detailed description in chapter three (Welsh, 2001).

Phase IV is the Follow-Up stage whereby teaching teams are evaluated from two perspectives. One is the internal assessment where teams utilize the ITTAP team-teaching behaviors tool, which are indexed to the Seven Building Blocks of Team Teaching. Then two external assessments are made, one from the administration of the local school and one from the curriculum coordinators. If it is determined at any time that a team needs assistance in order to continue to function as an effective unit, Mr. Welsh would return to the school system and provide an intense assessment of the team and the situation and provide services as needed (Welsh, 2001).

Today, the Welsh Model is utilized and implemented in a number of North Carolina counties including Buncombe, Camden, Harnett, Haywood, Henderson, Jackson, Lincoln, Moore, Pemberton, and Randolph. In addition, the model is being utilized at the Crossroads School in Georgia and the Boardman School District in Ohio.

The Impact of Brain Research

Susan Greenfield (2000) in her video, *All in the Mind: Understanding the Complexity of the Brain ,*reveals that all aspects of human experience, including the grouping of students in a public classroom, can be explained in the physical processes of the brain; learning is a much more personal event than has ever been realized. In addition to what students may internalize in the learning process, the value placed on learning by both parents and teachers on the academic process are critical elements in establishing the foundations for future academic accomplishments (Greenfield)

Caine (2005) uncovers twelve action principles that he groups around several key elements of the teaching and learning process including instruction, student processing, and the development of a learning climate that is conducive to a student's emotional and

academic growth. In his book, *Learning Principles in Action: The Field Book for Making Connections* Caine states how vital it is that special needs students feel they are part of the learning environment and have opportunities to bond with both classmates and the classroom teacher (Caine).

Sprenger (2002) testifies to the fact that understanding the elements and insights of the composition of learning behaviors and the biochemical reactions that determine the key elements in the learning process for students lays the groundwork for presenting a new paradigm in educational research. The key aspect in understanding the learning process, states Sprenger, is revealing a new awareness of how children learn from an academic perspective.

Sousa (2000), in his book *How the Brain Learns,* breaks down his research into non-technical language for the classroom teacher by explaining from a biological perspective how the brain processes certain behaviors and then ties it to specific instructional strategies for long-term retention and academic processing. In addition, Sylwester (2000) takes this knowledge a step further when he reveals classroom management as a process that hinges on the biological-ecological perspective of the cognitive research. In essence, an understanding of the functional element of the biological background of the learning process can, in fact, create classroom behaviors that are conducive to student learning and thus create an atmosphere that is not academically artificial, but allows students to connect this knowledge by enhancing its meaning.

As educators, research scientists, and psychologists begin to uncover new possibilities in the area of the cognitive sciences, students are creating new paradigms in

understanding the processes of comprehension and long-term retention. Much of what is known about the brain and the learning process has only been discovered in the last twenty-five years. For the first time, scientists are able to study the internal infrastructure of the human mind and the processing of information and its impact on the learning process (Parry & Gregory, 1998).

Recent discoveries have shown that the internal structure of the brain, in processing information, has to make sense of knowledge by being able to construct a meaning with that knowledge and then has to apply that information to what already exists in the brain (Caine & Caine 1991). By connecting new knowledge to old information already stored in the brain, the cognitive infrastructure begins to take ownership of the information, then stores it in long-term memory. This is why it is critical that when classroom teachers are presenting a new concept that they teach it in such a way as to try to connect the new information to some previously taught concept with which students can make a connection, thus taking private ownership of the new concept, and storing it in long-term memory (Caine & Caine).

Gardner (1983), after years of conducting a number of studies, created his theory on Multiple Intelligences. While there remain a number of critics of his research, the early foundations established by Gardner have led the way for more intensive studies in the area of the cognition, thus opening new doors for understanding the process of comprehension and the teaching-learning process (Gardner).

In his book, *The Frames of Mind*, Gardner (1983) establishes the foundation of what he calls his multiple intelligence theory. From extensive studies, Gardner recognized the early beginnings of his theory on eight different intelligences, which have

laid the groundwork for more discoveries in the area of academic ability. However, it is important to understand the concept of what Gardner calls the "developmental trajectory" of the various intelligences. In his research, Gardner undergirds his theory of the aptitudes by stating that while the research provides a definitive picture of each of the intelligences, from a neurological perspective, they are interrelated and tend to operate in a well-orchestrated and integrated component (Lazear, 1999).

Carolyn Chapman (1993), in her book "*If the Shoe Fits: How to Develop Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom*," lays the groundwork for the brain-compatible classroom in providing the best facilities available for optimum academic growth. According to Chapman, the establishment of an atmosphere of trust and belonging is a key element in laying the foundation for future social and academic success. Each child must feel that he or she is part of something important and feel they will able to contribute to the learning process that is being established within the classroom (Chapman).

Another key component established by Chapman (1993) asserts that the content of the curriculum must have some relevance to the students who are involved in the learning process; research has found that when students understand the lesson outcomes, along with the goals and purposes of the lesson, they become more involved in the teaching process.

In addition, Chapman (1993) states that the teaching environment should be a place where the learner can see his or her own work being displayed, thus creating a reminder of their academic efforts. This includes providing places for collaborative learning with their peers, a gathering place for discussions with their teacher, and a place

for independent work along with the exploration of a learning center.

A final disclosure of Chapman's (1993) study revealed the need for students to develop a respect for learning differences among their peers. When the material is presented in a variety of ways with regard to and recognition of a student's preferred learning modality, students are exposed to the cognitive diversity of their peers, thus creating exposure and recognition of their differences.

Summary

The literature chapter reviews three key elements of the inclusion classroom and the efforts to redefine the paradigm of the inclusive philosophy and its impact on academic achievement for special needs learners. First, the design of the inclusion classroom lays the foundations on which to build a successful program by incorporating a philosophy of academic success that is inherent into the paradigm of the classroom teachers.

A second element of a successful inclusion model is to incorporate effective instructional strategies that have shown, by research, to be effective in reaching and teaching all students involved in the inclusive process including both regular students as well as special needs learners.

A third and equally critical component is to understand the aspects of the cognitive sciences in relation to how the brain processes and retains information that is taught in the inclusive classroom. With the continuous evidence of what research is revealing to the educational community, implementing this element into the teaching process is key to establishing a pattern of academic success within the inclusion model.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this case study examined the implementation of Welsh's Inclusion Model at a targeted elementary school. The study covered two classrooms implementing the inclusion curriculum consisting of students ranging from the fourth to fifth grade. This study provided feedback to both the administration of the targeted school and to the Local Education Agency. Chapter 3 describes the (a) research questions, (b) participants, (c) research design, (d) procedures used to conduct the study in a non-biased setting, and (e) procedures used in the data collection and analysis to determine each participant's perception of the inclusion model as to the instructional effectiveness of the inclusion team.

Research Questions

The researcher has evaluated how well the targeted elementary school has implemented the Welsh Inclusion Model by collecting and comparing information from the principal, two inclusion teams, and the Director of Elementary Education. Four questions guided the study.

1. What are the perceived effects of the Welsh Inclusion Model on academic achievement as it pertains to both classroom academics as well as demonstrated growth on End-of-Grade tests for exceptional children during the course of the academic year?

2. What instructional practices are team members utilizing in the inclusion model?

3. What are teachers' dispositions about the team-teaching approach utilized in the Welsh Inclusion Model?

4. To what degree are the perceived effects of the SILK (Spatial, Linguistic, and Kinesthetic) grouping of students into "pods" impacting academic growth?

Study Design

The case study method chosen by the researcher is a study method that focused on a particular academic culture. Historically, case studies have been utilized in many professional fields including political science, sociology, social work, and various psychological areas. It was in the late 1960s and the early 1970s when case studies became an accepted method of research. In her investigations, Merriam (1998) contends that a case study in education, as well as other professional areas, is a legitimate methodological option for researchers when there is a focus on a particular culture that impacts various academic endeavors of an institution.

This case study provided a description of the co-teaching model in an inclusive classroom at the elementary level and moved the concept of co-teaching from a prescriptive phase to a descriptive practice. The Welsh Inclusion Model presented in this paper describes co-teaching as a collaborative relationship between the regular classroom teacher and the special educator. The researcher observed in two different inclusive classrooms involving two different inclusion teams teaching at various grade levels. The design for this research is a qualitative case study. According to Creswell (2003), a qualitative case study consists of a concrete set of elements encompassing an inventory of characteristics for qualitative research. He stated that qualitative research occurs in a natural environment which allows the researcher to "get a feel" for the educational setting. The qualitative approach will utilize multiple methods of data collection consisting of interviews and teacher surveys and will conclude with a focus group

dialogue encompassing various themes that emerge from the data analysis. This type of

research is evolving and may change or be developed as the study unfolds. A further

emphasis by Creswell states that qualitative research is subject to interpretation and that

the researcher "filters data through a personal lens that is situated in a specific

sociopolitical and historical moment. One cannot escape the personal interpretation

brought to qualitative data analysis" (p.182).

The case study design allowed the researcher to assess the implementation of the

Welsh Inclusion Model through a wide variety of instruments and attempt to clarify the

differences of opinions on the study and highlight how these dispositions have impacted

the result of the final analysis (Merriam, 1998).

Procedures

To undertake this study, the researcher interviewed the principal (See Appendix

A), the teachers of the inclusion teams (See Appendix E & F) who completed two

surveys that addressed specific elements of the inclusion model, and the Director of

Elementary Education. The questions on both surveys were correlated to the critical

elements of the model, which were matched by themes. In addition, the inclusion teams

utilized an internal assessment (See Appendix H) that addressed key issues within the

inclusion team. The administration also completed a survey (See Appendix G) to provide

observational data about the implementation of the inclusion model. Additionally, all of

the above-mentioned individuals, with the exception of the Director of Elementary

Education, participated in a focus-group interview, which explored the inclusion model in

more depth. As an added element to this study, the researcher utilized a *Co-Teaching*

Rubric (Appendix I) that encompassed six key elements of an inclusive classroom and

assessed the inclusion model from those six perspectives.

All of the instruments and surveys were given to a similar group of participants in another LEA to insure the reliability and validity of each assessment tool. Questions in the focus group evolved from the results of both the surveys and the interviews. Again, the interview questions were discussed with a similar group of participants to ensure reliability and validity.

Participants

Three teachers that make up the inclusion classrooms participated in the inclusion study through a targeted elementary school. Two teachers are regular education classroom teachers and the one teacher of exceptional children served both inclusion teams. Each team participated in both the survey as well as the focus group interview. Each classroom has an average of 22 students in their respective classrooms. The principal and both inclusion teams participated in a focus group interview and completed a survey. In addition, the administration participated in an interview where the focus was on administrative assessments of the model in order to add more depth to this study.

Instruments

The researcher collected information from the principal interview questions (Appendix A), the inclusion teams surveys (Appendix B & C), the Administrative Survey (Appendix D), the Inclusion Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol (Appendixes E, F, G, H), and the Inclusion Co-Teaching Rubric (Appendix I),

The teacher survey was used to collect information from classroom teachers on targeted elements of the inclusion program and the general components of the Welsh model. The principal survey, along with the administrative interview, provided

observational data about the implementation of the inclusion program at the targeted

school. In addition, Survey I, geared specifically towards the inclusion team members,

was adapted from those developed and utilized by Melissa Deutschmann, Director of

Special Education for the Middleborough School District in Boston Massachusetts.

Spencer (1995) based this survey on materials from *Creating Inclusive Classrooms:*

Effective and Reflective Practices.

The surveys used with the teachers and the administration provided information

about the daily classroom instructional activities as well as the collaboration component

of the Welsh Model. The Co-Teaching survey (Survey II) instrument is divided into five

sections to help the researcher compile and classify the results into six categories. The

survey will include (1) professional training and staff development, (2) student

engagement, (3) professional Support, (4) instructional strategies, (5) resources, and (6)

the perceived ownership of the model.

The principal interview (See Appendix A) was used to provide an overview of

how the inclusion model will be implemented within the targeted school. During the

principal interview, the researcher focused on the role of the principal as an instructional

leader within the implementation of the inclusion model.

Another instrument utilized in this study is the *Inclusion Team-Teaching Analysis*

Protocol (ITTAP). It examined two components of the inclusion team. It assisted in

determining how effective the inclusion team functioned in its instructional delivery to

students and how to assist teams in improving various elements of the inclusion team in

its teaching program. The ITTAP incorporated the composition of twenty team-teaching

behaviors that were indexed under seven domains, which comprised the building blocks

of team teaching under the inclusion program and are recorded on the ITTAP Behavior

Analysis sheet. Each of these behaviors is broken down into an analysis whereby the

teams can adequately assess how they are moving in specific directions that will enhance

the effectiveness of the teaching team. There are two forms of the ITTAP - Form A,

which is utilized by the regular classroom teacher to assess various components of the

inclusion team and Form B, an assessment by the exceptional children's teacher,

assessing the same elements as Form A. In addition, it is important to note that each team

member will utilizes this instrument independently.

An added instrument designed to evaluate an inclusion model and the inclusion

teams is the *Inclusion/Co-teaching Survey* (Survey I). This instrument looks at

administrative support, adequate resources to support the inclusive classroom, and

reflection upon the instructional strategies incorporated in the team-teaching model. This

instrument utilizes a set of sixteen questions focusing on the previously mentioned

elements of the inclusion program.

The last area or method of data collection was a focus-group interview that

included the principal and both of the inclusion teams. The focus group was tape-

recorded to enhance and clarify various elements of feedback that emerged from the

discussions within the group.

The format of the focus groups proceeded with the administrators and the

inclusion teams into one final assessment of the data analysis to create a clearer

understanding of the perceptions of both groups as demonstrated by both the surveys and

the interviewing process. The interview questions evolved from the themes that arose

within the data analysis from the various instruments. The researcher triangulated the

data from all sources to identify themes that emerged from the study. The principal interview, the administrative survey, the Director of Elementary Education survey, focus group interview, both inclusion surveys, the Co-Teaching Rubric, and the Inclusion Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol were all a part of the analysis of the Welsh Inclusion Model. Triangulation in a case study is an essential element that is necessary to help eliminate researcher bias within the study (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). As previously stated, multiple research instruments were incorporated to maintain validity and reliability within the research analysis.

The researcher analyzed (a) the surveys, (b) the interviews, and (c) the focus group interviews by recording key words or phrases from the various instruments and then grouping those words or phrases by themes. Repeated concepts were highlighted and those concepts were combined into an overall theme.

The researcher asked questions revolving around teacher dispositions and their ability to cover all of the objectives of the inclusion model. The researcher looked for various levels of knowledge as it pertains to the inclusion curriculum from all of the participants at the central office, school administration, and the inclusion teams.

Survey Descriptions

Inclusion/Co-Teaching Survey. Participants were asked to respond to a 5-point scale survey and to answer questions that included the following areas: (1) professional training as it pertains to the inclusion model, (2) student observations and engagement, (3) administrative support, (4) instructional practices, (5) professional resources, and (6) ownership/site-based decisions as they pertain to the model. Responses were ranked as follows: 1= agree, 2=disagree, 3= strongly agree, 4= strongly disagree, 5= undecided.

Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol. This instrument is an internal survey for inclusion teams to analyze the key elements of team teaching. This instrument incorporates a team analysis with twenty team-teaching behaviors created from a longitudinal study that evolved from intensive research encompassing regular and special education teachers, administrators, and support personnel from 15 states. This study took place from 1992 to 1996 to establish initial data for this instrument incorporating hundreds of team-teaching lessons from 8 states conducted from 1995 to 1997. The responses from this instrument also utilized a 5-point scale on two levels to answer questions that included the following professional elements: (a) educational philosophy, (b) scheduling, (c) team-ownership, (d) professional growth, (e) communication, (f) professional status, and (g) team-teaching mechanics. Responses were ranked as follows depending on the type of question asked: 1= strongly agree, never; 2= disagree, rarely; 3= undecided, sometimes; 4= agree, usually; 5= strongly agree, always.

Administrators Survey. The administrative survey incorporated the use of a 5-point scale addressing the same issues and concerns facing the classroom teachers, but from an administrative and observational perspective. The survey addressed (a) opportunities for continued professional growth as it pertains to the model, (b) observations of students within the model as it relates to student performance, (c) observations of the inclusion team as it relates to inclusion teammenship, (d) instructional practices and classroom management, (e) and the perceived administrative paradigm as it revolves around the perspective of internal ownership of the model.

The survey results were evaluated as either a positive response, a negative response, or a neutral response. The principal, and central office administrator's surveys differed from the classroom teacher's survey as to the various elements of assessment. Classroom teachers answered the survey questions as it related to their perspective of various elements of the inclusion classroom, while the principal and central office administrator responded to the survey questions as they related to their observations of how the Welsh model is being implemented at the targeted school.

Data Collection

Data was collected using the previously mentioned instruments, which include the surveys, interviews, and a focus group interview. The researcher requested permission to conduct the research and to explain the purpose of the study, which was granted by the Executive Director of Curriculum for the LEA and the Director of Elementary Education doing a joint meeting at the perspective school. The researcher then met with the principal to explain the purpose of the study and to establish a timeline at the targeted school.

After receiving permission from the Executive Director of the LEA, the researcher scheduled a meeting with the inclusion teams at the targeted school. The researcher explained the purpose of the study and the benefits to both the targeted school and the LEA. The participants were assured their survey information will remain both confidential and anonymous. Each participant was given a survey that was precoded with a number in the right hand corner for the purposes of separating the distinct assessment groups.

The administrators received their surveys from the researcher with the numbers in the right hand corner. They were asked to place their responses in an envelope and return to the researcher within a five-day timeframe. After the surveys were collected, the researcher made another contact with the targeted administration to set-up a timeframe to meet with the inclusion teams. It was at this time that the researcher also set up a time to interview the principal. Each interview took approximately 30 minutes. All of the participants were tape-recorded to assist with details of the responses as well to maintain anonymity.

After reviewing the data from the surveys and the information collected from the interviews, the researcher met individually with the focus group. This included the administration at the targeted school and the inclusion teams. The focus group interview of the inclusion teams was held at the school from which the study was conducted.

After reviewing the data gathered from the survey results, the interviews, and the focus groups, the researcher addressed specific elements of the research questions presented at the beginning of this study. Information derived from the ITTAP instrument was utilized to measure various elements of the inclusion team as it pertained to instructional practices, team collaboration, and student engagement. The *Co-Teaching Survey* was incorporated to measure administrative support as well as the utilization and supplication of materials needed to support the inclusion model. Finally, the interviews from the inclusion teams, as well as from the administrative staff at both the central office and the targeted school, infiltrated the study to add depth to the final analysis as to the academic impact of the inclusion model.

Summary

 The purpose of this study examined the implementation of the Welsh Inclusion Model at a targeted elementary school in Grades K-5 via two inclusionary classrooms. This model encompassed both exceptional children with varying disabilities as well as regular education students. This case study provided feedback both to the faculty of the targeted school as well as the local education agency. This chapter described the methods and procedures utilized to conduct the study as well as the data analysis. Chapter 4 will present the findings of this study.

Chapter 4: Results of the Study

Introduction

The purpose of this case study evaluated the implementation of the Welsh

Inclusion Model in a Pre-K-5 elementary school located in the Piedmont of North

Carolina. The study encompassed both a fourth and fifth grade classroom comprised of

approximately 43 students and two inclusion teams trained in the Welsh Inclusion Model.

The focus was on the Welsh Inclusion teams with a concentration on its impact on

various elements of the inclusion model, which included instructional delivery, the

grouping of students, and the level of teacher engagement or collaboration (Welsh, 2005).

Using two surveys, one which was developed by Melissa Deutschmann from the

Middleborough School District in Boston Massachusetts and the other that focused

around the Welsh Inclusion Model, the researcher compared the teacher survey results to

the administration and the Director of Elementary Education of the selected school

district results by collapsing responses and charting answers to the survey questions.

There were several opened-ended questions, which evolved from the results of this

analysis. The written comments are discussed by theme in chapter 5.

The researcher interviewed the principal to discuss the monitoring tools, the goals

of the inclusion program, and the professional development required to implement the

Welsh Inclusion Model at the selected school site. The final method of research consisted

of a focus-group interview. The group consisted of a fourth and fifth grade inclusion team

and the administration of the school. The Director of Elementary contributed to the study

by participating in the administrative survey. The questions for the discussion were

developed from the surveys and the interview responses. To determine the themes of the

study, the researcher studied the responses from the surveys and the interviews and extrapolated key words or phases that emerged from those replies. Those responses were collapsed into themes. By comparing the information from the various resources, the researcher was able to see where various elements of the information possessed different paradigm levels.

The following six tables depict the emergence of various themes extrapolated from the assessment instruments and the key words that evolved from those themes.

Table 1

Professional Development

Assessment Tool	Key Words
Teacher Survey I & II	Received quality training/4 days/Teaming strategies/Instructional model
Principal Survey	Inclusion classroom developmentally appropriate/Adequate materials for teaching all students/Teams provided with quality training from which we expand on the information and training given to us
Director of Elementary Education	Adequate training is provided
Focus Group Interview	Added to the formal training to meet needs for our students/Modified model to meet the various "tiers" within our classroom

Table 2

SILK Grouping Strategy

Assessment Tool	Key Words
Teacher Survey	Key element to student academic growth/ Allows for various instructional strategies/ Aids in meeting individual academic needs/ Assists in maintaining high time on task/ Enhances the integration of subject matter/ Allows for multiple assessments
Principal Survey	Decreased behavior referrals/Effective instructional strategy/Positive interaction among all students/Allows students to capitalize on their cognitive strengths/ Allows for a variety student engagement/ Environment conductive to higher time on task/Decreased office referrals
Director of Elementary Curriculum	SILK is only one process of this inclusion model/There are other models from which the same objective can be accomplished
Focus Group Interview	Modified grouping to meet the mechanics of our classrooms

Table 3

Amount of Time for Team Planning

Assessment Tool	Key Words
Teacher Survey	Team planning is limited
Principal Interview	More team planning is needed
Director of Elementary Curriculum	Not observed
Focus Group Interview	More time needed to fit daily schedules/ Ideal is to meet with inclusion teams then share our findings with rest of faculty/ESL/AIG/Deaf programs

Table 4

Importance of Inclusion

_____

Assessment Tool	Key Words
Teacher Survey	Allows for equal access to the regular curriculum for all students/ Provides positive role models for behavioral identified students/ The belief that identified students can be successful within the standard curriculum/Both teachers have equal access to all students and share equally with instructional responsibility/Allows for experimental teaching incorporating new strategies
Principal Survey	Academic equality/Positive role models for regular education students/Teaches students to their cognitive strengths/Allows for a variety of instructional approach
Director of Elementary Education	Inclusion is a positive step in academic equality and in providing positive role models for our behaviorally challenged students
Focus Group Interview	Strong common philosophy among inclusion team members/Still mis-concepts among faculty as to what inclusion means – still thought to be a low class/ Misconceptions among parents as well- still believe inclusion is for lower students and some parents do not want their child associated with this classroom

_____

Table 5

Need for Instructional Materials

Assessment Tool	Key Words
Teacher Survey	Adequate resources for instructional purposes/Could use additional materials
Principal Survey	Adequate curriculum materials to teach to many learning modalities
Director of Elementary Curriculum	Adequate curriculum materials to teach to many learning modalities
Focus Group	Need more materials that fit all of the learning needs of all of our students/Central office needs to more aware of this need and assist with funding

Table 6

Student Academic Growth

Assessment Tool	Key Words
Teacher Survey	Meets individual needs for both identified and regular education students/Allows students the opportunity for creative expression of their knowledge/ Students have a higher time on task/ Deterrence of behavioral issues/Allows students the opportunity to utilize their individual learning modalities
Principal Survey	Equal opportunity for academic success for all students on standard curriculum/IEPs followed with modifications when needed/Less office-discipline referrals
Director of Elementary Curriculum	This is only one model that contributes to the educational process/There are others that could address the same issues of student growth
Focus Group Interview	Strong team morale/Common philosophy among team members/Strong team bonding/ We see daily growth with our students but it takes time for it to show up on EOG scores-some formal evidence is seen from last year

Description of the Sample

The participants for this study consisted of two inclusion teams from the fourth and fifth grades. Both inclusion teams consisted of a regular fifth grade education teacher and a regular fourth grade teacher with an exceptional children's teacher serving as the support teacher for each team. The Director of Elementary Education and the school administration participated in both the surveys and the interviews in addition to the focus group conference.

The researcher met with the Executive Director of Curriculum for the LEA along with the Director of Elementary Education in an informal session. From this meeting, explanations surrounding the purpose of this study were shared. In addition, background information involving the school provided information as it revolved around the teaching staff involved within the study. The school engaged in this study is a Title I school which assisted with the funding of the implementation of the Welsh Inclusion Model. In addition, a third grade inclusion team incorporating the Welsh Model was also part of the inclusion program, but was not directly involved with the study except to offer feedback via an interview on their perceptions of the Welsh Model.

A Closer Look

What are the conditions at this school that warranted the implementation of an inclusion program? First, of the 595 students enrolled at this school, 109 or 18% of the student body has been identified as special needs learners. Secondly, the required Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) benchmark for the current school year (2007-2008) for the Students with Disabilities (SWD) is 76.7%. Currently, only 48.9% of its identified students are meeting that benchmark in reading and only 31.1% of the identified students are proficient in Math in grades 3-5. Given this analysis, the federal mandate has placed the school in School Improvement Status. Given this information, it was obvious that changes needed to be forthcoming. At this point, the implementation of the Welsh Inclusion Model was coupled with extensive training and inclusionary assessment in order to meet these standards and improve student success.

Presentation of the Data

Research Question #1. What are the perceived effects of the Welsh Inclusion Model on

academic achievement as it pertains to both classroom academics as well as

demonstrated growth on End-of-Grade Tests for exceptional children during the course

of the academic school year? In reviewing the feedback from both Teacher Survey I and

II and the administrative survey, evidence is given in relation to the perceived student

progress as it relates to academic growth for special needs children. In the first survey

(Survey I) where the focus is exclusively on the concept of the inclusion paradigm, three

of the inclusion team members or 75% of the teams "strongly agreed" that they felt that

students with disabilities were making progress. The remaining team member or 25% of

the inclusion teams "agreed" that special needs students were making academic

improvement as revealed in Question #3. The administration also felt that identified

students were receiving an adequate education within the model although there was some

difference of interpretation as to how this was achieved. In Question #2, the issue of

one's educational philosophy was addressed; a key element of a strong inclusion team.

With this question, it was found that 75% of the inclusion teams "strongly agreed" that

special needs learners can receive a quality education within an inclusion program, while

25% "agreed" they could. There was a feeling on the part of several team members that

the inclusion program was a key element of success for identified learners although they

all agreed that the model was providing an avenue of academic success for identified

students. Again, utilizing Survey I where the focus was exclusively on the inclusion

paradigm, both inclusion teams addressed the issue in Question #16 that they believed

that students with disabilities, along with their non-identified peers, should have equal

access to the same curriculum where modifications are implemented and all Individual

Education Plans are closely followed (100% Strongly Agreed). The administration also

felt this was a critical element to any inclusion program and agreed with the findings of

the inclusion teams.

In Survey II, evidence continued to demonstrate that students with disabilities can

receive a quality education and be allowed to have equal access to the same curriculum as

not disabled students as it deals exclusively within the Welsh Inclusion Model. First, both

teams felt that the model is conducive to the academic growth of special needs students

as it was addressed in Question #8. Overall, 50% of the team members felt that they

"agreed" that the model was favorable to academic growth of identified students while

50% "strongly agreed" that the Welsh model addressed academic needs of special needs

learners. However, the administrative thoughts were divided in this area. In the area

where the inclusion teams felt that both regular and special needs learners share the same

curriculum, both teams "strongly agreed" this was a critical element within the Welsh

model (Welsh, 2005) as it was revealed in Question #20. The administration thoughts

were equivalent on this finding. The inclusion teams also believed that the inclusion

process provides special needs students equal access to the regular curriculum, which is a

critical element in any inclusion model (Question #6). On this issue, all team members

stated they "strongly agreed" on this critical question, as did the administration.

The following table depicts the interpretation of this data derived from Surveys I

& II as they are applied to the educational process from both the classroom perspective as

well as from an administrative position. Given this study evolved from the foundations

surrounding all case studies, there were a limited number of both inclusion team members

as well as administrators. Therefore, the data derived from the previously mentioned

instruments, will be limited to only two inclusion teams and only two administrators.

Table 7

Perceptions of Implemented Components of the Welsh Inclusion Model

Components	Teachers Agree	Administrators Agree
	N=4	N=2
Learning Environments		
Classroom developmentally suitable	100%	100%
Organization of classroom	100%	100%
Organization of student routines	100%	100%
Grouping of students into pods	100%	50%
Curriculum and Instruction		
Pacing guides aligned with state standards	100%	100%
Quality and adequate training	100%	100%
Sufficient resources	75%	100%
Adequate support	100%	100%
Insufficient planning time	100%	100%
State objectives aligned with pacing guides	100%	100%
Students work in a variety of groupings	100%	100%
SILK grouping of students is an effective instructional strategy	100%	50%
Modifications for identified students are incorporated into each lesson objective	100%	100%
A variety of instructional strategies incorporated into each lesson is conducive to student comprehension	100%	100%

	Teachers Agree	Administrators Agree
The Model allows us to evaluate students from a variety of assessments	100%	100%

Components	Teachers Agree	Administrators Agree
Educational Philosophy		
The model is conducive to academic growth of identified students	100%	50%
The model allows for all students to share the same curriculum	100%	100%
Connecting with students' preferred modalities increases student motivation and academic success	100%	100%
I have had input into this program	100%	100%
I have seen concrete evidence of academic success for our identified students	100%	50%

The overall perception, as depicted within this chart, is that both the inclusion teams, as well as the administration, agree that the inclusion model does provide key elements for academic success within the inclusion program as it addresses the individual needs for identified students.

Research Question #2. What instructional practices are team members utilizing in the inclusion model? The Co-Teaching Rubric is an instrument that encompasses four key elements of assessment for classroom observation already mentioned in chapter 1 of this study. They are (1) teacher engagement, (2) instruction, (3) student engagement, and (4) organization of routines, which includes the physical arrangement of the room and the grouping of students. It is important to note that both inclusion teams are not only familiar with this instrument but also often utilize it to assess other inclusion teams within their school.

The instruction component focuses on various instructional strategies and practices that the inclusion teams are utilizing within their classrooms. The researcher focused on this one element during the six 60-minute observations of each lesson for both the fourth and fifth grade inclusion teams.

Day One. In the 5th grade classroom, the researcher observed 10 instructional practices that encompassed the *verbal/linguistic* approach to the teaching of a reading lesson. Mini-lectures (7 minutes) were given at the beginning of the lesson to define directions for the students as well as allowing for clarification of the assignment. In addition, there were 8 *visual/spatial* approaches to the teaching of the same lesson with 11 *motor/kinesthetic* instructional approaches. Also during this period, the inclusion team exchanged roles 7 different times during the instructional process so that one individual teacher was not responsible for the lesson presentation. There were 2 occasions when students participated in student-conferences, allowing time to discuss various elements of the reading concepts within their selected groups (25 minutes). On 2 occasions, the inclusion team served their students as facilitators and as additional resources for information.

The fourth grade inclusion team also had 60-minute lessons revolving around the same format as the fifth grade inclusion team. In this classroom, the researcher observed 17 different role changes among the inclusion team. During the course of the lesson, there were 6 *verbal/linguistic* instructional strategies implemented during the lesson on rain forests. In addition, there were 8 *visual/spatial* teaching strategies implemented and 2 *motor/kinesthetic* approaches. There was one segment of the lesson in which students worked within their teams and discussed the various concepts of the lesson on rain forests. Again, teachers served as facilitators within this lesson and as resources for their students and they monitored student progress during the course of the lesson as they

moved around the room taking part in student conferences. The student discussion lasted

approximately 12 minutes.

Day Two. The teacher introduction of the lesson on reading vocabulary began with a

power point presentation on each vocabulary word utilizing a combination of both

pictures and sounds along with a verbal definition for each word. In addition, a chart in

the back of the room served as a visual reminder of the vocabulary words for the week.

During various conversations that took place during this lesson, the teachers and students

continuously verbalized each vocabulary word in various sentences, building a context

around each word and allowing students to create meaning for each word using their own

perspective and meaning.

Within the context of the lesson, members of the fifth grade inclusion team

exchanged roles 21 times during the course of the class presentation. There were 3 brief

student conferences revolving around the lesson in addition to 7 *visual/spatial* and 7

verbal/linguistic instructional presentations. The members of the inclusion team also

served as facilitators on 5 different occasions during the lesson. In addition, there were 17

motor/kinesthetic instructional components added to the lesson format.

The regular education teacher opened the fourth grade lesson with a mystery bag,

which immediately captivated the students' interest. As she removed each item from the

bag, the students would attempted to guess how each individual piece (rubber bands,

corks from bottles, paper, and various fruits) may have evolved from their previous day's

lesson on the rain forest. The researcher noted how the rain forest theme continued

throughout the day as the inclusion team tied the classroom environment to their lesson

on the study of the rain forest.

During the course of the lesson, the inclusion team members exchanged roles 41 times as each team member contributed to various segments of the lesson. In addition, there were 8 *verbal/linguistic* and 5 *visual/spatial* instructional components presented within this lesson. Again, there were 2 student conferences along with 1 large group discussion of the lesson. Additionally, there were 7 *motor/kinesthetic* instructional components added to the lesson design. The researcher noted that during discussion times there was a high rate of student engagement where every student (18) contributed to the lesson in some aspect, which presented to the inclusion team each child's understanding of the concepts being discussed as they revolved around the lesson.

Day Three. During this observation, there was a strong element of student conferencing and interaction. The class divided into their "literature circles" to discuss various books the students had selected to read. Students were grouped according to their reading levels and could move up into other reading groups depending on how they progressed during the course of the academic year. The exceptional children's teacher lead the group of special needs learners where reading levels were below grade level. Each student kept a notebook where each member of the circle had a responsibility of leading and discussing specific elements of the book the group was reading. The regular education teacher "floated" to the other five literature circles to monitor progress and see that all students were on task. In addition, the regular education teacher monitored the progress of the students' notebooks as they move through each element of the literature circle, which consists of the Discussion Director, Literary Luminary, the Connector, and the Character Captain. The researcher noted that an exceptional children's assistant monitored and at times led the advanced group of readers during the literature circle component of the

lesson.

The inclusion team changed roles 14 times during the class discussion and there were 9 *verbal/linguistic* strategies implemented, along with 2 *visual/spatial*, and 7 *motor/kinesthetic* approaches employed. The researcher noted that due to the high volume of student conferencing during the class, there was less use of other elements of the instructional process.

The fourth grade seemed to follow the same instructional pattern as the fifth grade by incorporating the utilization of student conferencing for the lesson. While there were 24 exchanges in teacher roles during the class discussion, there was only 1 *verbal/linguistic, visual/spatial*, and *motor/kinesthetic* teaching strategy utilized during the course of the lesson due to the implementation of "Literature Circles." However, both inclusion team members circulated to observe and monitor the progress of students during the course of the lesson. The researcher did not observe any of the various instructional components due to the Literature Circles; however, the class did seem to follow a familiar pattern of student grouping where student conferencing and input served as the basis for instruction.

In reviewing the data entries from the Co-Teaching Rubric (Appendix I), the researcher found that during the fifth grade observations the inclusion team exchanged roles 26 times during the course of 3 lessons. In addition, the fifth grade inclusion team presented 3 lessons that encompassed 26 *verbal/linguistic* instructional strategies along with 17 *visual/spatial* and 35 *motor/kinesthetic*. The fourth grade inclusion team moved much higher in the area of exchanging roles where the team recorded a total of 82 times while utilizing 15 *verbal/linguistic,* 14 *visual/spatial*, and 10 *motor/kinesthetic* teaching

strategies. The benchmarks for assessing each of these strategies are contained within the

Co-Teaching Rubric as referenced in Appendix I where the four elements of this

instrument, a) teacher engagement, b) instruction, c) student engagement*,* and d)

organization of classroom routines and expectations are measured according to the

following criteria:

Exceeds Expectations…………………teaching behavior observed 3 times

Meets Expectations…………………….teaching behavior observed 2 times

Approaching Expectations…...................teaching behavior observed 1 time

Does Not Meet Expectations………………..teaching behavior not observed

In assessing these various instructional elements, it can be seen that both teams

fall along the continuum of either "meets expectations," or "exceeds expectations" as it

pertains to the Co-Teaching Rubric instrument as noted by the number of observable

behaviors.

Research Question #3. What are teacher dispositions about the team-teaching approach

utilized in the Welsh Inclusion Model? The ITTAP or the Inclusion Team-Teaching

Analysis Protocol is an instrument designed to measure two key components of the

inclusion team: a) It is used to determine how well inclusion and in-class support teams

function, and b) to assist teams in improving service delivery to their students. This

instrument measures data on a two-part scale as being "functional" or "needs

improvement" as it is aligned to the 20 ITTAP teaming behaviors (Appendix F), which

are indexed under Seven ITTAP domains (Appendix G)**.** A domain is considered a

strength when the growth potential for that team lies under 30% for each identified

behavior with each team having the potential to reach 100% as functioning at the top of

the percentage scale in each of the seven domains. A rating of 70% or higher indicates an area of strength for that individual team, while the remaining percentage represents an area for growth. In addition, the ITTAP measures the degree to which both team members share a common perception of the teaming relationship and its impact on student achievement.

In Ttable 8, the findings reveal the fourth grade inclusion team exceeded each of the twenty Team-Teaching Behaviors in every category. Ten of the Team-Teaching behaviors demonstrate how strong the fourth grade inclusion team is as it relates to supporting each team member as to the sharing of ideas and how they are incorporated into the daily lessons. In addition, the data reveals a strong compatibility between team members in areas of philosophy and instructional strategies. The weakest area, which still falls into the 70th percentile, leads into the category of both members teaching from the perspective of whole group instruction. The data from this teaching behavior did not reveal as to why this element met the minimal standard.

In the area of the Teaching Domains, which undergirds the twenty Team-Teaching Behaviors, findings depict the strongest area from the educational philosophy, which means each team member considers each other a valuable member of the inclusion team. The only area that depicts any weakness is the area of Joint Ownership, which, by definition, expresses a common purpose and the ability to share materials and other resources. However, with a benchmark of 70% representing a passing grade, the data still demonstrates a functional rating in this area.

Table 8

ITTAP Results Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol for 4th Grade Inclusion Team

Team Teaching Behaviors	Percentages	Rating
Evidence of joint planning	80%	Functional
Support teacher's idea accepted	100%	Functional
Support teacher's idea incorporated	100%	Functional
Both teachers have access to all students	100%	Functional
Both teachers have access to all facilities	100%	Functional
Both teachers teach to whole group	70%	Functional
Teachers have various approaches to instruction	80%	Functional
Teachers have compatible approaches to class management	100%	Functional
Both teachers capable of sharing leadership roles	90%	Functional
Both teachers capable of role release	90%	Functional
Both teachers have verbal access to lesson	90%	Functional
Teachers evaluate the effect on teaming on instruction and students	90%	Functional
Teachers keep track of each other during lesson presentations	100%	Functional
Teachers conference during lesson	90%	Functional
Evidence of exchange of professional skills	100%	Functional
Teachers use team-teaching as a way to practice new skills	90%	Functional
Teachers feel comfortable with the team-teaching model	100%	Functional
Teachers consider team-teaching model to be effective	100%	Functional
Both teachers agree on curricular focus	100%	Functional
Teachers share instructional responsibilities during the lesson	90%	Functional

The analysis of the ITTAP for the fourth grade inclusion team finds that all 20 areas of the team-teaching behaviors are "functional" with no "needs improvement" evident. The area listed under *Growth Potential* depicts the region where inclusion teams have room for improving in that specific area with the *Total Growth* demonstrating the total percentage listed for that particular area or domain. As can be seen by Table 9, the overall assessment for the fourth grade inclusion team finds it well above the norm and a highly functional team.

Table 9

ITTAP Results Team Teaching Domains for Fourth Grade Team Inclusion Team

Team Teaching Domains	Growth Potential	Total Growth
Educational Philosophy	3%	97%
Administrative Support, Time, and Scheduling	10%	90%
Joint Ownership	11%	89%
Professional Growth	10%	90%
Communication	10%	90%
Status	6%	94%
Team-Teaching Mechanics	10%	90%

Table 10

ITTAP Results Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol for 5th-Grade Inclusion Team

Team Teaching Behaviors	Percentages	Rating
Evidence of joint planning	80%	Functional
Support teacher's idea accepted	100%	Functional
Support teacher's idea incorporated	100%	Functional
Both teachers have access to all Students	100%	Functional
Both teachers have access to all facilities	90%	Functional
Both teachers teach to whole group	90%	Functional
Teachers have various approaches to instruction	80%	Functional
Teachers have compatible approaches to classroom management	100%	Functional
Both teachers capable of sharing leadership roles	100%	Functional
Both teachers capable of role release	100%	Functional
Both teachers have verbal access to lesson	100%	Functional
Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instructions and students	100%	Functional
Teachers keep track of each other during lesson presentations	100%	Functional
Teachers conference during lesson	100%	Functional
Evidence of exchange of professional skills	100%	Functional
Teachers use team-teaching as a way to practice new skills	90%	Functional
Teaches feel comfortable with the team-teaching model	100%	Functional
Teachers consider team-teaching model to be effective	100%	Functional
Both teachers agree on curricular focus	100%	Functional
Teachers share instructional responsibilities the lesson	90%	Functional

Of the twenty team-teaching behaviors within the ITTAP, the data reveal that the fifth grade inclusion team exceeds each of the standards set forth in each behavior and is functioning as a high level inclusion team with its only weak area falling in the region of joint planning and divergent approaches to instruction. Even with that area, the team is still highly functional when compared to each teaching behavior found within the confines of the ITTAP. Given the Twenty Team-Teaching behaviors, the data reveals that the fifth grade inclusion team achieves 100% in 14 of the teaching behaviors. The lowest category, which still ranks as functional at 80%, is the area of Joint Planning, which is a component outside control of the inclusion team. As is revealed in the interviews, it was ascertained that team planning is a concern from both team's perspectives as well as that of the administration and will be a priority for next year's schedule.

The results of the ITTAP Team Teaching Domains for the fifth grade inclusion team demonstrate a high-functioning team where there is literally no weakness presented in the data analysis. The area of administrative support and the mechanics of team-teaching, while important, mostly revolve around external forces that may influence the team, but show little or no effect within this model.

Table 11

ITTAP Results Team Teaching Domains—5th-Grade Inclusion Team.

Team Teaching Domains	Growth Potential	Total Growth
Educational Philosophy	2%	98%
Administrative Support, Time, and Scheduling	5%	95%
Joint Ownership	3%	97%
Professional Growth	2%	98%
Communication	0%	100%
Status	2%	98%
Team-Teaching Mechanics	5%	95%

Research Question #4. To what degree are the perceived effects of the SILK (spatial, linguistic, and kinesthetic) grouping of students into "pods" impacting academic growth? According to Survey II, the survey that deals exclusively with the Welsh Inclusion Model, all of the teachers responded positively to the questions revolving around this inquiry. Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, and 16 all focused on the question of the SILK grouping process. According to the survey, both inclusion teams either "agree" or "strongly agree" that this component of the model is a key element for implementing effective instructional strategies. In addition, the administrative survey addressed the same issues of the SILK grouping process and the feedback was the same. All eight questions within the administrative response, as they addressed the question of the SILK grouping element, recorded responses at "agree" or "strongly agree" on each response. For Question #3, both inclusion teams felt that the SILK grouping process was vital to student engagement and productive participation within the classroom. The responses

also stated that this component presented an effective teaching and learning component because "it allowed students to positively interact with others" during various lesson presentations.

From a different perspective, both teams and the administration felt that the "pod" concept allowed each student to capitalize on his/her individual learning modalities. In addition, both teams and the administration believed that it enhanced the integration of subject matter by allowing students to process information where once again they could utilize their comprehension modalities.

The surveys also revealed that the SILK grouping process allowed for a variety of student engagements that included whole group, peer paring, and small group responses, which kept the lesson both interesting and increased student motivation and participation. The responses also revealed that the grouping process created an environment that is more conducive to productive student engagement with a higher time on task, which they felt resulted in higher student comprehension and longer student processing of information.

From the administrative perspective, the concept of the SILK grouping element produced an environment that was not only academically productive, but also student friendly, which in-turn, created an atmosphere where there were fewer classroom disruptions and fewer office referrals. In addition, the SILK grouping component created an environment that produced safer student movement during the instructional process and increased positive student responses that revolved around the school's mission of producing a stronger character education factor as depicted in both the surveys and in the interviewing process.

Summary

Although there is some disagreement between the school administration and central office staff as it pertains to the implementation of the Welsh Inclusion Model, both inclusion teams agree that the Model is serving both the needs of the identified learners within the Model, as well as providing opportunities for professional growth for the members of the teams. The differences of the perceptions will be discussed in chapter 5.

Chapter 5: Summary and Conclusions

Introduction

Chapter 5 presents an overview of the study, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine the implementation of the Welsh Inclusion Model at a Pre-K-5th grade elementary school in the Piedmont of North Carolina. Information was collected and compared from the principal, Director of Elementary Curriculum, and two inclusion teams consisting of a fourth and fifth grade classroom. Four questions guided the study.

1. What are the perceived effects of the Welsh Inclusion Model on academic achievement as it pertains to both classroom academics as well as demonstrated growth on End-of-Grade Tests for exceptional children during the course of the academic school year?

2. What instructional practices are team members utilizing in the inclusion model?

3. What are teachers' dispositions about the team-teaching approach and how is it utilized in the Welsh Inclusion Model?

4. To what degree are the perceived effects of the SILK (Spatial, Linguistic, and Kinesthetic) grouping of students into "pods" impacting academic growth?

Overview of Study

The key question of this study, "How is the academic growth of special needs students impacted by the Welsh Inclusion Model as perceived by the inclusion teams, the school administration, and the district administration" was addressed in both the surveys and the interviews. To address this key question, two surveys were administered with a

focus on three key elements; (a) teacher collaboration among teams, (b) the instructional practices of the inclusion teams, and (c) the grouping of students into "pods" which is referred to in this study the SILK grouping process.

The school administration, two inclusion teams consisting of both a fourth grade and fifth grade classroom, and the Director of Elementary Education completed two surveys (Appendix B &C) and took part in interviews (Appendix K) to address this question. In addition, the incorporation of the Inclusion Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol (Appendix F) and the utilization of a Co-Teaching Rubric (Appendix I) also assisted in answering this question.

Research Question #1. What are the perceived effects of the Welsh Inclusion Model on academic achievement as it pertains to both classroom academics as well as demonstrated growth on the End-of-Grade tests for exceptional children during the course of the academic school year? This question was addressed from two perspectives, both of which evolved from two separate surveys. Survey I evolved from a study by Melissa Deuchmann of the Massachusetts School District and addressed the foundational components of the inclusion philosophy. In this survey, key elements of the inclusion paradigm laid the foundation of the study of the Welsh Inclusion Model. Within this survey, both inclusion teams dealt with the issues of educational philosophy, instructional strategies, ownership of the model, and concerns surrounding administrative support and quality staff development.

Survey II focused exclusively on the Welsh Inclusion Model and addressed similar issues as Survey I with the exception that the focus revolved around specific elements of the model itself. For example, there were eight questions surrounding the

component of the SILK grouping strategy where students were placed into "pods" determined by their individual learning modalities. The questions focused on the effectiveness of the grouping and its perceived impact on students involved in the model. The issue of student engagement with the academic tasks and with their peers was also an important element of this survey and seen as a vital component to the instructional process as depicted by this instrument. In addition, this strategy provided identified students with the "tools" they needed to be successful by supplying them with equal and full access to the standard curriculum while utilizing their modifications and providing the support staff needed to aid in their academic accomplishments. Teachers believed that this element also provided them with the freedom to experiment with various instructional strategies that enhanced the integration of the subject matter by allowing students to learn at their own pace without holding the regular education students back.

Research Question #2. What instructional practices are team members utilizing in the inclusion model? Incorporating the use of the Co-Teaching Rubric, six observations were completed by the researcher for both a fourth grade and fifth grade inclusion team focusing on the four domains of teacher engagement, student engagement, instruction, and classroom organization. During the course of these observations, most of the focus was on the instructional component with an emphasis on teacher and student engagement. First, it was observed by the researcher that the instructional process focused on three instructional modes consisting of *verbal/linguistic, visual/spatial,* and *motor/kinesthetic* utilizing the SILK grouping element. Within this model, teacher engagement laid the foundation for the instructional process and was critical in acknowledging the importance of both teachers' roles in the instructional practice. The exchange of roles during the

instructional unit within the model places an emphasis on the importance of understanding the leadership role each teacher plays within the model and how vital this exchanging of roles plays out during teaching. Its emphasis is on the teaming concept where each teacher shares, among other things, the benefit of being one unit. The sharing of lesson plans, as well as facilities and resources, is critical to the success of any inclusion team.

Within this model, the inclusion teams exchanged roles 108 times during the course of three lessons and incorporated the use of 41 *verbal/linguistic* strategies along with 41 *visual/spatial* and 45 *motor/kinesthetic.* The one key element that emerged within this model was that the special needs or exceptional children's teacher developed a better understanding and knowledge of the North Carolina Standard Course of Study and its place within the curriculum. Within the inclusion model, the support teacher was now required to gain a better understanding of the NCSCOS because she was now working with regular education children as well as those identified students. At the same time, the regular education teacher became more conscious of various methods instructing special needs learners along with a number of discipline strategies that have always been a part of the self-contained exceptional children's classroom.

Research Question #3. What are teachers' dispositions about the team-teaching approach utilized in the Welsh Inclusion Model? The Inclusion Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP) was the instrument incorporated into this study for the purpose of measuring teachers' dispositions of the inclusion team's perceptions as to how they were functioning as a team and the impact they are having on students' academic growth. There are 20 team-teaching behaviors that shaped the foundation of this instrument,

which is indexed to the Seven Inclusion Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol Domains (ITTAP). Utilizing a 1-5 scale where 5 ranked as the highest score, individual team members completed their respective forms according to their particular responsibility within the inclusion classroom. In reviewing the fourth grade analysis, as depicted in Tables 3 and 4, the data reveals a highly functioning team based on the percentages of growth for the inclusion team. Given the 70% benchmark as the lowest passing score, the fourth grade inclusion team just met that goal as it relates to the instructional element of both teachers teaching to whole class instruction. In addition, the fourth grade team scores at the 80th percentile in the area of joint planning, as well as the teams' approach to the area of incorporating various instructional strategies including shared instructional responsibilities during planning. The study revealed the fact that neither team has sufficient time for adequate planning as a team and that this critical inclusion component has to be done during times when teams are available outside the school day or as time is available. The administration also concurred that this is an on-going problem but hopes to address the problem next school year.

In the area of the Seven Domains from which the 20 teaching behaviors are indexed, the fourth grade inclusion team's lowest score was in the area of joint ownership, which still fell in the 89th percentile, well above the norm for establishing a functional team. As research has shown, the foundation for the successful implementation of any inclusion team is the commonality of an educational philosophy. In the establishment of any successful inclusion team, regardless of the model, there has to be a common ground or foundation where both members of the inclusion team share a bond woven within their philosophical beliefs. The fourth grade inclusion team scored 97% in

this area and is thus classified as a highly functional team.

The fifth grade data revealed a similar finding. Under the auspices of the 20 ITTAP teaching behaviors, the fifth grade inclusion team scored 80% in the area of joint planning, as well as the element of divergent approaches to instructional practices. This fact recognized that neither team has sufficient time during the day for joint planning. In addition, the data also show that the fifth grade team scored at 100% in 14 of the 20 team-teaching behaviors.

Research Question #4. To what degree are the perceived effects of the SILK (Spatial, Linguistic, and Kinesthetic) *grouping of students into "pods" impacting academic growth?* A review of Survey II demonstrates the perceptions of the inclusion teams as they pertain to this element of the Welsh Inclusion Model. As was alluded to in chapter 4, Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, and 16 all focused on the presentation of the perceptions of both inclusion teams as a testament to the effectiveness of the SILK grouping process. It was evident from the assessment instrument that both inclusion teams felt that this strategy is an effective component of the model and is vital for student engagement and participation during the course of the lesson. It was their belief that this component of the inclusion model opened avenues that allowed the inclusion team to experiment with various teaching strategies and to assist students within the inclusion team to grasp the concepts of the lesson as demonstrated from Question 15 in this survey.

In addition, the inclusion teams felt that the SILK grouping strategy allowed students to capitalize on their individual learning modalities, thus allowing students to grasp concepts more readily, and allowed for a variety of student engagements as presented in Questions 10, 15, and 16. In addition, both teams felt that the SILK grouping

element allowed the teams to enhance the integration of the subject matter more easily, thus increasing student interest and motivation as demonstrated in Question 11. Of the two teams, only 25% were unsure as to whether or not the grouping strategy enhanced the integration of subject matter, but the remaining inclusion members accepted the grouping strategy as a vital element for instructional purposes.

In addition, both teams felt that the SILK grouping process provided for safe and meaningful movement as students moved many times during various instructional presentations and activities as the teams presented lessons within the scope of the *motor/kinesthetic* teaching mode. This specific component was attended to in Question 5 of Survey II as the final question that focused on this area of the inclusion study.

Conclusions

The researcher analyzed the (a) surveys, (b) interviews, (c) ITTAP, (d) Co-Teaching Rubric, and (e) the focus group to look for emerging themes in the research. The following themes emerged from the research study:

Professional Development. The administrative interview led to the presumption that there was adequate staff development for her faculty as it pertained to the inclusion model, but there was always room for improvement. The principal felt that the training encompassing the Welsh Model would continue to aid as a monitoring element as well as offering on-going training for new inclusionary teachers.

In addition to the monitoring element, the principal also mentioned how the inclusion teams branched off from their training to create new instructional models outside the original training component of the Welsh Model. "While Rick models different strategies for our teachers, it's important that we critique each other and increase

our strategies as opposed to going to workshops" (Administrative Interview, 2008).

In addition to the foregoing elements of professional development, the principal felt that it was very important that training come from within the school and that the staff build from the training with Mr. Welsh. From this training, the staff would then go on to create instructional programs and models that directly serve her students, as opposed to going to workshops where the training is limited as to its direct impact on her students.

On the element of communication within the school, the principal mentioned that she attends inclusion meetings with her teams and listens to their concerns, as well as working directly with Mr. Welsh in providing support for her staff when needed. She felt that it was important as an instructional leader that she stay abreast of current happenings within the model and frequently visit the inclusion classrooms and provide feedback when she feels it is necessary. According to the principal, coaching is a key element in the success of any program, and it is one of her responsibilities to be available for debriefing purposes with Mr. Welsh after each training session and to assist in monitoring the program.

The SILK Grouping Strategy. From various discussions with the inclusion teams and the administration, each member was aware of cutting-edge research as it revolved around the concepts of how children learn. Many of the members quoted Howard Gardner's work on his multiple intelligence theories as well as Eric Jenson and his work with the cognitive aspects of the learning process for children. The team members presented verbal evidence both from the surveys and from the interviews that they had seen first-hand how some of their special needs children excelled within the inclusion atmosphere academically and built strong ties to their non-disabled peers. The utilization of

incorporating various instructional strategies within their lessons not only created an exciting learning atmosphere but also provided key elements in student comprehension and academic engagement. From the administrative perspective, it was voiced by the administration that this strategy caused a decline in office referrals as well as an increase in building character within the students as they gained respect for their classmates from working with them on various projects that required teambuilding.

Amount of Time for Team Planning. This area was a concern for both the administration and the inclusion teams. As was evident in both the surveys and the interviews, team planning is not a consistent tool that is viable for either team. While the state mandates that each teacher have a 30 minute duty-free period, most times this is the only opportunity when teams can have quality, uninterrupted time to plan the lesson as a team. Sometimes planning is done during their lunch period.

The principal made it clear that she faced the same dilemma when it came to incorporating a common planning time for her teams. With the state mandates on one side and the need to create a schedule that is conducive to all teachers and students as well as the inclusion teams on the other side, scheduling is a difficult challenge. In Survey I, specifically in Question 12, the issue of creating a schedule that would allow team members opportunity to plan inclusionary lessons revealed 100% agreement with this time issue.

Importance of Inclusion. As has been alluded to in other areas of this study, both inclusion teams and the administration feel that the concept of inclusion is both a viable and critical element in the educational process. Survey I, the instrument that focused only on the inclusion paradigm, extrapolated several key perceptions and beliefs that are held

within the inclusion teams. Question 2 stated, "I believe students with disabilities can receive an appropriate education in an inclusive regular education classroom," and each member of both teams stated they "strongly agree" with this philosophy. In addition, Question 3 adds to this critical element of one's educational philosophy by stating, "I have seen evidence of improved academic outcomes for students with disabilities in inclusion." Given this background, and the scores on both the ITTAP and the Seven Domains, it is evident that both the inclusion teams and the administration feel that the inclusion philosophy not only connects to the federal mandate IDEA of 1997, but also that each identified child can be successful within this program.

Need for Instructional Materials. Even though the inclusion teams agreed that the time sequencing was a problem, there was some disagreement as to the amount of resources provided to the teams. Question 6 of Survey I states, "I have sufficient resources to implement inclusion effectively;" 75% of the inclusion teams agreed with this statement. However, 25% of the inclusion teams were not sure if there were enough supplies and resources to carry out the designed lessons for the inclusion model. Overall, both inclusion teams felt they had sufficient resources for the task.

From the administrative perspective, the inclusion teams seemed to have the resources they needed but hoped to be able to increase those resources by adding new teams, a planning component, and more academic resources to provide depth to the instructional practices.

Observation of Students' Growth. Both inclusion teams have stated, by the data revealed in Survey I and II, that they have observed academic growth among their identified students. While the inclusion program is just now completing its second year, both the

administration and teachers within the team feel that the instructional strategies that have been incorporated within the teaching framework, coupled with the SILK grouping process, has served in meeting both the academic and emotional needs of their students.

Implications

Children with learning disabilities who are members of an inclusive classroom are evolving into productive citizens of the modern society. Numerous organizations, along with federal mandates of IDEA in helping meet the requirement of "least restrictive environment," have, for decades, attempted to connect identified children with their regular, non-disabled peers (Friend & Bursuck, 1988). These organizations, along with the federal laws, have clearly supported the ideals of inclusion. In addition, a growing body of research is continuing to express and present evidence on the positive effects for identified children learning along side their non-disabled peers, and as a result, we are seeing improved social skills, increased positive communication with classmates, and an enhancement in constructive peer relationships (Lord & Hopkins, 1986).

On the other side of this study, research continues to demonstrate the positive effects students with disabilities and students who are not identified have on each other within the inclusionary classroom. An atmosphere of academic acceptance, as well as an increase in the social augmentation, become the foundations of emulating modern society. Given these facts, the findings of this study only confirm what research is telling us and how modern society can aid in the development and acceptance of children with handicapping conditions (Sasso & Rude, 1988).

It is the progress of the children that is laying the foundation for productive citizenship. By incorporating effective instructional strategies, inclusionary teams

continue to aid in the social development of future citizens. In addition, children without disabilities are learning to accept these differences and assist in their development and growth as productive individuals.

Summary

This study clearly depicted two progressive inclusion teams that encompass strong elements of co-teaching coupled with a common educational philosophy and the creative ability to impart knowledge from a variety of academic resources. While the program is only in its second year, beginning with the current school year of 2007-2008, the administration and the inclusion teams are continuing their commitment to both the program and its objective of educating every child to their fullest potential by utilizing their own academic strengths and cognitive abilities.

Recommendations for Further Research

For the purpose of this study and research, the case study was limited to only the targeted school. However, future studies could encompass other inclusion settings within various districts including both Title I and non-Title I schools.

A further recommendation is that the current LEA under which this study was conducted should consider increased funding in staff development as it pertains to inclusionary practices. The LEA should also increase knowledge and training among other classroom teachers to assist with eliminating myths as it revolves around current inclusionary practices.

In addition, a longitudinal study of inclusion classrooms verses the "pull-out" program could begin to bring a new data-base of information that would demonstrate the impact of the inclusion movement on both identified and non-identified students. This

study has opened the doors to examining the inclusion movement at this targeted school,

as there is so much more to learn about the inclusion classroom and its impact on both

academic and social progress for our special needs children.

References

Annas, J. (September, 2004). Snapshots of meaning-making classrooms. *Educational Leadership, 62*(1), 36-40.

Ashman, A., & Giles, R.M. (2002). The effects of cooperative learning on students with learning difficulties in the lower elementary school. *The Journal of Special Education, 34*(1), 19-27.

Blatt, B., & Kaplan, F. (1974). Christmas in Purgatory: A Photographic Essay on Mental Retardation. Human Policy Press. Syracuse, New York.

Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S.J. (1989). Relationships with severely disabled people: The social construction of humanness. *Social Problems, 36*(2), 135-148.

Burstein, N., Cabello, B., Sears, S., Spagna, M., & Wilcoxen, A., (2004). Moving toward inclusive practices. *Remedial and Special Education, 25*(2), pp.104+.

Caine, R. (January, 2005). *Brain Learning Principals in Action: The Field Book for Making Connections*. California: Corwin Press.

Caine, R.N., & Caine, G. (1991). *Making Connections: Teaching and the Human Brain.* CA: Addison-Wesley.

Chapman, C. (1993). *If the Shoe Fits: How to Develop Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom.* Arlington Heights, Ill.: IRI/Skylight Publishing.

Chavis, I.M. (1977). Historical overview of special education in the United States. *Mainstreaming: Problems, Potential, and Perspectives* (pp. 25-41). Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project.

Cohen, E. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of Educational Research, 64*, 1-35.

Cohen, O.P. (1994, April 20). Inclusion should not include deaf students. *Education Week, 35*, 4.

Corbett, J. and Norwich, B. (1999). Inclusivity and school culture: Learners with special educational needs. Understanding pedagogy and its impact on learning. *British Journal of Special Education, 26* (1), 8-11.

Corbett, J. (1999). Special need, inclusion, and social exclusion. *Tackling Disaffection and Social Exclusion,* London: Kogan Press

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach. (2nd Ed.)* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crossley, K. E. (2000). Inclusion: A new addition to remedy a history of inadequate conditions and terms. *Journal of Law and Policy, 4*(239), 239-241.

Cross, L.S. & Walker-Knight, D. (1997). *Inclusion: Developing Collaborative and Cooperative School Communities.* The Educational Forum, Spring. EDC Group (1999). Active Learning: The Way Children Construct.

Council for Exceptional Children Policy on Inclusive Schools and Community Settings, (1993). *Teaching Exceptional Children, 25*(4).

Daniel. R.R. v. State Board of Education, 874 F.2d 1036 (5th Cir. 1989).

Ferguson, J.M. (1999). High school student's attitudes toward inclusion of handicapped students in the regular classroom. *The Educational Forum, 63*(2), 173-179.

Fisher, D., Pumpian, I., & Sax, C. (1998*).* Parent and caregiver impressions of different educational models. *Remedial and Special Education*, *19*(3), 173-180.

Flemming, A. R. (2002, November 17). Everyone learns from inclusion; Specially designed instruction puts students with disabilities in regular class environments. *The Washington Times,* pp. D01.

Forest, M., Stainback, W., & Stainback, S.,(1989). Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education. Baltimore, MD. Paul Brooks Publishing Co. 43-57.(if this is a chapter from a book, you need book title.

Fox, C. L. (1989). Peer acceptance of learning disabled children in the regular classroom. *Exceptional Children, 56*, 50-59.

Franklin, B.M. (1994). From Backwards to "At-Risk": Childhood learning difficulties and the contradiction of school reform. State University of New York Press.

Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. (1988). *Including Students with Special Needs: A Practical Guide for Classroom Teachers.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L.S. (1998). Response to Wang and Walberg. *Exceptional Children*, *55*(2), 138-146.

Gall, M.D., Gall, J.P., & Borg, W.R. (2003). *Educational Research: An Introduction.* Boston: Pearson Education.

Lipsky, D. R., Gartner, A., (2008). *Inclusion: A Service not a Place, a whole school Approach.* New York: Dude Publishing, Inc.

Gardner, Howard. (1983). *Frames of Mind.* New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Gilles, R.M., & Ashman, A.F. (2000). The effects of cooperative learning on students with learning difficulties in the lower elementary school. *The Journal of Special Education,* April 2000, *34*(1), 19-27.

Greenfield, S. (2000) Brain Stories: New Frontiers in Brain Research. Six Part Series, Number 1, *All in the Mind: Understanding the Complexities of the Brain.* BBC Productions, England.

Haines, C. (Producer), & Donaldson, J. (Director). (2001). *Health Wise* [Motion Picture]. NJ: Lenape Regional School District.

Heubert, Jay. (1994, July/August). Assumptions underlie arguments about inclusion. *Harvard Education Newsletter.*

Hord, S. (1992). Leadership: An imperative for successful change. *Issues About Change*, *1*(2). Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education. *Remedial on Special Education*, *27*(2), 77-94.

Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Amendments. June 4, 1997. Publ. L. 105 17.20 USC. Section 612.

Johnson, R.T., & Johnson, D.W. (1986). Action research: Cooperative learning in the science classroom. *Science and Children, 24*, 31-32.

Kauffman, J.M. (1995, April). *Why We Must Celebrate a Diversity of Restrictive Environments.* Keynote address presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Kaufhold, J.A., & Kaufhold, S.S. (2006). *The Psychology of Learning and the Art of Teaching.* New York: Writers Club Press.

Kulik, J.A., & Kulik, C.L. (1991). *Research on Ability Grouping: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives.* Storrs: University of Connecticut, National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.

Lazear, D. (1999). *Multiple Intelligence Approaches to Assessment.* Arizona: Zepher Press.

Lerner, J. (1997). *Learning Disabilities: Theories, Diagnosis, and Teaching Strategies.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Lief, B. (2001). The children's school: Lessons for inclusion, leadership, and school success. *Fordham Urban Law Journal, 29*(2), 705.

Lipsky, D.K., & Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and School Reform: Transforming America's Classroom.* Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Lipsky, D.K. (2003). The coexistence of high standards and inclusion: Whole school approaches can satisfy requirements of IDEA and NCLB Act. *The School Administrator, 60*(3), 32+.

Lord, C., & Hopkins, J.M. (1986). The social behavior of autistic children with younger and same-age non-handicapped peers. *Journal of Autism and Development Disorders, 16*, 249-262.

Mackie, R.P. (1963). *Statistics of special education for exceptional children.* U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.

McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N.L. (2007). Making differences ordinary in inclusive classrooms. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 42*(3), pp. 162+.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miranda, C. (1998). *Inclusion.* Non-published paper. University of Delaware.

Morrison, G.M., & Cosden, M.A. (1997) Risk, resilience, and adjustment of individuals with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, (20)*1, 43-60.

Murray-Seegert, C. (1989) *Nasty Girls, Thugs, and Humans Like Us: Social Relations Between Severely Disabled and Nondisabled Students in High School.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110 § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).

North Carolina School Report Card. School Year 2005-2006. State Level Report Card. Retrieved April, 2007, from www.ncreportcards/org/src/stateDetails.jsp

Parry, T. & Gregory, G. (1998). *Designing Brain Compatible Learning.* Arlington Heights, Ill.: Skylight Professional Development.

Peck, C.A., Carlson, P., & Helmstetter, E. (1992). Parent and teacher perceptions of outcomes for typically developing children enrolled in integrated early childhood programs: A statewide survey. *Journal of Early Intervention, 14*(4), 342-351.

Piuma, M. F. (1989) *Benefits and Cost of Integrating Students with Severe Disabilities in Regular Public School Programs: A Study Summary of Money Well Spent.* San Francisco State University.

Public Law 94-142 Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975. Washington, D.C.

Rogers, J. (1993, May). The inclusion revolution. *Research Bulletin, No. 11.* Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappan.

Sailor, W. (April, 1990). Policy Implication of Emergent Full Inclusion Model for the Education of Students with Severe Disabilities. San Francisco State University, CA. California Research Institute.

Sasso, G., & Rude, H. A. (1988). The social effects of integration on nonhandicapped children. *Mental Retardation*, *23*, 18-23.

Scheerenberger, R.C. (1983). *A History of Mental Retardation.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing.

Sklaroff, S. (1994, January 12). American federation of teachers urges halt to full inclusion movement. *Education Week, vol*, pg.

Skrtic, T.M. (1991, May). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. *Harvard Educational Review, 61*(2), pp. 148-206.

Slavin, R. E., (1998). *Success for All.* Center for Data-Driven Reform in
Education, John Hopkins University.

Sousa, D.A. (2000). *How the Brain Learns.* California: Corwin Press.

Spencer, J. (1995). *Creating Inclusive Classrooms: Effective and Reflective
Practices.* Denver, CO.: Prentice-Hall.

Sprenger, M.B. (2002). *Becoming a Whiz at Brain-Based Teaching.* Thousand Oaks,
CA.: Corwin Press, Inc.

Stainback, S. (2002). The inclusion movement: A goal for restructuring
education. In M. Winzer & K. Mazurek, *Special Education in the 21st Century:
Issues of Inclusion and Reform.* Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Stainback, W., Stainback, S., & Bunch, G. (1989). Introduction and historical
background. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, and M. Forest (Eds.), *Educating All
Students in the Mainstream of Regular Education* (pp. 3-14). Baltimore: Paul H.
Brookes Publishing.

Strong, R.W., Silver, H.F., & Perini, M.J. (2001). *Teaching What Matters Most,*
Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Sylwester, R. (2000). *A Biological Brain in a Cultural Classroom.* California: Corwin
Press.

Thompkins, R., & Deloney, P. (1994). Inclusion: The Pros and Cons. Issues about
Change. *Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 4*(3), pg. 1-12.

Tornillo, P. (1994, March 6). A lightweight fad bad for our schools. *Orlando Sentinel.
Pg. 17-18.*

Tralli, R., Columbo, B., & Desher, D.D. (1996). The strategies intervention
model: A model for supported inclusion at the secondary level. *Remedial and
Special Education, 17*, 204-216.

Validya, S.R. (1997). Meeting the challenges of an inclusive classroom of
improving learning for all students. *Education, 117*(4), 622+.

Validya, S. R., & Zaslavsky, H. (2002). Teacher education reform effort

for inclusion classroom: Knowledge versus pedagogy. *Education, 121*(1), 145-152.

Vaughn, S., & Schumm, J.S. (1992). Planning for Mainstreamed Special Education Students: Perceptions of General Education Teachers. *Exceptionality, 3*(2). 81-98.

Vaughn S. & Schumm, J.S. (1995). Responsible inclusion for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28*(5), 264-270.

Villa, R.A., & Thousand, J.S. (2000). *Restructuring for a Caring and Effective Education: Piecing the Puzzle Together*. (2nd ed). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing.

Wade, S. E. (2000a). *Preparing Teachers for Inclusive Education: Case Pedagogies and Curricula for Teacher Educators*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Eribaum Associates.

Wade, S.E. (2000b). Inclusive Education: *A Casebook and Readings for Prospective and Practicing Teachers*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Eribaum Associates.

Walter, T.C., & Bryant, M.S. (1996, July). Planning for effective co-teaching: The key to successful inclusion. *Remedial and Special Education*, *17*(4), 255-265.

Walther-Thomas, C.S., Bryant, M. & Land, S. (1996, July). Planning for effective co-teaching: The key to successful inclusion. *Remedial and Special Education, 17*(4), 225-265.

Walther-Thomas, C.S. (1997 July/August). Co-teaching Experiences: The benefits and problems that teachers and principals report over time. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 30*, 395-407.

Wang, M.C., Rubenstein, J.L., & Reynolds, M.C. (1985). Clearing the road to success for students with special needs. *Educational Leadership, 43,* 62-67.

Ware, L.P. (1994). Contextual barriers to collaboration. *Journal of Education and Psychology Consultation, 5*(4), 339-357.

Weiner, R. (2007*). Impact on Schools.* Washington, D.C: Capital Publishing.

Welch, M., & Sheridan, S.M. (1993). Educational partnerships in teacher education: Reconceptualizing how teacher education candidates are prepared for teaching students with disabilities. *Action in Teacher Education, 15*(3), 35-46.

Welsh, Rick. (2001). *Team Teaching for Inclusive Classrooms.* Sanford, North Carolina: Educational Services Consultant Co.

United States Department of Education. (2001) National Center of Education Statistics, Institute of Education Science. Washington, D.C.

Zigmond, N., & Baker, J.M. (1996). Full inclusion for students with learning disabilities: Too much of a good thing? *Theory into Practice*, *35*(1), 26-34.

Appendix A

Principal Interview Questions

Principal/Assistant Principal Interview Questions

1. What role do you play in implementing the Welsh Inclusion model at your school? Do you see a need to improve the model and if so, how do you plan to implement those changes?

2. What goals do you have for your inclusion program?

3. What type of on-going professional development needs to be implemented for your teachers to continue the implementation of the inclusion curriculum?

4. As an administrator, how do you monitor the inclusion program at your school?

5. How do you communicate with your teachers within the inclusion model as to your concerns of the inclusion agenda?

6. Based on your End-of-Grade test scores from this past year, do you see the inclusion program having a positive impact on the academic growth of you school?

7. How do you see the model affecting academic growth of your identified students?

8. What do you think is the next step for your inclusion program at your school and how are you going to implement those steps?

Appendix B

Inclusion Teacher Survey I

Teacher Survey on Inclusion

1. I have received the training I need to successfully use co-teaching strategies and implement inclusion.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

2. I believe students with disabilities can receive an appropriate education in an inclusive regular education classroom.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

3. I have seen evidence of improved academic outcomes for students with disabilities in inclusion.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

4. I have the necessary cooperation and assistance from educational support personnel to implement inclusion successfully.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

5. I find it difficult to modify my instructional strategies and my teaching style to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

6. I have sufficient resources to implement inclusion effectively.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

7. I believe students without disabilities can receive an appropriately challenging education in an inclusive regular education classroom.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

8. I have had input in the development of an inclusive program at my school.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

9. I have the time to individualize instruction for students with disabilities.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

10. I believe that special educators working in inclusion generally take a subordinate role in the classroom.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

11. I have found that inclusion has encouraged me to experiment with new teaching Strategies.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

12. I do not have enough time to communicate and collaborate with my co-teacher.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

13. I have the necessary cooperation and assistance from colleagues to implement   . inclusion successfully.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

14. In the inclusion classroom, my co-teacher and I consistently work with all students, including those with disabilities and those without disabilities

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

15. The students with disabilities in my inclusion classroom work separately from their classmates without disabilities a majority of the time.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

16. In my inclusion classroom, students with disabilities and students without disabilities receive equal access to the same general curriculum.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

Appendix C

Inclusion Team Survey II

Teacher Survey Questions on the Welsh Inclusion Model

1. My classroom is developmentally appropriately with adequate curriculum materials
to teach within the inclusion model.

    A. Agree   B. Disagree   C. Strongly Agree   D. Strongly disagree   E. Undecided

2. The grouping of students into "pods", more commonly referred to as SILK Grouping,
is an effective strategy to teach various lessons within the model.

    A. Agree   B. Disagree   C. Strongly Agree   D. Strongly disagree   E. Undecided

3. The grouping of students into "pods" is vital for student engagement and participation
during the course of the lesson into pods.

    A. Agree   B. Disagree   C. Strongly Agree   D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

4. The grouping of students into "pods" provides for safe and meaningful movement of
students during the course of the lesson.

    A. Agree   B. Disagree   C. Strongly Agree   D. Strongly disagree   E. Undecided

5. The grouping of students into "pods" presents an effective teaching and learning
component because it allows students to positively interact with each other during
the presentation of the lesson.

    A. Agree   B. Disagree   C. Strongly Agree   D. Strongly disagree   E. Undecided

6. This inclusion model allows for all students the opportunity for success especially
in meeting the needs of our identified students.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

7. Each identified student within this model that has an Individual Education Plan
that is being followed during the presentation of each lesson.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

8. From my observations, this model is conductive to the academic growth of each
identified student within this program.

    A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

9. The modifications that are incorporated within each IEP of the identified students
are being implemented every day during the instructional process of each lesson.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

10. The grouping of students into "pods" is vital to student success as it allows each student the opportunity to capitalize on his/her individual learning modality.

A. Agree   B. Disagree   C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

11. The grouping of students into "pods" enhances the "integration" of subject matter by allowing students to process the material from their own learning styles.

A. Agree   B. Disagree   C. Strongly Agree   D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

12. The school system's pacing guides are aligned with North Carolina's Standard Course Of Study.

A. Agree   B. Disagree   C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

13. During our lessons, we follow the guidelines of the pacing guides as we move through lesson presentations.

A. Agree   B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

14. This model gives us opportunities to assess students in various ways including the utilization of class projects, multiple-choice, oral responses, open-ended assessments, and, at times, computer assisted instruction.

A. Agree   B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

15. The grouping strategy of placing students into "pods" allows for a variety of student engagements including whole group, small group, peer paring, and individual responses.

A. Agree   B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

16. The grouping of students into "pods" creates an environment that is more conductive to student engagement of the lesson.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

17. All lessons that are taught within the inclusion model specifically address goals and objectives that are aligned to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

18. The non-traditional approach to teach various lessons within the model allows for a a variety of instructional strategies that is conductive to a higher time on task and more freedom for student expression.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

19. The incorporation of a variety of instructional strategies coupled with the grouping of students into their preferred modality, decreases student disruption and negative behaviors.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

20. The term inclusion allows for both regular education students and identified students to share the same learning environment. This allows all students to feel academically equal and is conductive to producing positive role models for students with behavior issues.

A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

Appendix D

Administrative Survey

Administrative Survey ----- Welsh Inclusion Model

1. The inclusive classroom is developmentally appropriate with adequate
   curriculum materials to teach the various learning modalities within the model.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E.Undecided

2. The grouping of students into "pods" seems to be an effective instructional
   strategy that increases student participation and more time on task.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

3. As an administrator, I believe the grouping of students into "pods" is a key
   element in student comprehension and academic engagement.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

4. The grouping of students into "pods" allows for safer and meaningful
   movement of students during the instructional process.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

5. The grouping of students into "pods" presents an effective teaching and
   learning strategy because it allows students to positively interact with each
   other during the instructional process.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly Agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

6. This inclusion model allows all of our students the opportunity for success and
   especially in meeting the needs of our identified students.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

7. As an administrator, I am sure each Individual Education Plan for our special
   needs students are being followed within this inclusion model.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

8. From my observations, this model is conducive to the academic growth of each
   identified student within this inclusion model.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly Disagree E. Undecided

9. From my observations of this inclusive program, the modifications of our
   special needs students are being incorporated and followed within this model.
        A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

10. The grouping of students into "pods" is vital to student success as it allows each student the opportunity to capitalize on his or her own learning modality.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

11. The grouping of students into "pods" enhances the integration of subject matter by allowing students to process information from their own learning styles.

   A. Agree B.Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

12. The school's pacing guides are aligned to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

13. As an administrator, I have observed the teachers in the inclusion program utilizing the pacing guides in the presenting of their lessons.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

14. In my observations of the inclusion model, I have observed our teachers evaluating students from a variety of assessments including oral responses, group projects, open-ended questions and, at times, computer assisted instruction.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

15. The grouping of students into "pods" allows for a variety of student engagements including whole group, small group, peer-pairing, and individual responses.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

16. The grouping of students into "pods" creates an environment that is more Conducive to student engagement of the lesson.

   A. Agree B. Disagee C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

17. All lessons that are taught within the inclusion model specifically address goals and objectives that are aligned to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

18. The non-traditional approach to teaching lessons within the model allows for a variety of instructional strategies that are conducive to a higher time on task and more freedom for student expression.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

19. The incorporation of a variety of instructional strategies coupled with the Grouping of students into their preferred modalities has decreased student disruptions and less office referrals from this program.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

20. The term inclusion allows for both regular education students and identified students to share the same learning environment creating an atmosphere of academic equality and is presenting positive role models to students with behavior issues.

   A. Agree B. Disagree C. Strongly agree D. Strongly disagree E. Undecided

Appendix E

Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol

The Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP) is a descriptive instrument designed to (1.) determine how well the inclusion team perceives how they are functioning as an instructional unit, and (2.) to assist teams in improving service delivery to their students.

Both members of the inclusion team will complete a 20-item questionnaire revolving around various elements of the inclusion model including the perception of teamwork, shared responsibilities of the teaching component of the model, evaluation of instruction and classroom management, and equal access to instructional resources. This instrument incorporates two separate forms utilized by both the exceptional children's teacher (Form B) and the general education instructor (Form A). Each member of the team will fill out the questionnaire independent of each other and requires both candid and honest responses. Many of the questions will touch on sensitive issues as they pertain to teamwork, but they must be answered as honestly as possible in order to obtain valid and accommodating results.

Form A: General Education Teacher

Team Teacher Self –Interview

Directions: Circle the number that most closely corresponds to your perception or opinion.

Codes: 1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided   4. agree   5. strongly agree

 Or   1. never   2. rarely   3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

Statement	Semantic Scale	Rating
1. My partner offers input to the teaching plan before the lesson.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
2. I look forward to partner's suggestion and comments.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
3. I incorporate my partner's ideas into the lesson.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
4. I expect my partner to work with all students in the classroom.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
5. I share all teaching facilities in the room with my partner.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
6. My partner and I both present information to the entire class.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
7. My partner and I tend to present information in different ways.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
8. My partner's management style is compatible to mine.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
9. My partner and I are both capable of leading the lesson.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
10. My partner and I can assume each other's roles spontaneously.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
11. My partner's interjections are appropriate and will timed.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5

12. We discuss our teaming and how it impacts our students   never-always   1 2 3 4 5

13. I am aware of my partner's actions/location during the lesson.   never-always   1 2 3 4 5

14. My partner and I talk to each other during the lesson.   never-always   1 2 3 4 5

15. I learn new skills from my partner.   never-always   1 2 3 4 5

16. My partner and I practice new skills when we are together.   never-always   1 2 3 4 5

17. I feel comfortable working in a team-teaching environment.   SD-SA   1 2 3 4 5

18. My partner and I accomplish more together than separately.   SD-SA   1 2 3 4 5

19. My partner's role is to help students experience success.   SD-SA   1 2 3 4 5

20. My partner has an equal share of the teaching role.   SD-SA   1 2 3 4 5

Form B: Special Education Team-Teacher

Teacher Self Interview

Directions: Circle the number that most closely corresponds to your perception or

opinion. Answer as honestly as possible.

Codes: 1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided   4. agree   5. strongly agree

Or   1. never   2. rarely   3. sometimes 4. usually 5. always

Statement	Semantic scale	Rating
1. I contribute to the planning of the lesson.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
2. My suggestions and comments are accepted as valid.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
3. My ideas are incorporated into the lesson.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
4. I have access to all students in the classroom.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
5. I have access to all teaching facilities in the room.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
6. My partner and I both present information to the class.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
7. My partner and I present information in different ways.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
8. My partner's management style is compatible to mine.	SD-SA	1 2 3 4 5
9. My partner and I are both capable of leading the lesson.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
10. My partner and I can assume each other's roles.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
11. My partner's interjections are appropriate and timely.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5
12. We discuss how our teaming impacts our students.	never-always	1 2 3 4 5

13. I am aware of my partner's actions/
location during lesson.   never-always   1 2 3 4 5

14. My partner and I talk to each other
during the lesson.   never-always   1 2 3 4 5

15. I learn new skills from my partner.   never-always   1 2 3 4 5

16. My partner and I practice new skills when
we are together.   never-always   1 2 3 4 5

17. I feel comfortable working in a team-
teaching environment.   SD-SA   1 2 3 4 5

18. My partner and I accomplish more
together than separately.   SD-SA   1 2 3 4 5

19. My partner's role is to help students
experience success.   SD-SA   1 2 3 4 5

20. My partner has an equal share of the
teaching role.   SD-SA   1 2 3 4 5

Appendix F

Twenty Team Teaching Behaviors Analyzed by the ITTAP

Twenty Team Teaching Behaviors Analyzed by the

Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP)

Item #	Team Teaching Behavior
1	There is evidence of joint planning
2	Support teacher's ideas accepted as valid
3	Support teacher's ideas incorporated into lesson
4	Both teachers have access to all students in the class
5	Both teachers have access to all teaching facilities in the classroom
6	Both teachers teach to whole group simultaneously
7	Teachers have divergent approaches to instruction
8	Teachers have compatible approaches to management
9	Both teachers are capable of sharing leadership role
10	Both teachers are capable of total role release
11	Teachers both have verbal access to lesson
12	Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students
13	Teachers keep track of each other during lesson
14	Teachers conference during the lesson
15	There is evidence of exchange of professional skills
16	Teachers use team-teaching as an opportunity to practice new skill
17	Teachers feel comfortable with the team-teaching model
18	Teachers consider the team teaching model to be effective
19	Both teachers agree on curricular focus
20	Teachers share instructional responsibilities during lesson

Appendix G

The ITTAP Domains

The Seven Building Blocks of Team Teaching

1. Educational Philosophy encompasses beliefs and values. It is shaped by training and prior experience. The elements of what constitutes teaching and learning, as well as acceptable standards for performance and behavior in a classroom will largely be determined by the educational philosophy that govern the classroom. Personal comfort issues may also be closely tied to and reinforced by the educational philosophy of the classroom teachers. Flexibility and openness can allow for harmonious integration of philosophies that may differ, whereas rigidity may prevent any accommodation from evolving.

2. Administrative, Time and Scheduling are external issues that can exert a powerful force on teaming. Shortages in time may cause some teams to neglect crucial activities such as planning and evaluation. This may result in less than maximal utilization of both members of the inclusion team. An administration must be sensitive to the special time and scheduling needs of the inclusive classroom, but teams must also utilize the time available for effective planning. The actual time spent together in the classroom may be all of the time to not only teach and evaluate students, but to teach and evaluate each other as well.

3. Joint ownership is an element that expresses a common purpose and the ability of the team to share materials and other resources as needed for effective instruction. When joint ownership is achieved in a classroom, the learning process becomes the primary focus and the roles and functions of the teaching partners shift and adapt to insure the success of all students within the inclusion team. Joint ownership demands that both partners exert influence over the total learning environment, and that they share responsibilities for the teaching process and accountability for its outcomes.

4. Professional growth assumes that the students are not the only learners in the classroom, but encompasses the classroom teachers as well. Teachers must recognize that they also need to expand their knowledge base as well as improving their teaching and academic skills. They can learn from each other as well as from observing the students and the outcomes resulting from using new strategies and teaching techniques. In order for professional growth to occur, an educational philosophy must be dynamic, not static. There must be a high level of trust and support between team members since they may have to accept the risks associated with becoming learners themselves.

5. Communication is a basic requirement if the teaming relationship is to be successful. Since information must be constantly exchanged before, during, and after the actual teaching element, multiple forms of communication is required (verbal, written, and non-verbal). Finding ways and opportunities to communicate is essential, but it is also important to keep in mind the effect that the communication may have on both members of the inclusion team as well as each member of that team. Since time is often at a premium, communication should be clear and efficient. Unfortunately, this can create a discomfort zone in certain areas. No one can be expected to eliminate an automatic reaction to negative or unpleasant information, but partners must learn not to yield control to their initial impulses. If all information shared is based on the best interest of the students involved in the model, and is conveyed with respect to the other member of the inclusion team, the potential for discomfort will be minimized.

6. Status is related to the extent to which factors such as power, authority, and influence define or redefine interpersonal relationships. In educational settings, status may be determined by years of experience, knowledge of subject matter, advanced

degrees, certification, or specialized skills. It can determine how input from other sources is interpreted. If status exerts a negative influence on the teaming relationship, the definition of roles and functions of the members of the inclusion team assumes an importance that may rival or overshadow the actual learning process. This can adversely affect student outcomes. Elevating each other's status, should be a goal of all team members. In this way, they gain access to all aspects of the instructional process and have license to focus all of their skills and talents on meeting the needs of the students within the model.

7. Team-building mechanics is the "nuts and bolts" of the team's activity. It is also the "before, during, and after maintenance" of the team teaching process. A team must be intact in both theory and application. Team teaching mechanics are physical behaviors required for a team to function at its highest level.

Appendix H

20 Team Behaviors Indexed to the Seven Domains

Twenty ITTAP Behaviors

Indexed to the Seven ITTAP Domains

Educational Philosophy encompasses beliefs and values. It is shaped by training

and prior experience of the classroom teachers. The elements of what constitutes the

teaching and learning process within the classroom will largely be determined by the

educational philosophy of the main stakeholders. Personal comfort issues may also be

closely tied to, and reinforced by, educational philosophy. Flexibility and openness can

allow for harmonious integration of philosophies that may differ significantly, whereas

rigidity may prevent any accommodation.

ITTAP behaviors associated with educational philosophy:

Item #	Behavior
2	Support teacher's ideas accepted as valid
3	Teachers have divergent approaches to instruction
8	Teachers have compatible approaches to management
17	Teachers feel comfortable with the team-teaching model
18	Teachers consider the team-teaching model to be effective
19	Both teachers agree on curricular focus
20	Teachers share the instructional responsibilities during the lesson

Administrative, time, and scheduling are external issues that can exert a powerful

force on teaming. Shortages in time may cause some teams to neglect critical activities

such as planning and evaluation. This may result in less than maximal utilization of both

team members of the teaching team. An administration must be sensitive to the special

time and scheduling needs of the inclusive classroom, but teams must also use the time

available to them effectively. The actual time spent together in the classroom may be all

of the time that some teams are allotted. They must therefore use that time to not only

teach and evaluate students, but to teach and evaluate each other as well.

ITTAP behaviors associated with administrative, time, and scheduling:

Item #	Behavior
1	There is evidence of joint planning
12	Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students
16	Teachers use team-teaching as a chance to practice new skills
20	Teachers share the instructional responsibilities during the lesson

Joint ownership expresses common purpose and the ability to share. When joint

ownership is achieved in a classroom, the learning process becomes the primary focus

and the roles and functions of the teaching partners shift and adapt to insure success of all

students in the classroom. Joint ownership also demands that both partners exert

influence over the total learning environment, and that they share responsibilities for the

teaching process and accountability for its outcomes.

ITTAP behaviors associated with joint ownership:

Item#	Behavior
1	There is evidence of joint planning
3	Support teacher's ideas incorporated into lesson
4	Both teachers have access to all students in the class
5	Both teachers have access to all facilities in the classroom
6	Both teachers teach to whole group simultaneously
9	Both teachers capable of sharing leadership roles

10	Both teachers capable of total role release
11	Both teachers have verbal access to lesson
12	Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students
13	Teachers keep track of each other during lesson presentation
19	Both teachers agree on curricular focus
20	Teachers share equal instructional responsibilities during lesson

Professional growth assumes that the students are not the only learners in the classroom. Teachers must recognize that they also need to expand their knowledge bases and improve their skills. They can learn from each other as well as from observing the students and the outcomes resulting from using new strategies and techniques. In order for professional growth to occur, an educational philosophy must be dynamic, not static. There must also be a high level of trust and support between partners since they may have to accept the risks associated with become learners themselves.

ITTAP behaviors associated with professional growth:

Item#	Behavior
4	Both teachers have access to all students in the class
9	Both teachers capable of sharing leadership role
10	Both teachers capable of total role release
12	Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students
15	There is evidence of exchange of professional skills
16	Teachers use team-teaching as an opportunity to practice new skill

Communication is a basic requirement if the teaming relationship is to succeed. Since information must be constantly exchanged before, during, and after the actual

teaching, multiple forms of communication (verbal, written and non-verbal) should be considered. Finding ways and opportunities to communicate is essential, but it is also important to bear in mind the effect that the communication itself may have on a partner. Since time is often at a premium, communication should be clear and efficient. Unfortunately, this can create discomfort in certain situations. No one can be expected to eliminate an automatic reaction to negative or unpleasant information, but partners must learn not to yield control to their initial impulses. If all information shared is based on the best interest if the students and is conveyed with respect, the potential for discomfort and hurt feelings will be minimized.

ITTAP behaviors associated with Communication:

Item#	Behavior
1	There is evidence of joint planning.
11	Teachers both have verbal access to lesson.
12	Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students.
13	Teachers keep track each other during the lesson.
14	Teachers conference during the lesson.

Status is related to the extent to which factors such as power, authority and influence, define interpersonal relationships. In educational settings, status may be determined by years of experience, knowledge of subject matter, advanced degrees, certifications or specialized skills. It can determine how input from other sources is interpreted. If status exerts a negative influence on the teaming relationship, the definition of roles and functions of the team members assumes an importance that may rival or overshadow the actual learning process. This can adversely affect student outcomes.

Elevating each other's status, should be a goal of all team members. In this way, they gain access to all aspects of the instructional process and have license to focus all of their skills and talents on meeting the needs of the students in the classroom.

ITTAP behaviors associated with Status:

Item #	Behavior
2	Support teacher's ideas accepted as valid.
3	Support teacher's ideas incorporated into lesson.
4	Both teachers have access to all students in the class.
5	Both teachers have access to all facilities in the classroom.
9	Both teachers capable of sharing leadership role.
10	Both teachers capable of total role release.
11	Teachers both have verbal access to lesson.
12	Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students.
14	Teachers conference during the lesson.
15	There is evidence of exchange of professional skills.
17	Teachers feel comfortable with the team teaching model.
20	Teachers share the instructional responsibilities during the lesson.

Team teaching mechanics, as the name suggests is the "nuts and bolts" of the team's activity. It is also the "before, during and after maintenance" of the team teaching process. A team must be intact in both theory and application. Team teaching mechanics are physical behaviors required for a team to function operationally.

ITTAP behaviors associated with Team Teaching Mechanics.

Item #	Behavior
1	There is evidence of joint planning
4	Both teachers have access to all students in the classroom
5	Both teachers have access to all teaching facilities in the classroom
7	Teachers present information in different ways
12	Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students
13	Teachers keep track of each other during the lesson
14	Teachers conference during the lesson
20	Teachers share instructional responsibilities equally during lesson

Appendix I

Inclusion Co-Teaching Rubric

Observation Rubric

Teacher Number: _____ Observation Number: _____ Date: _____

Lesson Title:_____

	Criteria				Points
	Exceeds Expectations (3)	**Meets Expectations (2)**	**Approaching Expectations (1)**	**Does Not Meet Expectations (0)**	
Teacher Engagement	*Continuous Engagement *Instruct in variety Of modalities *Exchanges roles many times lesson *Instructional Responsibilities Shared	*Occassional engagement *Occasionally instructs in a variety of modalities *Exchanges roles at least 3 times in lesson *Instructional duties shared but one partner dominates	*Teachers trade roles during lesson *Teaches from limited modalities *One teacher assumes bulk of teaching unit *One teacher circulates and monitors	*Only one instructional leader during lesson *Teaches from one modality *One teacher assumes all instructional duties *One teacher assumes subordinate role	
Instruction	*Verbal/Linguistic Visual/Spatial Motor/Kinesthetic input is integrated cohesively into instruction *Teacher acts as facilitator for student interaction *Student's verbal conferencing and physical input serves as the basis for instruction	*Instruction carries verbal/linguistic and visual/spatial components *Motor/Kinesthetic may be used as an add-on to lesson *Students may conference in groups prior to responding to questions posed by teacher	*Instruction is primarily verbal/linguistic with occasional support in Visual/Spatial *Questioning directed to class with single students chosen to respond *Some discussion of questions and concepts occurs among students	*Instruction tends to be verbal/linguistic *Pacing off lesson is determined by teacher via lecture and questioning *Questions tend to be directed to class with single students being chosen to respond	
Student Engagement	*Most or all of students are consistently engaged in the	*A few students are off task *Most students engaged in lesson	*Identifiable subsets of students are occasionally off task or disengaged *Some students are engaged	*Identifiable subsets of students are frequently off task or disengaged *Students who are engaged show little evidence of lesson involvement	
Organization Of Routines And Expectations	*Students embrace classroom routines and keep the room running smoothly	*Students anticipate routines and take initiative with minimal prompting	*Students seem aware of expectations and routines and comply when prompted by teachers	*Little evidence of routines and expectations	

Appendix J

Survey 1 Permission

Deutschmann, Melissa

11/17/2007   **Subject**

                          Dissertation Project

History: **This message has been replied to.**

****

Dear Mr. Pickard,

I do not have any objections to you using the survey. Good Luck with your

dissertation!

Sincerely,

Melissa Deutschmann

Massachusetts School System

Appendix K

Principal Interview--Questions and Answers

Principal Interview Questions and Answers

1. What role do you play in implementing the Welsh Inclusion Model at your school?

   "Well, I support the teachers in their efforts. I work with Rick as far as……we try and have a brief time to debrief during the time he is here. When he is here,…..this is his room (conference room) and I open my door (principal's office connected to conference room) and have privy to listening to what he is doing…..and, then with the staff we talk a lot about the model. The inclusion program was struggling because they did not have any support. So, I went…..um…..I try and go to the inclusion team meetings….now, they don't have as many as they used to……they used to meet monthly when we were trying to take our baby steps in get this going."

   Do you see a need to improve the model and if so, how do you plan to implement those changes?

   "There is always ways to improve. I think the model is good…um….one of the things that we have talked about as a group is that Rick doesn't present all of the co-teaching strategies…that some of the teachers …….they have learned more strategies…..which is awesome…you know, but that has been a result of learning those from Rick and they have kind of gone beyond that and I don't know if he…..his emphasis is on the strategies that he uses in his model.

2. What goals do you have for your inclusion program?

   "I would like to have it better staffed. Our staffing is not fair right now. I would like to see it continue appropriately………like the right ratio with student numbers, but in

order to do that you have to have enough staff and right now we are….(makes verbal gesture that it is not good).

3. What type of on-going professional development needs to be implemented for your teachers to continue the implementation of the inclusion model?

"I think with this group continuing with Rick as a coach and then to have him being able to come when I get new people in the program. Like next year, I will have two new teachers –probably three- and just to have him come ….and as I have shared with you before, coaching to me is the way to make things happen. So, sending people to workshops is not by bag – you know you can sit and listen all day and get excited, but you just do not implement it. With Rick's model, the model is implementing it. He models it…..they model it….they critique each other (Co-Teaching Rubric)…and its right there in their classroom and its things they can continue with verses going to a workshop where you get out, go home and fix supper and the next morning you are back at the same old grind and you don't put the new things in place….that's been my experience.

4. As an administrator, how do you monitor the inclusion program at your school?

"We have a lot of discussion, like I said. Course, as you know, it falls upon me to do observations and evaluations…and with those we try and do those during core academic times, so, I get to see the co-teaching and that's a good way to model it, but, communication……good scores, but certainly data. I would be remise if I did not talk about data.

5. How do you communicate with your teachers within the inclusion model as to your concerns of the inclusion agenda?

"Meeting with them when the inclusion teams meets. If they have specific concerns and they are during their co-teaching planning – I can meet with them or our assistant principal can meet with them as well. They can communicate with me as to their frustrations because they are the ones that are short-staffed, and sometimes we do poor placement. Sometimes just giving them the opportunity to expand upon that is enough.

6. Based on our End-of-Grade scores from this past year, do you see the inclusion program having a positive impact a positive impact on the academic growth of your school?

"I do…..its not as great as we would want them to be. In the 5th grade inclusion classroom, every child that took the EOG passed unless they were on the extend II. Those were kids she had looped with and she hung up a sign that said all children in here will pass the EOG. We are still a school of improvement because they did not all. The way to see improvement is to look at individual growth. We have kids to get out of EC and I think that is the direct result of the model.

7. How do you see the model affecting academic growth of your identified students? This was addressed in the previous question.

8. What do you think is the next step for your inclusion program at your school and how are you going to implement those steps?

"I am going to keep Rick on. Again, train the new people. I think so many times we

get new programs going and we assume they are going to be doing what everybody else is doing. We have to be more thoughtful as to how we implement our staff development. Staff development is such a key. So, I am going to implement those steps by contracting with Rich to come a few days next year. To know he is available if I need him for more when I have new staff people. Trying and get some more staff. I need to clone my EC teacher.

Appendix L

Teacher Survey I Results

Teacher Survey Results – Welch Inclusion Model

1. I have received the training I need to successfully use co-teaching strategies and
   implement inclusion.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   75%   25%

2. I believe students with disabilities can receive an appropriate education in an inclusive
   regular education classroom.

a. Agree   B.Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

                      100%

3. I have seen evidence of improved academic outcomes for students with disabilities
   in inclusion.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   25%   75%

4. I have the necessary cooperation and assistance from educational support personnel to
   implement inclusion successfully.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   75%   25%

5. I find it difficult to modify my instructional strategies and my teaching style to meet
   the needs of students with disabilities.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

        100%

6. I have sufficient resources to implement inclusion effectively.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   E.Undecided

   25%   75%

7. I believe students without disabilities can receive an appropriately challenging
   education in an inclusive regular education classroom.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  25%   75%

8. I have had input in the development of an inclusive program at my school.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

                      75%   25%

9. I have the time to individualize instruction for students with disabilities.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  50%   50%

10. I believe that special educators working in inclusion generally take a subordinate role in the classroom.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  25%   50%   25%

11. I have found that inclusion has encouraged me to experiment with new teaching strategies.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

                      100%

12. I do not have enough time to communicate and collaborate with my co-teacher.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  75%   25%

13. I have the necessary cooperation and assistance from colleagues to implement inclusion successfully.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. undecided

  50%   50%

14. In the inclusion classroom, my co-teacher and I consistently work with all students including those with disabilities and those without disabilities.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

100%

15. The students with disabilities in my inclusion classroom work separately from their classmates without disabilities a majority of the time.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

           25%   75%

16. In my inclusion classroom, students with disabilities and students without disabilities receive equal access to the same general curriculum.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

100%

Appendix M

Teacher II Survey Results

Teacher Survey II Results---Welch Inclusion Model

1. My classroom is developmentally appropriately with adequate curriculum materials
   to teach within the inclusion model.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   75%   25%

2. The grouping of students into "pods," more commonly referred to as SILK grouping,
   is an effective strategy to teach various lessons within the model.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   75%   25%

3. The grouping of students into "pods" is vital for student engagement and participation
   during the course of the lesson.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   25%   75%

4. The grouping of students into "pods" provides for safe and meaningful movement of
   students during the course of the lesson.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

                                  100%

5. The grouping of students into "pods" presents an effective teaching and learning
   component because it allows students to positively interact with each other during
   the presentation of the lesson.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

                                  100%

6. The inclusion model allows for all students the opportunity for success especially
   in meeting the needs of our identified students.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

                                  100%

7. Each identified student within this model that has an Individual Education Plan
   is being followed during the presentation of each lesson.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   25%   75%

8. From my observations, this model is conducive to the academic growth of each
   identified student within this program.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   50%   50%

9. The modifications that are incorporated within each IEP of the identified students
   are being implemented everyday during the instructional process of each lesson.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   100%

10. The grouping of students into "pods" is vital to student success as it allows each
    student the opportunity to capitalize on his/her individual learning modality.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   75%   25%

11. The grouping of students into "pods" enhances the "integration" of subject matter by
    allowing students to process the material from their own learning style.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

                            75%   25%

12. The school system's pacing guides are aligned with the North Carolina's Standard
    Course of Study.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

    75%   25%

13. During our lessons, we follow the guidelines of the pacing guides as we move
    through lesson presentations.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

                           100%

14. This model gives us opportunities to assess students in various ways including the utilization of class projects, multiple-choice, oral responses, open-ended assessments, and, at times, computer assisted instruction.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided
  50%   50%

15. The grouping strategy of placing students into "pods" allows for a variety of student engagements including whole group, small group, peer paring, and individual responses.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  50%   50%

16. The grouping of students into "pods" creates an environment that is more conducive to student engagement of the lesson.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  75%   25%

17. All lessons that are taught within the inclusion model specifically address goals and Objectives that are aligned to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

                       100%

18. The non-traditional approach to teach various lessons within the model allows for a variety of instructional strategies that is conducive to a higher time on task and more freedom for student expression.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  50%   50%

19. The incorporation of a variety of instructional strategies coupled with the groupings of students into their preferred modality, decreases student disruptions and negative behaviors.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  50%   50%

20. The term inclusion allows for both regular education students and identified students to share the same learning environment. This allows all students to feel academically equal and is conducive to producing positive role models for students with behavior issues.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

100%

Appendix N

Results of Administrative Survey

Administrative Survey ---Welch Inclusion Model

1. The inclusion classroom is developmentally appropriate with adequate
   curriculum materials to teach the various learning modalities within the model.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   100%

2. The grouping of students into "pods" seems to be an effective instructional
   strategy that increases student participation and more time on task.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   50%   50%

3. As an administrator, I believe the grouping of students into "pods" is a key
   element in student comprehension and academic engagement

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   100%

4. The grouping of students into "pods" allows for safer and meaningful movement
   of students during the instructional process.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   100%

5. The grouping of students into "pods" presents an effective teaching and
   learning strategy because it allows students to positively interact with each
   other during the instructional process.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

   50%   50%

6. This inclusion model allows for all of our students the opportunity for success and
   especially in meeting the needs of our identified students.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

             50%   50%

7. As an administrator, I am sure Individual Education Plans for our special needs
   students are being followed within the model.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   50%   50%

8. From my observations, this model is conducive to the academic growth of each
   identified student within this inclusion model.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   50%   50%

9. From my observations of this inclusion program, the modifications of our special
   needs students are being incorporated and followed within this model.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   100%

10. The grouping of students into "pods" is vital to student success as it allows each
    student the opportunity to capitalize on his/her own learning modality.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   50%   50%

11. The grouping of students into "pods" enhances the integration of subject matter
    by allowing students to process information from their own learning styles.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   50%   50%

12. The school's pacing guides are aligned to the North Carolina Standard Course of
    study.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   50%   50%

13. As an administrator, I have observed the teachers in the inclusion program utilizing
    the pacing guides in the presenting of their lessons.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. undecided

   100%

14. In my observations of the inclusion model, I have observed our teachers evaluating

students from a variety of assessments including oral responses, group projects, open-ended questions, and, at times, computer assisted instruction.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  50%   50%

15. The grouping of students into "pods" allows for a variety of student engagements including whole group, small group, peer-tutoring, and individual responses.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  50%   50%

16. The grouping of students into "pods" creates an environment that is more conducive to student engagement of the lesson.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  50%   50%

17. All lessons that are taught within the inclusion model specifically address goals and objectives that are aligned to the North Carolina Standard Course of study.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  100%

18. The non-traditional approach to teaching lessons within the model allows for a variety of instructional strategies that are conducive to a higher time on task and more freedom for student expression.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  50%   50%

19. The incorporation of a variety of instructional strategies coupled with the grouping of students into their preferred modalities has decreased student disruptions and Less office referrals from this program.

a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree e. Undecided

  50%   50%

20. The term inclusion allows for both regular education students and identified students to share the same learning environment creating an atmosphere of academic equality and is presenting positive role models to students with behavior issues.

   a. Agree   b. Disagree   c. Strongly Agree   d. Strongly Disagree   e. Undecided

   50%   50%

Appendix O

Focus Group Interview Questions

Focus Group Questions

1. Do you feel the inclusion model is making an impact on your special needs children? If so, what evidence do you have that demonstrate your identified children are making progress.

2. As a school, what would you do to improve the impact of the model?

3. Do you feel this model is positively affecting your non-identified students? How do you know?

4. If you could make any changes within the model, what would it be and why?

5. What are your future goals for this program?

6. How well would you say that you monitor your inclusion model from both an administrative perspective as well as an inclusion team?

7. Is there anything else someone would like to share with the group?

Appendix P

Focus Group Interview Responses

Focus Group Questions and Answers

1. Do you feel the inclusion model is making an impact on your special needs children? If so, what evidence do you have that demonstrate your identified children are making progress?

"I'd say yes. I see a lot of students that are identified………..they don't like being pulled out….they don't like the stigmatism of being pulled out and I think they forget they are EC when they are in the inclusion setting and I think that causes them to push themselves a little more.

I see it also among our more severe students and they see it too. They have be on grade level in order to hang and I think that pushes them to stay on grade level.

We have a student who reads on first grade level. Other then hearing him read you would never know he was on first grade level. Not only does he rise up, but we see it in other students as well who are not identified who want to help him with his reading and they rise up to take on leadership positions.

We see him reading words that we were shocked to hear and we know its attributed to inclusion.

We see our EC growth from last year and we know it is because of inclusion.

We our students making individual goals and reach their objectives…..

As it pertains to test scores from last year, all of our students passed math and all but one passed reading.

2. As a school, what would you do to improve the impact of the model?

I think we identified what we need to do to improve performance. I think this comes from understanding the philosophy of inclusion and allowing teachers to have more involvement in the inclusion model… I also think we need Rick Welsh to come in and work with rising inclusion teachers that will be teaching the model. I think also we need him to teach this to all of our teachers…..kind of making them think outside the box strategies…..I think that is one step that we have made.

If we could dream it would be ideal to true inclusion to have all classes that are co-taught and have two teachers teaching the classroom the entire day.

I think it would go beyond EC and go into ESL and AIG as well. I think we see what is being done with our EC students and I think how this could be done to all of our children.

I think to make that you have to have more personnel. Increase the EC staff and maybe include the AIG as well.

I think one of the best things we can do is to continue education the staff on what is inclusion and what are we doing and how do we go about doing this on your own.

And to get rid of misconceptions. You still have a lot of that going around. It is getting better....it has come along way!

We hear some teachers saying things like........."Well, he's low so lets put him in the inclusion classroom....or.....he needs to be tested and its too late in the year so if we place him in the inclusion program so, if he qualifies, he will be already be in the inclusion class for next year.

And, sometimes its hard to implement the model because you don't have those different levels...........you don't have your higher kids to always act as role models.

Every year it is getting better and teachers who are placing kids in the inclusion model is getting better at placing them correctly.

3. Do you feel this model is positively affecting your non-identified students? How do you know?

Yes, definitely. We see our higher achieving students acting as tutors...peer coaches. We know that if they are able to teach someone else about something we learned in class, then we know that the ones who teach will retain 90% of what they learned and we know they got it.

Plus, we know having a co-teacher in the room, nonidentified students in the room helps them focus their attention better. Applying the learning styles....has helped us bring about better teaching approaches.

I think that is the beauty of the model.....we don't look at students as "he is identified" or" she is not identified" ....we teach to each student and that has allowed us to teach to each student and individualize everyone's education.

As an outsider coming in, I think you would have a hard time identifying our EC students....

We forget even....a lot of the modifications we use we do not just use for our identified students...we use them for everyone.

When we think about modifications, we think about our other students and begin saying.....well, this student needs help expressing himself and this modification will help him f....or she is a couple of grade levels below....kind of helps you think about all of your children and it just branches off after that.

4. If you could make any changes within the model, what would it be and why?

I think that the one thing we need is more time for more planning. Now, that helps us as friends here, but we do need more time to plan things. But, a change that we need to make is to allow more time.

We tried to schedule more planning……….like we will decide on a day and say that is sacred that is our time to plan and then something comes up……….so, time protected during the school day is gone.

5. What are your future goals for this program?

The philosophy……our goal is for the philosophy to be there……and we can't have tons and tons of EC teachers…its important that the philosophy carry over.

To keep it where it sustains itself….so, if we are not here anymore…..we share the same philosophy.

I would like to see the program spread. Even if we do not have a co-teacher in our room the philosophy is there and we understand that what one teaching strategy works for one student may not work for another one.

I would like to see this philosophy spread to other areas like ESL and AIG that my dream and would requiem more people and more money but I think that is a logical step too.

We would like to see support…now, we have building support but we do not have central support. We do not have any materials like we should have …....they should come in and see what we are doing…..that would be nice.

They give lip service…but that's where it ends.

If we leave, it will not sustain itself….there is not the upper level of support.

6. How well would you say that you monitor your inclusion model from both an administrative perspective as well as an inclusion team?

Conversation….we used to have team meetings but that was before we had Rick.

We know what is going on because of you (looking at the principal)….and we try to work with all levels (grades) and knows where everyone is on the curriculum without always having to meet with those teachers…though we do occasionally.

What is nice she has worked worth all of our kids……..she knows when they come to me in the 5th grade….she already knows the kids learning styles…..as well as the

parents of that child……

A couple of weeks ago…we used Angela's lessons and worked really well for kids……(used at several levels)

7. Is there anything else someone would like to share with the group?
   I think one thing is that we have modified Rick's model a little bit………..we have kind of made it fit to our styles………we have adapted it to fit our needs.

   We still recognize all the learning styles….but the philosophy is the same…...and their teams are still diversified…..which is the key…………you keep it heterogeneous

   With no other comments, being made and the time winding down…………the interview ended within the hour that was allotted for this element.

.

Appendix Q

Results of the Inclusion Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol

For the 4th Grade Inclusion Team

Condensed ratings of Form A and Form B of the Inclusion Team-Teaching

Analysis Protocol for 4th Grade Inclusion Team

Codes 1. Agree   2. Disagree   3. Strongly Agree   4. Strongly Disagree   5. Undecided

Or   1. Never   2. Rarely   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always

Statement	Semantic Scale	Ratings
1. My partner offers input to the teaching plan before the lesson.	Never..always	4
2. My suggestions/comments are accepted as valid.	Agree…Undec	3
3. My ideas are incorporated into the lesson.	Never…Always	4
4. I have access to all students in the classroom	Agree…Undec	3
5. I have access to all teaching facilities in the room	Agree…Undec	3
6. My partner and I present information to the class at the same time.	Never..always	3.5
7. My partner and I to present information in different ways.	Agree….Undec	3
8. My partner's management style is compatible with mine.	Agree…Undec	3
9. I can take the lead when I need the children's attention.	Never…Always	4.5
10. My partner and I can assume each other's roles spontaneously.	Never…Always	4.5
11. I feel free to speak at any time during the lesson.	Agree….Undec.	1
12. We discuss how our teaming succeeds/fails to meet student needs.	Never-Always 4.5	
13. My partner is aware of my actions and location during the lesson.	Never-Always	5
14. My partner and I talk to each other during the lesson.	Never…Always	4.5
15. I learn new skills from my partner.	Never…Always	5
16. My partner and I practice new skills when we are . together.	Never…Always	4.5
17. I feel comfortable working in a team-teaching environment.	Agree…Undec.	3
18. My partner and I accomplish more together than we could alone.	Agree…Undec.	3
19. My primary role is to help students experience success.	Agree….Undec	3
20. I have an equal share of the teaching when in my partner's class.	Never…Aalways	4

Appendix R

Results of the Inclusion Team-Teaching Analysis Protocol

For the 5th Grade Inclusion Team

Condensed ratings of Form A and Form B of the Inclusion Team-Teaching

Analysis Protocol for 5th Grade Inclusion Team.

Codes 1. Agree   2. Disagree 3. Strongly Agree   4. Strongly Disagree   5. Undecided

Or   1. Never   2. Rarely   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always

Statement	**Semantic Scale**	**Ratings**
1. My partner offers input to the teaching plan before the lessons.	Never..always	5
2. My suggestions/comments are accepted as valid.	Agree…Undec	3
3. My ideas are incorporated into the lesson.	Never…Always	5
4. I have access to all students in the classroom	Agree…Undec	3
5. I have access to all teaching facilities in the room	Agree…Undec	1
6. My partner and I present information to the class at the same time.	Never..always	4.5
7. My partner and I to present information in different ways.	Agree….Undec	1
8. My partner's management style is compatible with mine.	Agree…Undec	3
9. I can take the lead when I need the children's attention.	Never…Always	3
10. My partner and I can assume each other's roles spontaneously.	Never…Always	5
11. I feel free to speak at any time during the lesson.	Agree….Undec.	3
12. We discuss how our teaming succeeds/fails to meet student needs.	Never-Always	5
13. My partner is aware of my actions and location during the lesson.	Never-Always	5
14. My partner and I talk to each other during the lesson.	Never…Always	5
15. I learn new skills from my partner.	Never…Always	5
16. My partner and I practice new skills when we are together.	Never…Always	4.5
17. I feel comfortable working in a team-teaching environment.	Agree…Undec.	3
18. My partner and I accomplish more together than we could alone.	Agree…Undec.	3
19. My primary role is to help students experience success.	Agree….Undec	3
20. I have an equal share of the teaching when in my partner's class.	Never…Always	4.5