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### Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Schumm, J., & Vaughn, S. (1992) | To examine the general educator’s perception of planning for students with disabilities in the general education environment. | Methodology: Survey and interviews. Descriptive analysis including overall means and standard deviations were conducted. Sample: 775 general educators from 39 schools in a large southeastern school district. | • Teachers spend a mean of 7.03 hours planning for general education students and 1.29 hours for students with disabilities.  
• Teachers were positive about attending workshops to learn strategies for working with students with disabilities ($M = 1.80$), but they were not positive about making daily accommodations and modifications ($M = 1.96$).  
• Teachers identified special educators as facilitators ($M = 3.49$).  
• Teachers used information more readily from other teachers and the student ($M = 2.21$) than from the IEP and other agencies ($M = 2.95$).  
• Teachers used interactive planning ($M = 2.08$) more often than daily and long range planning for students with learning disabilities ($M = 2.62$). |
| Vaughn, S., & Schumm, J. (1994) | To investigate the preplanning, interactive planning, and postplanning of general educators for students with LD. | Methodology: Interviews, classroom observations, think alouds, teachers’ planning, videotaped teaching episodes, stimulated recalls, rating scales, and open-ended questions. Data was reduced and analyzed using microlevel and macrolevel analysis. Sample: 3 general educators at the middle school level. | • Results revealed that there were three guiding principles that form the framework for planning: content versus knowledge acquisition, classroom management and student interest, and planning for students as a whole.  
• Teachers felt it was necessary to cover certain objectives during a specific time frame, maintaining a peaceful classroom. They seemed less concerned about what students learned or whether they learned at all.  
• Teachers planned activities that maintained a peaceful classroom but also kept students engaged.  
• Teachers planned for the class as a whole. They did not address the needs of specific students. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Schumm, J., Vaughn, S., Haager, D., McDowell, J., Rothlein, L., & Saumell, L. (1995) | To study general educators’ planning for content area instruction for students with LD.                                                  | Methodology: Interviews, classroom observations, teacher reflections, and surveys. Data was reduced and analyzed using microlevel and macrolevel analysis. Sample: 12 teachers (4 elementary, 4 middle, and 4 high school). | • Preplanning – Elementary teachers planned for the individual needs of students. Secondary teachers planned for the whole group. Students with disabilities were expected to be responsible for the same content as their nondisabled peers. Teachers structured their classrooms to ensure high levels of peer acceptance for all students. Special and general educators did not collaborate as they should to meet the needs of students with disabilities.  
• Interactive Planning – Teachers checked on students with LD to ensure that they are on task. They monitored for understanding on a less frequent basis.  
• Postplanning – Teachers postplanned based on the performance of the class as a whole. |
| Schumm, J. & Vaughn, S. (1991)                                            | To determine teachers’ perceptions of the desirability and feasibility of making adaptations for students with disabilities in general education classrooms. | Methodology: Adaptation Evaluation Instrument designed by the authors and focus group interviews. Both the mean and mode of desirability and feasibility ratings were found for each item. The Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was used to compare the difference of desirability and feasibility ratings. A Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis was also used for each item to compare the desirability and feasibility of adaptations among elementary, middle, and high school teachers. Sample: 25 elementary, 23 middle school, and 45 high school teachers from a metropolitan school district. | • Adaptations considered most feasible included establish appropriate routine, provide reinforcement and encouragement, establish personal relationships, establish expectations, and involve students with disabilities in whole class activities.  
• Middle school teachers found it less desirable than high school teachers to communicate with special educators and establish expectations for students with disabilities in the general education setting. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellet (1993)</td>
<td>To examine the instructional practices teachers were willing to use to meet the needs of students with disabilities in general education classrooms.</td>
<td>Methodology: Survey created by the researcher, which addressed background information, identified the greatest needs of students in the general education classroom, and identified instructional strategies general educators were willing to utilize in their classroom to meet the needs of students with LD. Descriptive analysis including overall means and standard deviations were conducted. Sample: 89 teachers in the Poway Unified Schools District in San Diego County.</td>
<td>• Teachers considered student study skills to be the most important predictor for classroom success. • The ten highest ranking strategies for general educators to use in their classrooms were those that focused on direct interventions with students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classroom Management**

<p>| Smith, D. (1983) | To examine the classroom management approaches of general educators and LD resource teachers. | Methodology: Survey created by the researcher, the Classroom Management Questionnaire (CMQ), which assessed the style of socialization of the individual teaching. An ANOVA was conducted to investigate differences among the subscales. Sample: 158 general educators and 32 LD resource teachers. | • An ANOVA revealed significant differences on the full scale of the CMQ with $F(1, 156) = 5.27, p &lt; .02$; the dependent subscale, $F(1, 156) = 3.87, p &lt; .05$; and the female subscale with $F(1, 156) = 5.25, p &lt; .02$. • LD resource teachers selected significantly more inductive responses than general educators. • 78 of the 158 teachers were involved in graduate training. An ANOVA revealed significant differences on the full scale with $F (2, 75) = 3.40, p &lt; .04$; the dependent subscale with $F (2, 75) = 3.62, p &lt; .03$; and the female subscale with $F (2, 75) = 5.18, p &lt; .008$. The Scheffe procedure, a post hoc analysis, revealed that teachers that received graduate training in LD chose significantly more inductive responses than the others. • Female teachers selected inductive responses more significantly ($p &lt; .05$) than male teachers. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D, &amp; Hamlett, C. (1989)</td>
<td>To investigate the importance of curriculum-based measurement (CBM) in planning effective instructional programs for students with learning disabilities.</td>
<td>Methodology: Teachers implemented CBM or control treatment for a 15-week period. After completion, student graphs portraying their progress on curriculum-based measures were inspected to divide students into the following groups: CBM with measurement only (M-ONLY), CBM with measurement and evaluation (M + E), and control. Sample: 53 students with disabilities (41 classified as LD and 12 as ED) and 29 special educators.</td>
<td>• The results of the one-way ANOVA revealed no significant difference for total number of years teaching or number of years of special education experience. • A chi-square test revealed a statistically significant relationship between previous CBM experience and the implementation group, $X^2 (1, N = 4.07, p &lt; .05)$. • One-way ANOVAs conducted on students age, grade, placement, reading performance level, and years in special education revealed no significant differences. • Analysis of achievement data for the RECALL pre-test revealed means of $M = 6.80$ for the M-ONLY group, $M = 9.65$ for the M + E group, and $M = 10.35$ for the control group. An ANOVA, however, revealed no significant differences. • An ANCOVA conducted using post-treatment RC scores and RECALL as the covariate revealed a significant effect, $F (2, 49) = 4.70, p &lt; .05$. • Follow-up tests to the regressed adjusted scores revealed that the achievement of the M + E group was greater than that of the control group, $F = 15.11, p &lt; .001$ with an effect magnitude of .72. • The achievement of the M-ONLY group was not significantly different than the control group. • A slope was calculated using a least-squares regression equation for data in the two CBM implementation groups. The slope represented gains on curriculum-based assessments. The ANOVA conducted on the slope produced statistically significant value, $F (1, 34) = 3.98, p &lt; .05$. The slope for the M + E group exceeded the M-ONLY group with an effect magnitude of .86.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/Year</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Methodology/Sample</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deno, S, Fuchs, L., Marston, D., &amp; Shin, J. (2001)</td>
<td>To show how CBM can be used as a form of progress monitoring and also to establish academic growth standards for students with LD.</td>
<td><strong>First approach</strong>&lt;br&gt;Methodology:&lt;br&gt;The analysis of student scores representing the number of words read aloud correctly in one minute. Using median scores, the growth rates for the students were determined through a regression line fitted to each student’s CBM scores using the Ordinary Least Squares method. Beta levels were then used to compute the weekly increase in the numbers of words read correctly across students within each grade level and with the two program types.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Sample:&lt;br&gt;Students with and without disabilities from grade levels 1 through 6 from four local education agencies: urban north (N = 249), urban south (N = 728), rural midwest (N = 1742), and mid-size west (N = 280).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Second Approach</strong>&lt;br&gt;Methodology:&lt;br&gt;Examined the research literature that met the following criteria: (a) incorporated a 10-week reading treatment, (b) reported pre- and post-treatment data using a CBM measurement, (c) reported outcomes for both students with and without disabilities, (d) included a control or contrast group, and (e) documented statistically significant improvements for one experimental treatment.</td>
<td><strong>First approach</strong>&lt;br&gt;- In first grade, the greatest differences in the rate of growth or slope existed between students without disabilities (M = 1.80, SE = .15) and students with disabilities (M = .83, SE = .15).&lt;br&gt;- Differences decreased progressively in grades 2, 3, and 4, but in grades 5 and 6 growth rates were nearly identical.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Second approach</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Students with LD made weekly gains from .56 to 2.10 words, with a weighted mean gain of 1.39 words per week, which is twice that made by students with LD in the normative CBM growth rates with typical practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/Year</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Methodology/Sample</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Menlove, R. (1999)      | To study IEP team member satisfaction with the IEP development process.                           | Methodology: IEP Team Member Satisfaction Survey created by the author with follow-up exploration utilizing IEP team member focus groups. Analyses were also conducted to investigate the relationship between perceived importance and satisfaction by calculating means for responses and then applying the Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient $r$. Sample: Participants included students with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, special educators, regular educators, LEA/building administrators, special education professional staff, students services personnel, and transition services/agency representatives from 13 school districts in Utah. | • 98.2% of special educators found it important to understand the purpose of the IEP meeting, and 96.2% were satisfied with it. 76.2% of regular educators found it important to understand the purpose, and 66.7% were satisfied with it.  
• 98.7% of special educators rated it important to feel prepared in their IEP meeting role compared to 74.6% of general educators. A larger difference was found in the satisfaction of feeling prepared to carry out IEP meeting roles, with 91.9% of special educators, and 61.1% of general educators marking high ratings.  
• 96.2% of special educators perceived the value of their input by other team members as important, reporting high levels of satisfaction (93.8%), also. However, 72.2% of special educators perceived the value of their input by other team members as important, and only 65.1% reported high levels of satisfaction.  
• 96.9% of special educators felt that the decision-making process of the IEP meeting was important compared to 74.6% of general educators. Satisfaction ratings of the decision-making process were also higher for special educators (82.5%) than the general educators (58.7%).  
• Importance and satisfaction that IEPs enhance student learning did not differ between the two groups as much as previous items.  
• Correlation coefficients revealed that there was a stronger relationship between the importance and satisfaction of IEP factors for general educators than for special educators. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pugach, M. (1982)</td>
<td>To investigate the general educator’s involvement in the development and utilization of IEPs.</td>
<td>Methodology: Survey was used to collect data, and analysis involved descriptive statistics and correlations. Sample: 33 elementary general educators from a Midwestern school district.</td>
<td>• Involvement in IEP development usually involved conferring with the special educator (M = 4.45, SD = .83) and by providing current levels of students performance (M = 3.36, SD = 1.03). • The least involvement in the IEP process involved filling out forms about the student’s educational program (M = 2.84, SD = 1.82). • General educators seldom used IEPs for planning and monitoring. They did review them prior to annual reviews (M = 2.39, SD = 1.58) and prior to generating new instructional objectives (M = 2.03, SD = 1.38). • Only half the teachers went to their students most recent IEP meetings (52%). • 67% of the teachers reported that the goals on the IEPs were not written for participation in general education environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevin, A, Semmel, M., &amp; McCann, S. (1983)</td>
<td>To investigate the general educator’s role in the implementation of the IEP.</td>
<td>Methodology: Review of students records, a teacher survey, and follow-up teacher interviews. Results of the survey were reported through descriptive statistics. Sample: 245 IEPs reviewed for content analysis; 100 IEPs reviewed to identify service providers, including regular educators; 59 general educators surveyed; 16 of the 59 general educators also participated in direct observations/interviews.</td>
<td>• 24% of the modifications done within the general education classroom were not ones listed on the IEP. • IEPs were rarely used by general educators; but if they had a copy in their room, they were more likely to use it. • Although general educators were not involved in the IEP developmental process, they were actively involved in the education of students with disabilities included in their classroom setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/Year</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Methodology/Sample</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| McIntosh, R,     | To examine the instructional practices used with students with LD by general educators, the behaviors of general educators towards students | Methodology: Observations using the Classroom Climate Scale created by the researchers. Sample: 60 general educators and 60 students with LD across 10 elementary, 5 middle, and 3 high schools in a large southeastern school district.                                                                                                 | • The first component, teacher-initiated behavior, revealed only a few significant items at the .01 level. Teachers made more negative comments to students without LD (M = 1.56, SD = .66) than students with LD (M = 1.18, SD = .68). Teachers monitored the ongoing performance of students without LD (M = 3.70, SD = 1.31) more than students with LD (M = 3.47, SD = 1.49), and lastly, teachers used praise more frequently with students without LD (M = 3.20, SD = 1.22) than students with LD (M = 3.02, SD = 1.32).  
• Results of the second component, student-initiated behavior, revealed several significant differences at the .001 level. Students without LD (M = 2.70, SD = 1.19) asked for help from the teacher more than students with LD (M = 1.93, SD = 1.30). In addition, students without LD (M = 3.30, SD = 1.35) volunteered to answer questions more often than students with LD (M = 2.09, SD = 1.23). Students with LD (M = 1.87, \( SD = 1.32 \)) however, interfered with the work or activity of other students less often than students without LD (M = 2.45, SD = 1.38). Other significant differences were also found at the .01 level such as students with LD (M = 1.28, SD = 0.72) made less negative comments than students without LD (M = 1.72, SD = 1.18) even though the frustration level of both students appeared to be the same.  
• Results of the third component, student-teacher participation and interaction, found that students with LD (M = 3.68, SD = 1.54) participated significantly less often than students without LD (M = 4.20, SD = 0.92) in teacher-directed activities at a .01 significance probability. |
<p>| Vaughn, S.,      |                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Schumm, J.,      |                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Haager, D.,      |                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Methodology/Sample</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Olson, M., Chalmers, L., &  | To investigate the attitudes and attributes of general educators working with students with disabilities in inclusive instructional settings.                                                          | Methodology: Interviews and follow-up questionnaires.  
Sample: 10 general educators from elementary and secondary schools in the Grand Forks metropolitan area and surrounding rural districts identified by principals and special educators as effective inclusionists. | The following seven themes emerged from the data. The teachers (a) described their personalities as tolerant, reflective, and flexible; (b) accepted responsibility for all students; (c) described a positive working relationship with special education; (d) reported adjusting expectations for integrated students; (e) indicated that their primary inclusionary attitude was showing interpersonal warmth and acceptance in their interactions with students, (f) felt that there was insufficient time available for collaboration; and (g) expressed reservations about fully including all students. |
Appendix C

Research Proposal

A. Identification of the problem

The term learning disabilities (LD) was used for the first time in 1963 by Samuel Kirk (Houck, 1984; Kirk, 1981). The Children with Learning Disabilities Act (PL 91-230) passed in 1969 initiated the acceptance of this category of exceptional learners (Kirk, 1981; Kirk & Chalfant, 1984) and laid the groundwork for the inclusion of the category in the landmark legislation, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) in 1975, which was renamed to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1990.

The ultimate goal of EAHCA/IDEA is to ensure that all students with disabilities are provided a free appropriate public education (FAPE). Specifically, the purpose outlined by the 1997 Amendments of IDEA is to “ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for employment and independent living” (20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1)(A)), as well as “to assess, and ensure the effectiveness, efforts to educate children with disabilities” (20 U.S.C § 1400(d)(4)).

FAPE is ensured for students with disabilities through “special education and related services that (A) have been provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge; (B) meet the standards of the state educational agency; (C) include an appropriate preschool, elementary, or secondary school education in the State involved; and (D) are provided in conformity with the individualized education program required under [this Act]” (20 U.S.C. § 1401(8)). Special education is defined as “specifically designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability” (20 U.S.C. § 1401(25)). FAPE has been further explained as “instruction reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit, developed in a manner procedurally consistent with the law, and designed for the unique educational needs of the child” (Crockett & Kauffman, 1999, p. 95).

Another major provision of the EAHCA/IDEA that affected the education of students with LD was the least restrictive environment (LRE) mandate. Turnbull, Turnbull, Shank, and Leal (1995) defined this term as “a rule requiring schools to educate students with disabilities with nondisabled students to the maximum extent appropriate for students with disabilities” (p. 53). This mandate was further emphasized by Madeline Will, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education, in a controversial keynote address at the Wingspread Conference on “The Education of Special Needs Students: Research Findings and Implications for Policy and Practice” held in Racine, Wisconsin in 1985. Will stated that the current educational “pull-out” approach used with students with disabilities was not effective. She claimed that the needs of these students could be better met if they were in the general education environment.

Today students with LD continue to comprise the most prevalent disability among students age 6 through age 21. In 1998–99, 5,683,707 students with disabilities were served under Part B of IDEA. Of these, 2,871,966 (50.5%) were identified as having learning disabilities. Additionally, the majority of these students received most of their education in the general education environment (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

Therefore, with the influx of students with disabilities served in the general education environment for most of their instruction, there is a greater demand for the general educator to possess the knowledge and skills to provide a dynamic learning environment to a very diverse
group of students (Christenson, Ysseldyke, & Thurlow, 1989; deBettencourt, 1999). This challenge is even more complex with the push of standards-based reform and educational accountability.

High quality academic standards and systems that support such standards are currently the focus of education (McDonnell et al., 1997; Nolet & Mclaughlin, 2000). Recent federal legislation has supported standards-based reform and the inclusion of students with disabilities in such initiatives. Thus, students with LD must be exposed to high quality instruction and expectations in order to have the opportunity to address the same state standards as students without disabilities. Both general and special educators are now pressured to change their instructional practices and other aspects of the educational process to meet the needs of students with disabilities under such conditions (McDonnell, et al., 1997).

Therefore, along with FAPE and the LRE, validated instructional practices that make it possible to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities and provide them with the opportunities to meet high quality academic standards are necessary. “This trio of FAPE, LRE, and validated practices has been called by some ‘the holy trinity’ of special education law” (Crockett & Kauffman, 1999, p. ix). As more students with disabilities return to general education classrooms, it is important that general and special educators use teaching practices that will provide students the opportunities to access the general curriculum to the maximum extent appropriate while ensuring that these students also receive FAPE.

B. Statement of the study’s purpose and the hypotheses to be tested

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore the teaching practices of special and general educators working in inclusive instructional settings at the middle school level with students with LD in order to examine how they are aligning their practices to ensure FAPE for these students. Duke (1987) suggested in reference to his “vision of teaching excellence” (p.67) that teacher skill and judgment in six key teaching situations are necessary for student success. Therefore, this study will investigate teaching practices utilized by both general and special educators in the planning, instruction, classroom management, progress monitoring, clinical assistance, and caring for students with LD in inclusive instructional settings at the middle school level.

Research Questions

The overall research question that will be explored is this: How do teachers working in inclusive instructional settings with students with LD characterize their teaching practices? Supporting questions include: (a) How do special educators describe their teaching practices? (b) How do general educators describe their teaching practices? and (c) How do the teaching practices of general and special educators compare in inclusive instructional settings?

C. Description of related studies

A review of the research literature related to the teaching practices of special and general educators working in inclusive instructional settings resulted in findings that focused specifically on planning (Schumm et al., 1995; Schumm & Vaughn, 1992; Vaughn & Schumm, 1994), instruction (Ellet, 1993; Schumm and Vaughn, 1991), classroom management (Smith, 1983), progress monitoring (Deno, Fuchs, Marston, & Shin, 2001; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Hamlett, 1989), clinical assistance (Menlove, 1999; Nevin, Semmel, & McCann, 1983; Pugach, 1982), and caregiving (McIntosh et al., 1993; Olson, Chalmers, & Hoover, 1997). However, none of these research studies looked comprehensively at all of the above instructional elements, which
according to Duke (1987) comprise a vision of teaching excellence. Most of the research studies investigated the perceptions and willingness of general educators to do what is necessary to meet the needs of students with LD in inclusive instructional settings. They excluded special educators as participants in their studies and, therefore, excluded their involvement in the inclusion model.

D. Description of the methodology & data analysis techniques

The qualitative methodology used in this study will be self-contained focus groups. Data collection procedures will consist of 3 focus groups of regular educators and 3 focus groups of special educators, with an ideal group size of 5 to 6 participants. Duke’s six teaching situations will guide the questions asked of participants during the focus groups. Prior to the start of each focus group, participants will complete as a group a 5-item questionnaire, consisting of questions dealing with the critical components of special education. In addition, at the conclusion of each focus group the participants will identify key concepts during their discussion with the assistant facilitator.

I hope to complete focus groups after school hours, as well as during the afternoon on early release days, allowing teachers to obtain professional development hours for participating in the focus groups. Each focus group and the final panel discussion should take approximately 1-1/2 hours to complete.
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SUBJECT: Expedited Approval – "Exploring the Teaching Practices of Educators Working in Inclusive Instructional Settings with Students with Learning Disabilities" – IRB # 03-031

This memo is regarding the above-mentioned protocol. The proposed research is eligible for expedited review according to the specifications authorized by 45 CFR 46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110. As Chair of the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board, I have granted approval to the study for a period of 12 months, effective January 27, 2003.

Approval of your research by the IRB provides the appropriate review as required by federal and state laws regarding human subject research. It is your responsibility to report to the IRB any adverse reactions that can be attributed to this study.

To continue the project past the 12 month approval period, a continuing review application must be submitted (30) days prior to the anniversary of the original approval date and a summary of the project to date must be provided. My office will send you a reminder of this (60) days prior to the anniversary date.

✓ cc: File

A Land-Grant University—The Commonwealth Is Our Campus
An Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Institution
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January 3, 2003

Dear ______________________,

As part of my dissertation work at Virginia Tech this year, I will be exploring the teaching practices of general and special educators working in inclusive instructional settings with students with learning disabilities (LD) at the middle school level in order to examine how they are aligning their teaching practices to ensure a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for these students. This will be done through qualitative methodology using focus groups, consisting of special and general educators. Focus groups and the final panel discussion will take place after school hours, and teachers will obtain professional development hours for participating in them.

Participation of general and special educators in this study is voluntary. It has been reviewed and approved by Research, Testing, and Statistics. I would appreciate your support in encouraging teachers to attend focus group sessions if selected for the study. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

Roni Myers-Daub
XXX-XXXX
e-mail: _______________________

XXX XXXXXXXXX
Senior Coordinator, Middle Schools
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January 3, 2002

Dear____________________,

As part of my dissertation work at Virginia Tech this year, I will be exploring the teaching practices of general and special educators working in inclusive instructional settings with students with learning disabilities (LD) at the middle school level to examine how they are aligning their practices to ensure a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for these students. Data for this study will be collected through focus groups, consisting of either special or general educators.

You have been selected to participate in a general/special educator focus group. As an educator currently working in an inclusive instructional setting, your participation in this study will provide pertinent information on the current teaching practices of general and special educators working in this model, as well as insight on what can be done to improve such practices so that the district can ensure that these students are receiving FAPE.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

Roni Myers - Daub, Researcher

XXX-XXXX        Senior Coordinator, Middle Schools
e-mail: _________________________

---

Name______________________________________

Yes. I am interested in participating in this study.

No. I am not interested in participating in this study.

Please place the bottom portion of this letter in the pony addressed to:
Roni Myers-Daub
XXXXXX High School
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_______________, 2002

Dear ________________.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. Below you will find the date, time, and location of your assigned focus group. In addition, you will find a graphic organizer enclosed with this letter, which will allow you to write down notes under the six domains that will be covered during the focus group session.

Date: ______________________________

Time: ______________________________

Location: _____________________________

I look forward to seeing you.

Thanks again,

Roni Myers-Daub
XXX-XXXX
e-mail: ________

enclosure:
graphic organizer
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Questions for General Educators Focus Groups

Planning

- How do you plan for instruction in the inclusive instructional setting?
  How do you communicate with the collaborative special educator about planning?
- How do you plan for the diverse student abilities found in the inclusive instructional setting?
- How do you plan for the unique needs of students with LD in the inclusive instructional setting?

Instruction

- What types of instructional techniques do you use in the inclusive instructional setting that engage all students in learning?
- How does your instruction demonstrate both flexibility and responsiveness to student needs?
  How do you differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students with LD in the inclusive instructional setting?
- How are the accommodations and modifications needed by students with LD accomplished in the inclusive instructional setting?
  How are you informed of the accommodations and modifications needed by students with LD?
  How are you responsible for these?
- What instructional strategies are taught to students with LD to help promote their success in the general education classrooms?

Classroom Management

- How do you organize and manage the inclusive instructional setting so that all students can be successful?
  What routines have you established which help students with LD understand expectations of the general education setting?
- How do you manage the necessary resources needed to meet the needs of all students?

Progress Monitoring

- How do you monitor the progress of students with LD?
- How are the results from monitoring student progress used within the inclusive instructional setting?
  How are results used to modify instructional activities?
Clinical Assistance

- What is your involvement in the development and implementation of the IEPs of students with LD?
  How do IEP objectives coordinate with the expectations of the general education curriculum?
- How are the needs outlined in the IEPs of students with LD met within the inclusive instructional setting?
  How do you work with the collaborative special educator to ensure that these needs are met on a daily basis?

Caring

- How do you create an environment of respect and rapport in the inclusive instructional settings?
  How do you provide reinforcement and encouragement to students with LD?
- How do you show respect for student differences and encourage students to do so as well?
  How do you demonstrate acceptance in your interactions with students with LD?
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Questions for Special Educators Focus Groups

Planning

- How do you plan for instruction in the inclusive instructional setting?
  How do you communicate with the collaborative general educator about planning?
- How do you plan for the diverse student abilities found in the inclusive instructional setting?
- How do you plan for the unique needs of students with LD in the inclusive instructional setting?

Instruction

- What types of instructional techniques are used in the inclusive instructional setting that engage students with LD in learning?
- How do you participate in the daily instruction of the inclusive instructional setting?
- How does instruction demonstrate both flexibility and responsiveness to student needs?
  How do you differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students with LD in the inclusive instructional setting?
- How are the accommodations and modifications needed by students with LD accomplished in the inclusive instructional setting?
  How do you inform general educators about accommodations and modifications needed by students with LD?
- What instructional strategies are taught to students with LD to help promote their success in the general education classrooms?

Classroom Management

- How do you organize and manage the inclusive instructional setting so that all students can be successful?
  What routines have you established which help students with LD understand expectations of the general education setting?
- How do you manage the necessary resources needed to meet the needs of all students?

Progress Monitoring

- How do you monitor the progress of students with LD?
- How are the results from monitoring student progress used within the inclusive instructional setting?
  How are results used to modify instructional activities?
Clinical Assistance

• What do you involve general educators in the development and implementation of the IEPs of students with LD?
  How do IEP objectives coordinate with the expectations of the regular education curriculum?
• How are the needs outlined in the IEPs of students with LD met within the inclusive instructional setting?
  How do you work with the collaborative general educator to ensure that these needs are met on a daily basis?

Caring

• How do you create an environment of respect and rapport in the inclusive instructional settings?
  How do you provide reinforcement and encouragement to students with LD?
• How do you show respect for student differences and encourage students to do so as well?
  How do you help students with LD feel accepted in the general education environment?
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Critical Components of Special Education Questionnaire

Please indicate whether the group consists of general or special educators by checking the appropriate box:

- general educators
- special educators

Please answer the following questions.

1. What is the purpose of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)?

2. What is the definition of special education?

3. What is the purpose of an individualized education program (IEP)?

4. What is meant by a free appropriate public education (FAPE)?

5. What is the intent of the least restrictive environment (LRE) requirements?
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Demographic information of people participating in the focus group

1. Gender
   Male
   Female

2. Race
   White
   Black
   American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut
   Asian or Pacific Islander
   Other

3. Years Teaching Experience
   0 – 3
   4 – 7
   8 – 12
   13 – 15
   more than 15

4. Years Teaching Experience in Inclusion Model
   0 – 3
   4 – 7
   8 – 10
   more than 10

5. Area Currently Teaching
   Special Education
   General Education (please list specific area ________________)

6. Type of Teaching Certificate
   Provisional (coursework or examination necessary for full endorsement)
   Bachelors Degree
   Masters Degree
   Masters + 30 additional hours
   Ed.D/Ph.D

7. Area of Endorsement on Teaching License
   General Education
     Elementary
     Middle (6-8)
     Secondary (9-12)
   Special Education (please list specific endorsement area(s))

   Other (please list specific endorsement area(s))
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VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent for Participants of Research Projects

Title: Exploring the Teaching Practices of Educators Working in Inclusive Instructional Settings with Students with learning Disabilities

Investigators: Roni Myers-Daub, Jean Crockett and Travis Twiford (faculty advisors)

I. The Purpose of this Research Project

The purpose of this research project is to explore the teaching practices of special and general educators in the planning, instruction, classroom management, progress monitoring, clinical assistance and caring of students with LD working in inclusive instructional settings in order to examine how they are aligning their practices to ensure a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) for these students. Representatives from each of the eight middle schools of the district will be involved, resulting in three regular educator focus groups and three special educator focus groups.

II. Procedures

The procedures for this study include focus group sessions and a final panel discussion to examine how the practices of general and special educators are similar and different in inclusive instructional settings. You were randomly selected to participate in this study based on your current teaching position in an inclusive instructional setting. Focus group sessions will take approximately two hours. Focus group sessions will be tape-recorded as back up. The participants will identify key points during the focus group with help from the assistant moderator at the end of the session.

You will be asked to complete a short questionnaire on the critical components of special education as a group at the beginning of the focus group. This information will only being used to gather knowledge of participants in the field of special education

III. Risks

There are no risks to you as a participant in this study. The only potential discomfort is sharing of personal experiences obtained from working in inclusive instructional settings with educators from middle schools within the district in which you work.
IV. Benefits of this Project

The benefits of this study include an understanding of the current practices used by general and special educators in inclusive instructional settings with students with LD in order to examine how they are aligning their practices to ensure a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) for these students. This study may lead to recommendations formulated during the final panel discussion that may improve the education of students with LD in inclusive instructional settings.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality

Your identity as a participant in this study will be confidential. School and participant names will not be used during the study.

Audiotapes of focus groups will be made. They will remain in the possession of the researcher and not shared with the district.

VI. Compensation

You will not receive any monetary compensation for participating in this study.

VII. Freedom to Withdraw

You are free to withdraw from this study at anytime. You do not have to participate in the group completion of the questionnaire on critical components of special education. You do not have to answer questions during the focus group that you do not wish to answer.

VIII. Approval of Research

This study has been approved by the school district’s Department of Research, Testing, and Statistics. It has also been approved by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies.

IX. Participant’s Responsibilities

As a participant in this study, I voluntarily agree to the following responsibilities:

- to participate in tape-recorded focus group
- to participate in the group completion of the questionnaire on critical components of special education
X. **Participant’s Permission**

I have read the Informed Consent and understand the conditions of this study. All my questions have been addressed. I acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for participation in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Should I have any pertinent questions about this research or its conduct, and research subjects’ rights, and whom to contact in the event of a research-related injury to the subject, I may contact:

- **Roni Myers-Daub** (757) 451 – 4110 / romyers@vt.edu
- **Dr. Jean B. Crockett** (540) 231 – 4546 / crocketj@vt.edu
- **Dr. Travis W. Twiford** (540) 552 – 1880 / twiford@vt.edu
- **David M. Moore** (540) 231 – 4991 / moored@vt.edu

Chair, IRB  
Office of Research Compliance  
Research & Graduate Studies
### Appendix N

Critical Components of Special Education Matrix – General Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. What is the purpose of the IDEA?</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of IDEA is to ensure that persons with disabilities are afforded the same or nearly the same opportunities in education, workplace, and public facilities.</td>
<td>To afford students with disabilities individualized programs to meet the educational needs in the least restrictive environment.</td>
<td>For students to be included into regular education where their needs are met in the least restrictive environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What is the definition of special education?</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special education is the service provided to students found eligible for that service. Students who qualify for special education may have a learning disability, a health condition, a permanent mental impairment, or may have an emotional condition.</td>
<td>An education that is differentiated but equal.</td>
<td>A program for students who have been identified with specific educational needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. What is the purpose of an IEP?</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of an IEP is to make sure that a child who qualifies for an IEP has the accommodations needed to allow him/her an opportunity for success in school.</td>
<td>To ensure that all people are aware of a student’s needs and accommodations. The purpose is to identify and monitor goals.</td>
<td>To ensure that the specific needs are identified, agreed upon, and met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. What is meant by FAPE?</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAPE means that or spells out what is necessary for each student to have an educational experience that suits, or is proper, for that student to have.</td>
<td>Education that is accommodating to children with special needs. To ensure that the educational process is paid for by tax dollars.</td>
<td>No matter what the needs of the child, the child will be provided with a free and appropriate education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. What is the intent of LRE requirements?</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The intent of this language is to provide a student who qualifies for special education services with learning situation that does not impact or place</td>
<td>The extent of the LRE is for socialization and to prohibit stereotyping and labeling.</td>
<td>Child will be able to get the same education as regular education students in the same setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limitations on the best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning situation for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that student. It assists in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensuring that a child is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not limited to certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Critical Components of Special Education Matrix – Special Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the purpose of the IDEA?</td>
<td>IDEA was developed to ensure that individuals with disabilities have equal access to the same programs that others have and to provide them the necessary accommodations, modifications, and supports needed for them to benefit from access to these programs.</td>
<td>To provide services to students with disabilities in the LRE and give parents the opportunity to be involved in the planning and implementation of these services.</td>
<td>To ensure that students with disabilities are provided a free and appropriate education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the definition of special education?</td>
<td>Special education is an educational program that provides a cascade of services to assist students with disabilities to participate to the greatest extent possible in mainstream educational settings. It, also, assists in the identification and educational planning for these students.</td>
<td>To meet the needs of students with disabilities.</td>
<td>Specialized instruction for students with disabilities in need of special services in the specific area of their disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the purpose of an IEP?</td>
<td>An IEP is a legal document that identifies a special education student’s present level of performance, the extent to which the disability impacts the student’s ability to participate in the regular education environment, and the strategies, accommodations, services, and modifications to be provided to assist the</td>
<td>Roadmap to educate students with disabilities and meet all their needs.</td>
<td>To provide individualized instruction that meets the needs specific to the individual student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. What is meant by FAPE?</th>
<th>Every student is entitled to an education program designed to meet their individual needs so that they can benefit to the fullest from the program.</th>
<th>Each child is given the opportunity to a free public education, no exclusions.</th>
<th>All students are entitled by law to receive educational services regardless of their handicapping condition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the intent of LRE requirements?</td>
<td>The LRE requirements are intended to prevent the unnecessary separation of special education students from the general education environment. It ensures that special education students are allowed to participate in the regular education environment to the greatest extent possible.</td>
<td>To provide students with disabilities with the same opportunities that every other age appropriate student has.</td>
<td>That students with disabilities receive their services in the least restrictive educational setting with their non-disabled peers where they can be successful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>