8-2014

Pull-Out or Push-in Service Delivery Model: Conducive to Students or Teachers?

Stacey M.L. Dawson
St. John Fisher College

Pull-Out or Push-in Service Delivery Model: Conducive to Students or Teachers?

Abstract

On account of controversy surrounding the subject of the most appropriate environment for a student to receive special education and related services, the researcher thought it beneficial to conduct an anonymous survey to discover current educators' opinions on inclusive education. To collect data on this topic, an anonymous survey was sent electronically to all staff members of one elementary school ranging from grades pre-k to sixth in a large urban school district. The survey was nine questions where all questions focused on the staffs' knowledge of inclusive education and common practices between classroom teachers and service providers. In completion of the survey 100% of recipients had a general understanding of inclusive classrooms, however the underlying theory of students receiving services within the general education classroom was an idea that most recipients were not comfortable with. It was also found that many classroom teachers and service providers do not cover the same concepts when a student is pulled from the classroom and the educators rarely have occasions to sit down and speak in depth about student growth and need. Therefore it has been found that professional development would be valuable for educators to increase the success rate of students with disabilities. Furthermore it would seem as though educators need set times throughout the school day to have extensive and thorough discussions about students with disabilities so that goals specified on their individualized education plan (IEP) are being met and documented.

Document Type
Thesis

Degree Name
MS in Special Education

Department
Education

Pull-Out or Push-in Service Delivery Model:
Conducive to Students or Teachers?

Stacey M.L. Dawson

St. John Fisher College

Abstract

On account of controversy surrounding the subject of the most appropriate environment for a student to receive special education and related services, the researcher thought it beneficial to conduct an anonymous survey to discover current educators' opinions on inclusive education. To collect data on this topic, an anonymous survey was sent electronically to all staff members of one elementary school ranging from grades pre-k to sixth in a large urban school district. The survey was nine questions where all questions focused on the staffs' knowledge of inclusive education and common practices between classroom teachers and service providers. In completion of the survey 100% of recipients had a general understanding of inclusive classrooms, however the underlying theory of students receiving services within the general education classroom was an idea that most recipients were not comfortable with. It was also found that many classroom teachers and service providers do not cover the same concepts when a student is pulled from the classroom and the educators rarely have occasions to sit down and speak in depth about student growth and need. Therefore it has been found that professional development would be valuable for educators to increase the success rate of students with disabilities. Furthermore it would seem as though educators need set times throughout the school day to have extensive and thorough discussions about students with disabilities so that goals specified on their individualized education plan (IEP) are being met and documented.

Table of Contents

Pull-Out or Push-in Service Delivery Model: Conducive to Students or Teachers?

Providing students with disabilities a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) has historically been and remains a misinterpreted concept. As a result, the U.S. Supreme Court System has taken the responsibility of clarifying any confusion; in doing so educators are able to better serve students with disabilities. Rulings have affirmed that FAPE stipulates that students with disabilities are to be afforded the generalized education as well as a specialized education alongside their peers that are non-disabled, while at the same time encouraging special education services and related services to be provided to students within their general education classroom (NCLD editorial team, 2010). Since it is reported that over 6.5 million students, ages six to twenty-one, are served under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), Part B, educators should anticipate that 8.4% of their students will be students with disabilities (35th annual report, 2014).

However, even though mandates are in place to ensure students with disabilities receive a free and appropriate education, there is still much controversy on which environment is best for students to receive their education. Thus, this paper intends to provide an analytic view into the perceptions of educators that are currently teaching. Additionally a review of specific literature will cover the following topics: the benefits and disadvantages to students and teachers alike of both push-in and pull-out models for providing special education services and related services, positive and negative psychological impacts on students with disabilities that receive such services in different environments, mandates and laws written to ensure academic success of students with disabilities and current implementations of special education and related services within school districts for students with disabilities. Separate but equal education for students

with disabilities is a repugnant theory of the past. Therefore educators must be prepared to

educate and accept students with many different disabilities within their general education

settings. In addition all educators need to be well versed on how to best differentiate and/or

modify for all students, as well as become comfortable with collaboratively working with special

education teachers and those who provide related services to students; hence a willingness to

welcome the providers into the classroom.

Literature Review

The American educational system has been molded through litigation and laws throughout the last five decades. The foremost change made to the educational system is that of IDEA, which mandates "… the right to a free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment; [and] individualized education programs (IEPs)…" (Talley & Schrag, 1999, p. 235) for all school aged children. In addition "IDEA and its predecessors prescribed multidisciplinary, multidimensional services to be coordinated to effectively maximize the student's learning and growth" (Talley & Schrag, 1999, p. 235). For individuals with disabilities in the schooling system, IDEA is in place to protect their right to be treated and educated in the same manner and beside their non-disabled peers. The improvement in laws surrounding educating individuals with disabilities has shifted school environments into inclusive settings which "challenges special education and other support programs to work together and with general education rather than to function as isolated separate programs" (Talley & Schrag, 1999, p. 235).

Context and Background

Serving individuals with disabilities in the educational system is a team effort because students with IEP's require "related services, which are school-based services that the child with a disability will be receiving that provide[s] support for him or her and enhance[s] educational performance" (Pierangelo & Giuliani, 2012, p. 339). As a result of related and instructional services and documented delivery of these services, IDEA's Data Accountability Center (2012), reported that in 2011 of those students served under IDEA in mainstream classrooms: 61.08% of students spent at least 80% of the school day in a regular classroom, 19.79% of students spend at least 40-79% of the school day in a regular classroom, and 14.05% of students spent less than

40% of their day in a regular classroom (table B3-2). Therefore of all individuals served under

IDEA in 2011, 94% of the students spend at minimum, 20% of their day out of the classroom to

receive related and instructional services. Unfortunately this means these students loose time

with their non-disabled peers and access to the same instructional time as their non-disabled

peers on a daily basis to receive required supportive services, based on implementation method.

Of all related and instructional services that students with disabilities receive under

IDEA, the 30th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the IDEA Act reports "the

largest disability category among students ages 6 through 21…was specific learning disabilities

(44.6 percent). [and] The next most common disability category was speech and language

impairment (19.1percent)…" (2011, p.44).

This paper addresses the most common reasons professionals often choose a segregated

pull-out model for the delivery of additional instructional and related services when educating

students with disabilities. Through analysis of (a) statistics, (b) research, (c) current law, and (d)

case studies, this paper reviews if instructional and related delivery models being chosen is a

result of efficacy, student needs in their less restrictive environment possible (LRE), or

professional characteristics.

Delivery Models

Speech and language professionals provide services for students to address many

different deficits. In 2010 Robert Mullen and Tracy Schooling conducted a study that reported

the largest categories served by speech and language professionals were: "Speech sound

production, Spoken language comprehension, and Spoken language production" (p. 48). Though

there are different options – e.g. in classrooms, pull-out group, or pull-out individual- to deliver

services for these deficits, "the overwhelming majority of students were treated in pull-out

groups of two to four students" (Mullen & Schooling, 2010, p. 48-9). An individualized

education program (IEP) is supposed to provide services specific to an individual student's needs

in the least restrictive environment possible. However Mullen and Schooling (2010) found "there

is little in these data to suggest that student characteristics influence service delivery" (p. 56).

When servicing students with disabilities, these findings go against IDEA regulation under title

34 CFR part 300.550; which states

> (1) That to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children
>
> in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are
>
> nondisabled; and (2) That special classes, separate schooling or other removal of children
>
> with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only if the nature or
>
> severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of
>
> supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. (Department of
>
> Education, 2006)

When specialists providing related and instructional services for students with disabilities

choose a method of delivery outside the classroom, they are providing "…isolated instruction in

his or her area of expertise based on two broad assumptions: (a) that certain skills must be

mastered before other skills are introduced and (b) that any skill learned can be transferred to

other contexts" (Bailey, Brent, Head, & Daniel, 1993). Yet students receiving these additional

services are struggling within the environment they need to apply their learned skills. Therefore

"…basic skill areas such as communication, decision making, gross and fine motor and vision

never actually become incorporated into real-life activities" (Bailey, Brent, Head, & Daniel,

1993). Many students have difficulty with generalizing learned skills to different situations and

tasks, whether disabled or non-disabled. For this reason "the focus [should] be on helping the

student to benefit from the special education programming provided in his or her primary

placement" (Bailey, Brent, Head, & Daniel, 1993). When related and instructional service

professionals make the choice of an in-class delivery model, "students could then benefit from

instruction that improves both their participation in activities and their learning of skills" (Bailey,

Brent, Head, & Daniel, 1993).

The idea that related and instructional services be integrated into the classroom is more

beneficial to students than pulling them out has become evidence based through professionals

themselves assessing delivery models. Diane Anderson (2006) reports on her attempt to

successfully improve comprehension skills in two students with learning disabilities and her

choice of delivery is an intense resource room model for intervention (p.176). However the goals

set for the two students were not meet. Anderson (2006) states "As I reviewed my decision to

separate Jack and Pete for more individualized instruction, I saw that it had resulted in missed

opportunities for Jack and Pete, Jen [the general education teacher] and me, and the class as a

whole" (p.178). Although Anderson learned through her small case study that "…there are more

effective ways to enhance reading comprehension instruction in an inclusive setting than directly

teaching these strategies in a small group setting outside the classroom" (Anderson, 2006,

p.178), teachers of today can learn from Anderson now instead of in hindsight as she did.

Student Reactions to Delivery Models

Removing a student from their primary classroom for related and instructional services is

not only shown to be less effective through academic assessments, but it can also affect their

sense of belonging or make them feel left out. Obiakor, Harris, Mutua, Rotatori, and Algozzine

(2012) reports on two students with learning disabilities receiving additional supportive services

using different delivery methods. (1) Raul receives pull-out services and never reaches his goals

for reading and behavior worsened when in the resource room. However when in his general

education classroom, Raul is engaged and focused even when required to complete a lot of

reading. (2) David receives services in his classroom in a team taught approach with the general

and special education teachers, in which he makes great improvement and meets all his goals

(p.481-84). After closely comparing the two case studies, the authors find that the students "…do

not want to be excluded or stigmatized based on their placements" (Obiakor, Harris, Mutua,

Rotatori, and Algozzine, 2012, p.482). Providing students with an education in their least

restrictive environment serves to allow students to remain with their peers so they are not

ostracized and they receive the same curriculum afforded to their peers. On the contrary when

supportive services are provided outside the classroom, students are isolated and often

"…receive a watered down curriculum that places them at an even further disadvantage"

(Obiakor, Harris, Mutua, Rotatori, and Algozzine, 2012, p.485).

    Although supportive services are in place to enrich student's education and create an

environment where all can learn, students have voiced distressing reasoning for preferring pull-

out service models in comparison to in-class models.

      Martin liked going to the resource room because (a) there were animals in the

      classroom, (b) he got free time when he finished his work, and (c) he was able to get

      away with things in (or on the way to) the resource room…, [but] the work was easy, and

      'that's not so good' (Klingner, Vaughn, Schumm,   Cohen, & Forgan, 1998, p.154).

Although IDEA states that all have the right to a free and appropriate education, easier work for

students with disabilities is not always appropriate. Students may prefer easier work, but

"students with LD [learning disabilities] said they got more work done and that the work was

harder when they stayed in their general education classroom" (Klingner, Vaughn, Schumm,

Cohen, & Forgan, 1998, p.154). Hence if a student is able to complete the same work as their

peers, within their classroom and all they need is supportive services in the general education

classroom, then providing those services in the classroom is their least restrictive environment

mandated by IDEA.

Determining Delivery of Services

When determining when and where to provide students with disabilities supportive

services, many factors are determinates. The committee for special education team must ask

themselves if the instructional arrangement they have chosen for a student is best for the student

to achieve their goals in their least restrictive environment possible. A school-based intervention

decision- making model (SIDM) consists of the student – e.g. strengths, needs, current abilities,

peer modeling, impact on general education, severity/type of disability, motivation and attitude,

and grade and developmental level -, service provider – e.g. clinical training, professional

development, and relationship to school personnel – and workplace – e.g. workload,

administrative support, and team input (Brandel & Loeb, 2011, p.461). By reason of IEP's and

supportive services being individualized, this process needs to be followed for each individual

student, and "…if followed are consistent with the requirements of IDEA…in order to provide

services in the student's least restrictive environment" (Brandel & Loeb, 2011, p.461).

While all supportive service delivery decisions should be rendered depending on the use

of a SIDM scale, a Brandel and Loeb (2011) study concluded that the majority of the sampled

speech pathologists reported their recommendations were based on the SIMD model and student

needs (p. 4). "However, in most instances, regardless of severity, grade, or type of disorder,

students were seen in a group outside of the classroom" (Brandel & Loeb, 2011, p.474). Many

times when providing related and instructional services to students, there are assumed durations

of time or methods that are deemed suitable for delivery. Yet "…there are no efficacy studies

that have evaluated the claim that 2-3 times a week for 20-30 min in groups outside of the

classroom [are] sufficient" (Brandel & Loeb, 2011, p.474). This is why IDEA mandates services

for a student are determined and reviewed on an individual basis, because what is appropriate for

one student cannot be generalized for other students simply due to similarity in disabilities.

       An additional factor that affects service delivery in schools is the scarcity in a disability

and/or service providers in a specific area of expertise. For example students that are deaf or hard

of hearing receive related and instructional services from a specialist, but "typically they [the

specialist] serve children in several schools…usually provided on a pull-out basis" (Moores,

2008, p.273). Service providers in a travelling situation "…enjoy the diversity of students and

freedom in scheduling, but they have problems with time constraints, travel, and isolation"

(Moores, 2008, p.273). Traveling specialists are limited to the time they can dedicate to

individual students and the manner in which their services are rendered. These specialists have

no area in which their materials are already set up and not being in the school building makes

continual collaboration among teachers difficult, which impedes the service's effectiveness.

"This result[s] in fewer opportunities for higher-level questioning, student evaluation,

assignment or correction of homework, or any intensive academic activity related and

instructional to content areas…[and] due to time constraints, teachers often skipped important

parts of the organization of instruction" (Moores, 2008, p.274).

       An additional underlying factor that affects the method in which professionals provide

supportive services, is the model used to establish what services are needed. Many students with

disabilities receive additional services that "…is part of a medical model of service delivery,

[which is] a model that typically uses individual disciplines (speech and language, physical

therapy, occupational therapy, psychology, sensory impairments) to address each specific area of need" (as cited in Bailey, Brent, Head, & Daniel, 1993), which Pugach (1988) reports. Although a medical model is useful in determining a child's needs for IEP purposes, Campbell (1987) along with Rainforth and York (1987) agree that adhering to this model for isolated delivery of services "…tends to divide [a] child with multiple disabilities into separate problem areas" (as cited in Bailey, Brent, Head, & Daniel, 1993). Consequently those students that need multiple supportive services have to be seen by various professional dependent on the availability of the professionals, caseload, and their idea of sufficient/effective approaches as previously stated.

One of the most vital components of determining methods of delivering related services to students with disabilities is financial costs. Although the Educate America Act of 1994 "…emphasize[s] the importance of linking and coordinating services and services within education and across education and other social service programs" (Talley & Schrag, 1999, p.237), related service professionals – e.g. speech therapists, occupational therapist, physical therapists, etc. – are trained medical professionals that even when within a school system, continue to work as such. Professionals providing related services to students with disabilities are customarily part of a school's staff, but generally thought of being paid through Medicaid health insurance; especially those professionals within high risk demographic areas. The Social Security Act states that "through EPSDT [early periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment service] multiple health services… [for] special needs can be provided at a school site and reimbursement if the services provided meet the conditions of the program" (Talley & Schrag, 1999, p.233). Meaning the medical model that so many schools use to deliver related services to students with disabilities is beneficial to the school because they are refunded costs paid to the professionals providing the services. As a result, a related service professional's choice of a pull-out,

segregated approach to provide their services is closely associated with the manner in which they have to present services rendered to Medicaid for the school to receive a cost return.

There has been extensive research conducted on the use of different delivery models for specific supportive services. "We can envision a way to teach all kids, including those with the most complex needs…[but] there is no cookie cutter disability studies infused program that can or should be replicated" (Ashby, 2012, p.98). Thus teachers have to be open-minded, dedicated, and continuously researching best practices to implement when servicing students with disabilities. Unfortunately "…special education administrators are more inclined to be reactive than proactive...denote[ing] their conservative stance in relation to the demands of ongoing change, along with their fortitude and commitment to supporting SWD [students with disabilities] and other people related to this mission" (Connor, 2012, p.36).

Consequently, even with further research into best practices and the efficacy afforded through different models for providing instructional and related services provided for students with disabilities; many professionals are still resistant to change. A study conducted by Azano, Missett, Callahan, Oh, Brunner, Foster, and Moon (2011) found that even when presented with resources and research proving effectiveness, "…the beliefs teachers held about their students, their own expertise, their autonomy, and the time required for implementing the units ultimately produced varying degrees of fidelity" (p.713). Although teachers set goals for students to achieve, a teacher's ability to afford every child a chance to succeed is never dependent on his/her expectations or experiences because one never knows what a child is actually capable of unless all methods, strategies, resources, and teacher dedication is offered to them. Therefore "…creating and delivering professional development specifically addressing beliefs and

expectations… could be an important first step in mitigating these potentially adverse influences" (Azano, Missett, Callahan, Oh, Brunner, Foster, and Moon, 2011, p.714).

Several factors which contribute to the isolation to students with disabilities were identified by the U.S. Department of Education in the early 1980's in monitoring reports delivered to states. These factors which the department identified as unacceptable reasons for removing children from regular education classes include:

- the configuration of service delivery systems

- administration convenience

- category of disability

- and failure to consider modification of curriculum

Department rationale for these preclusions was that none where relevant to the individual child's educational needs. Over the last 20 years these factors have been validated in case law (personal communication, David Rostetter)

Thus in order to be in compliance with federal and state laws on the issue of educating students with disabilities, states, districts, and schools alike must come together and establish a system where students spend the maximum time possible within their general education classroom; despite additional services they require to succeed in school. Otherwise "…students [who] move in and out of general education settings because schools have not developed a systematic change strategy that involves a districtwide (K-12) service delivery model, children will continue to be victims of a disjointed educational system" (Dieker, 2001, p.268).

Methodology

Researcher Stance

Given that FAPE is the basis for a fully inclusive school system, the researcher went into this study having faith that all educators were well-informed on what true inclusion means and embraced inclusion in their classrooms. Based on the vast amount of students that have IEP's and/or 504 plans, the researcher assumed that in order to be staffed at a public school one would have to be knowledgeable on the key elements that afford a student with disabilities the same advantages as their non-disabled peers within the same environment as their peers. Upon entering the special education field, I felt it conducive for me to reveal true opinions and awareness of fellow colleagues. It is thought that if there are misconceptions in the true meaning of full inclusion or there are educators that still believe students with disabilities belong in an alternate setting than that of the general education classroom, it would be beneficial to teachers and students if they were presented with valuable research to demonstrate why inclusion is effective for students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers.

Design & Data Collection

Utilizing an internet application called "Survey Monkey," an anonymous survey was sent to approximately one-hundred twenty staff members at an urban elementary school in upstate New York; after reception of approval from the Instructional Review Board (IRB). Due to it being the end of the school year, which is an extremely busy and stressful time for teachers, it was ideal to utilize an electronic manner in which to collect responses because staff members are able to submit responses on computers or cell phones which assures a bounty of responses.

Participant Population

One school in a large urban school district, grades pre-k-6, was chosen to participate in completion of this survey. The school consists of approximately one-hundred twenty respondents that range in their job titles and have different roles within the building. The school staff was sent an e-mail over the internet with a request to complete the anonymous survey. In being employed within the district surveyed, the researcher had access to district e-mail for all employees and chose the staff from an urban elementary school housing grades pre-k through sixth grade after receiving approval from the school principal. Out of the one-hundred twenty possible respondents, the survey was closed after a random twenty-seven staff members responded to the survey.

Data Analysis

Given the fact that there were two types of questions asked on the survey, response and scale questions, the data for each question was analyzed in two different manners; percentages and common categorical themes. Questions that required a written response were reviewed and common themes were detected, which created categories in which each respondent's answers were tallied. The categorical themes were then weighed out as percentages using a mathematical computation. This data analysis process was completed by the careful eye and scrutiny of the researcher.

The remaining questions that allowed respondents to choose an answer on a scale 1-10, were easily analyzed and converted into percentages by means of the website used to create the survey (Appendix B). However for these same questions, the respondents did have the opportunity to choose the answer marked "other," in which there were able to respond in their own words or explain their responses. In this scenario, the responses were broken into common themes and then tallied and transformed into percentages as discussed previously.

Findings & Discussion

Findings

Of the approximate 100 staff members the survey was sent to, there were only 27 staff members that responded in the allotted timeframe. The low response rate is presumed to be due to the survey being sent out within the last few weeks of the school year when school staff is usually completing report cards, planning field trips, preparing materials and classrooms for summer closure, etc. Despite the low number of respondents, the data collected is sufficient enough for an analysis of how educators within an urban school district truly consider the best place for students to receive special education and related services and determine what inclusion really means to these educators.

To gain a better understanding of how educators regarded the impact to instructional time if students receive special education service within the classroom, survey question one was a scale question (Appendix A) which helped respondents to begin thinking about their views on how special education and related services should be provided to students. As result of the question type, the data was easily converted into percentages. It was found that 37.03% of respondents perceive receiving services within the classroom to be distractive to instructional time, while 48.14% of educators state that there is little to no distraction to classroom instruction. This survey question also had the option of "other" where educations were able to create their own rating or explain their responses. There were four respondents that chose this response option. After reviewing their responses for this option, it was apparent that all four responses fell into the same thematic category which was: 'If properly placed.' One respondent stated: "If services are consistent students rarely pay attention to adults coming and going from the classroom; besides to look up at see who opened the door." It may be possible that those who

found push-in services destructive, where personally distracted rather that the students being

distracted.

Survey question two was an opinion question which warranted personal responses from

each educator to better understand what staff members actually considered inclusive education to

entail. Given the question type, the responses to this question were analyzed and broken into

common categorical themes found by the researcher, which are: Teaching and Pedagogy,

Opportunity and Access, Diversity and Classroom environment and Modifications and Support.

Of the 27 respondents to this question there are only 14.8% of educators that listed

teaching/pedagogy as an aspect of inclusive education, 55.5% of educators stated that

opportunity and access where important dynamics of inclusive education, 29.6% of educators

believe that modifications and additional classroom support are factors of inclusion, and the

most prominent response is educators believing a productive classroom environment denotes the

meaning of inclusive instruction where 62.9% wrote responses that fell into this category. As all

these categories are strong components in an effective inclusive classroom, it is reassuring to

find that all educators were able to provide an answer falling into at least one of these categories,

however it is discerning that not one educator resolved to include all four categories.

Question three was a scale rating question pertaining to the rate at which students are

readily able to transfer strategies from one environment to another. Findings show that 81.21%

of the educators that responded experience students that range from cannot transfer or have

difficulty transferring strategies across environmental settings. Additionally, 11.11% of

educators state that students have little to no difficulty transferring helpful strategies from one

environment to the other. Comparable to other questions, this question also had the option of an

"other" response, which two respondents chose; that is 7.41% of respondents. Of the respondents

that chose the "other" category, the thematic category to represent the responses was

"Dependent" (Appendix B). In light of this data it would seem that students with disabilities are

not swiftly able to generalize strategies acquired in a push-out model of special education, so it

would give the impression that this model is a disservice to these students.

Survey question number four was again a scale ranging question concerning the amount

of time that classroom teachers and special education providers spend covering the same content

when students are pulled out of the classroom to receive services. The question choices were

broken down into four major categories: always, sometimes, never and often. Of the responses

51.85% of respondents state that they sometimes cover the same content and 11.11% report that

the same content is never covered. Again, "other" was an option for a response, in which 37.04%

of respondents chose this option. After carefully analyzing the responses, there were two

thematic categories found by the researcher: unknown and rarely. Of the 'other' responses, 40%

convey that the classroom content is rarely covered during pull-out services mainly due to the

service providers following the IEP goals rather than what is being covered in the classroom. In

addition, 60% of responses specified they were unable to respond to this question because their

position did not include such experiences. This confirms that there is a significant loss of content

instruction when students are pulled from the classroom to receive special education services.

Question five is also a scale response question that endeavored to determine the amount

of time an average classroom teacher and service provider meet to discuss students that receive

services. This question is broken down into five major categories as well: 3-4 times, 5-6 times, 7-

8 times, never and other (Appendix B). Of the responses given, 7% reported meeting 3-4 times

per month, 11% reported never meeting within a month's time and 33% decided to explain their

answer in a written response. Of those that reported an "other" response, the answers were

broken into three thematic categories at the discretion of the researcher: doesn't apply, in passing

and daily. Since there are some staff members that do not have a position where they have to

meet with service providers, 67% of them stated that this question doesn't apply to them or they

are unsure, 22% of respondents stated that there is no allotted time for meetings of this nature

within the school day so they meet when possible in passing time (breaks, lunches and

after/before school when needed), lastly one outlier response stated that they speak daily to the

service providers for their students that receive services. This shows that although students are

receiving services stated on their IEP's, the question becomes: How is it determined that

progress is being made in the classroom based on services provided outside the classroom if

educators are unable to meet and discuss this very topic due to poor opportunities for

collaboration?

In hopes to gain insight into how educators spend their time planning for the needs of

their special education students, question six is a scale range question that also entails a

justifiable response. Therefor this question is analyzed in two different manners: percentage of

scale which is 1-10, but results are reported based on a 1-5 or 6-10 response and those that

responded without a number rage will be placed into the "other" category based on written

responses. There are a reported 43% of respondents that say it is extremely to kind of difficult to

manage the needs of special education students, 25% of educators state that minimal to no

difference is needed in managing the needs of the special education students versus the general

education students and 4% of educators state there is no difference among the population

because "Kids are kids." Among the responses 26% chose not to base their answer on a number,

but instead to supply a written response explaining their stance. There were 26% that gave an

"other" response, ranging in answers from "this doesn't apply to me" or "it depends on student

level of need". This question pertained to the educational needs of the students, however some

respondents alluded to behavior management issues with students. Therefore it is perceived that

many respondents were not focusing on the intended meaning of the question and if a future

survey be issued the question needs to be clarified as asking about instructional planning rather

than behavior management issues.

       Survey question seven is a response based question that is meant to determine what is

discussed during meetings between classroom teachers and service providers which is a

corresponding response to question five. Since this is a personal response question, the responses

were analyzed and it was found by the researcher that there were eight common thematic

categories that educators reported for this question: Does not apply, goals & academics, behavior

management, strategies/modifications, student growth, parent-teacher discussions, services being

provided and student concern. Due to this question being an open-ended question, some

respondents gave answers that fell into one or more thematic categories. Of the thematic

categories determined, 15% of educators stated that this question did not apply to them, 26%

stated meetings discussed goals and academics of the student at hand, 15% of meetings discussed

effective behavior management and the need for behavior management, 26% of meetings

discussed strategies that are working, possible useful strategies, and possible modifications for

upcoming classroom lessons, 22% of meetings included conversations surrounded around

student growth (strengths and weaknesses), 4% of meetings involved discussing outcomes of

parent-teacher discussions, 4% of meetings involved special education and related services being

provided and 4% of meetings incorporated concerns that educators have for the student in

question. Because of many educators previously stating that they did not have many occasions to

meet with service provides to discuss their students, it is encouraging to know that when they do

have the opportunity to meet, the majority of meetings involve the most important aspects that

enhance student growth; strategies, goals and academics and student growth thus far.

Question eight of the survey is a duration question that staff was allowed to choose and

answer from a list of hours in range or complete a personal response by choosing the "other"

category. This question is intended to determine how much extra time is spent by classroom

teachers to modify or accommodate student needs. In reviewing the data it was found that 30%

of educators spend an additional 1-2 hours per week in planning for special education students,

30% of educators spend an additional 3-4 hours, 7% spend an additional 5-6 hours per week, 4%

spend an additional 7-8 hours and 4% state that there is no additional planning time needed. Due

to this being a question with a possible "other" category, 26% of educators chose to respond in

their own words and explain their answers. These responses were analyzed and dispersed among

four thematic categories; however each category had a common factor which is the fact that no

extra time was needed for planning, but for different reasoning's. There were responses that

determined 29% of respondents were not able to reply to this question, 43% stated it depended

on the specific child's needs and ability levels, 14% stated that they incorporate small group

instruction on a daily basis that aids to relieve extra planning time and 14% of respondents said

there is no difference because differentiation is meant for all students not simply special

education students and with the use of this all students' needs can be met. It is quite possible that

of those that stated they spent a minimal time for extra planning time for special education

students is because differentiation is a part of their daily practice which has become innate,

although they may have not mention this in their response.

Lastly, question nine is a multiple choice question that is coupled with justification of

respondents' answers. Of the possible predetermined answers provided 15% of educators said a

self-contained classroom is more effective for students with disabilities, 11% stated students

were more prosperous when receiving a pull-out model and 44% revealed that a push-in model

for services is more effective. Although there is a percentage for each category chosen, there

were different reasoning's for many participants, which were also placed in categories. Those

respondents that chose a self-contained setting offered reasoning's such as: "there is more

consistency and better student-teacher relationship can be built, students with disabilities get

special attention and only if needs are more severe". Those that deemed a pull-out model had

justifications such as indicated by one participant who stated, "students receive one-to-one

attention and in my experience this method has worked well." The highest percentage category

deems the push-in model to best, with arguments including: "when pulled out there is a loss of

instructional time, depends on disability and only if needs are greatly severe, with proper staff

the push-in model builds confidence, least restrictive area is in the general classroom and

students are able to receive the same content with support." Although this was a multiple choice

question mirrored with explanation, there were 26% of respondents that gave an answer that fell

into an "other" category. Reasons for this "other" category are mainly due to educators placing

their answers into a category that warranted that name 'depends'. Responses were mostly based

on the need of the student and if their disability is severe that would be the reason to place the

student in a different setting rather than a push-in model. Consequently this question revealed a

clear majority belief that the best placement for students with disabilities is within the general

education classroom where they also receive their special education services whenever the

disability is not too great.

Conclusion

By reason of data collected from an urban elementary school staff, it is deducible that many educators have a great understanding as to the ideal environment for students to receive special education and related services. This conclusion is based on many educators believing that the least restrictive environment for students with disabilities is alongside their peers in the general education classroom. In addition it has been found that the majority of educators would welcome or prefer students to receive special education and related service within the classroom because in doing so there is less of a chance that a student's educational deficit would become greater due to no loss of instruction time and the proper modifications, support, and strategies being provided to thrive in the general education classroom. One respondent made it clear as to why full inclusion (all special education services provided in the general education classroom) is beneficial to students and educators alike: "If students are pulled out you cannot guarantee that they are receiving the content instruction that they need with the modifications in the [way] that needs to be done. With APPR [Annual Professional Review Performance Review] I would want services as push-in."

Many educators are very aware of the least restrictive environment and how it pertains to a free and appropriate education to all students within the educational system despite disability or IEP goals/needs. However there are some outliers when reviewing the data. Reasons for these outliers may include: some educators being unable to answer specific questions due to their position, some educators have had bad experiences with full-inclusion, or some educators can possibly have never experienced full inclusion and the fear of the unknown is sometimes scary or upsetting. Also in the same manner that one respondent felt as though full inclusion would

positively effect APPR scores, other educators could view full inclusion as having an overall

negative effect which would deter educators from welcoming full inclusion due to all the weight

to an educators position this new APPR score has.

As a result of many educators knowing and understanding what full inclusion entails, but

some that do not or are fearful of full inclusion it is imperative that educators become

knowledgeable about the benefits of full inclusion for students and teachers alike. This

knowledge can be acquired through mandatory professional development or simply mandatory

staff meetings which provide data as a demonstrable form of evidence based practices. In

addition a probationary period of full inclusion, where APPR scores are not affected, could be

very valuable to students because educators would be able to embrace the ideals of full inclusion

without the concerns of how this will affect me as a future educator based on my APPR score.

Limitations

This study is merely a glimpse into the reality that educators and special education

students experience on a daily basis. This study was conducted in one low income urban

elementary school where the majority of students are of African American and Hispanic

descendant. All school districts are different and have many different aspects that consummate

their makeup; therefore this study may not be able to be generalized among school districts as a

whole.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, it is apparent that the topic on where the best place for students to

receive special education services and related services remains a debatable issue.   For this reason future

research needs to be conducted and should focus of comparing the effectiveness of different

delivery models of related and instructional services within the special education community.

Individual or small studies are helpful in influencing a professional's delivery mode, but in the absence of mass studies and statistics "…insufficient high-quality evidence is [un]available to support any strong conclusions about differential benefits of service delivery models used in school settings." (Cirrin, Schooling, Nelson, Diehl, Flynn, Staskowski, & Adamczyk, 2010, p.248). Therefore it would be greatly beneficial to the education profession to have a present-day study organized at the national level to better determine best practices that can enhance student growth based on a student's least restrictive environment to receive all special education service; thus endeavoring to pave the way to determine if full inclusion is actually more effective than current delivery methods being utilized today in the educational world.

References

Azano, A., Missett, T., Callahan, C., Oh, S., Brunner, M, Foster, L., & Moon, T. (2011).

Exploring the relationship between fidelity of implantation and academic achievement in

a third-grade gifted curriculum: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Advance Academics,*

22(5), 693-719.

Anderson, D. (2006). In or out: Surprises in reading comprehension instruction. *Intervention in*

School and Clinic, 41(3), 175-179.

Bailey, Brent, M., Head, & Daniel, N. (1993). Providing o&m services to children and youth

with sever and multiple disabilities. *Re: View, Heldref Publications, 25,* 57-66.

Brandel, J. & Loeb, D. (2011). Program intensity and service delivery models in the schools:

SLP survey results. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 42,* 461-90.

Campbell, P. (1987). The integrated programming team: An approach for coordinating

professionals of various disciplines in programs for students with sever and multiple

handicaps. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Sever Handicaps, 12,* 107-16.

Cirrin, F., Schooling, T., Nelson, N., Diehl, S., Flynn, P., Staskowski, M.,… Adamczyk, D.

(2010). Evidence-based systematic review: Effects of different service delivery models of

communication outcomes for elementary school-aged children. *Language, Speech, and*

Hearing Services in Schools, 41, 233-64.

Dieker, L. (2001). Collaboration as a tool to resolve the issue of disjointed service delivery.

Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 12(3), p.263-9.

Klingner, J., Vaughn, S., Schumm, J., Cohen, P., & Forgan, J. (1998). Inclusion or pull-out:

Which do students prefer? *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 31*(2), 148-58.

Moores, D. (2008). Inclusion, itinerant teachers, and the pull-out model. *American Annals of the*

Deaf, 153(3), 273-75.

Mullen, R. & Schooling, T. (2010). The national outcomes measurement system for pediatric

speech language pathology. *Language, Speech, and Hearing in Schools, 41,* 44-60.

National Center for Learning Disabilities. (2010). What is fape, and what can it mean to my

child? *Retrieved from* http://ncld.org/parents-child-disabilities/ld-rights/what-is-fape-

what-can-it-mean-my-child/page-2

Obiakor, F., Harris, M., Mutua, K., Rotatori, A., & Algozzine, B. (2012). Making inclusion

work in general education classrooms. *Education and Treatment of Children, 35*(3), 477-

490.

Office of Special Education Programs. (2011). *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*

(IDEA) Data [Table B3-2]. Available from

https://www.ideadata.org/arc_toc13.asp#partbLRE.

Pierangelo, R. & Giuliani, G. (2012). *Assessment in special education: A practical approach*

(4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Pugach, M. (1988). Special education as a constraint on teacher education reform. *Journal of*

Teacher Education, 39, 52-64.

Rainforth, B. & York-Barr, J. (1987). Integrating related and instructional services in community

instruction. *Journal of the Association for Pearson with Sever Handicaps, 12,* 190-8.

Talley, R. & Schrag, J. (1999). Legal and public policy foundations supporting service

integration for students with disabilities. *Journal of Educational and Psychological*

Consultation, 10(3), 229-49.

U.S. Department of Education, ED Performance and Accountability. (2011). 30th Annual

Report to Congress on the Implementation of IDEA, 2008. *Retrieved from*

http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2008/parts-b-c/index.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2006). 34 CFR parts 300 and 301 assistance to states for the

education of children with disabilities and preschool grants for children with disabilities;

final rule. *Federal Register, Rules and Regulations, 71*(156).

U.S. Department of Education. (2014). 35th Annual report to congress on the implementation

of the individuals with disabilities education act, 2013. *Retrieved from*

http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2013/parts-b-c/35th-idea-arc.pdf

Appendix A

1. On a scale from 1-10 (1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest) how much of a distraction would be caused to instructional time, If students were to receive special education services and related services within the general education classroom?

| Other (please specify) ▼ |

| |

2. What does inclusive education mean to you?

| |

3. On a scale from 1-10, how easily do students transfer strategies learned from recourse room, PT, OT, or other special education services to the general classroom?

1- cannot transfer from one environment to another
○ 2- extremely difficult to transfer strategies
○ 3- difficult to transfer strategies
○ 4- some difficulty transferring strategies
○ 5- can sometimes transfer strategies
○ 6- generally has little trouble transferring strategies
○ 7- easily transfers SOME strategies
○ 8- easily transfers ALL strategies
○ 9- I don't know
○ Other (please specify)

| |

4. How often do classroom teachers and special education services and related services cover the same content at the same time during student pull outs?

| ▼ |

| |

5. If you have students that receive special education services, on average how many times per month do you and the special service teachers sit down to determine growth or need?

6. On a scale of 1-10, (1 being the most difficult and 10 being no difference) how difficult is it to manage the needs of a special education student related to the needs of a general education student? Justify your response.

7. During meetings between yourself and special education service providers, what is generally discussed and or planned?

8. On average how much additional time is spent per week to plan for the needs of a special education student to thrive in the general education classroom with their non-disabled peers?

9. Where is the best place for a student to receive special education services for the student to be most successful: a) a self-contained room b) pull out from a general education classroom, c) push into a regular classroom. Explain your answer.

Q1

On a scale from 1-10 (1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest) how much of a distraction would be caused to instructional time, If students were to receive special education services and related services within the general education classroom?
- **Answered: 27**
- **Skipped: 0**

Answer Choices	Responses
1- extremely distractive	3.70% 1
2-very distractive	7.41% 2
3-somewhat distractive	14.81% 4
4-distraction	0.00% 0
5- can be distractive	11.11% 3
6- kind of distractive	3.70% 1
7- not much distraction	7.41% 2
8- small amount of distraction	14.81% 4

Answer Choices–	Responses–
–	18.52%
9- minimal distraction	5
–	3.70%
10- services go unnoticed	1
–	14.81%
Responses	4
Other (please specify)	

Showing 4 responses

Depends on the level of support the SWD needs.
6/25/2014 7:58 AM

4 - depending on the provider it can be distractive and at it also can be an asset. it all depends on who is providing services and how the instruction is set up
6/22/2014 6:31 AM

If done right.
6/21/2014 4:03 AM

If services are consistent students rarely pay attention to adults coming and going from the classroom; besides to look up at see who opened the door.
6/20/2014 5:37 PM

Total	27

Q2

What does inclusive education mean to you?

- **Answered: 27**

Showing **27** responses

special ed students receive access to same curriculum as reg ed.
6/25/2014 8:09 PM

Equal for adults, yet monitored for appropriate learning levels and styles for students
6/25/2014 2:24 PM

Giving a student more individual time.
6/25/2014 11:22 AM

Inclusive education means allowing every student to be included in a general education or least restrictive setting learning setting regardless of their abilities.
6/25/2014 10:56 AM

Education for all
6/25/2014 10:20 AM

All students have access to any education as other students.
6/25/2014 10:06 AM

Gen ed. mixed with special ed.
6/25/2014 9:08 AM

All students included in the least restricted environment
6/25/2014 7:58 AM

Gen ed. mixed with special ed.
6/25/2014 9:08 AM

All students included in the least restricted environment
6/25/2014 7:58 AM

Special education students in class with general education students
6/25/2014 7:53 AM

It means children with special needs get to participate whenever possible in what the general education students are doing, often with adult support
6/25/2014 7:26 AM

Equitable situation for all students
6/25/2014 7:24 AM

Children with special needs emotional or physically being included within a regular ed. classroom setting
6/24/2014 1:12 PM

Students with special needs are welcomed and taught alongside general/regular ed. students.
6/24/2014 9:13 AM

Having special education students mixed in the same class with regular education students with a special education teacher in the classroom to meet their educational needs. It benefits the regular education student as well as the special education student.
6/24/2014 6:47 AM

All students learn together with support
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

Special ed students are taught in the same classroom alongside reg ed students.
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

Students with disabilities being included with and treated the same as gen. ed students.
6/24/2014 3:55 AM

Students receive educational services they need to succeed in a school setting within a regular education classroom.
6/23/2014 7:32 PM

I think it means that students will participate in the curriculum that students in general ed have but with modifications.
6/23/2014 4:19 PM

Inclusion means that each child follows the daily routine and hears all the instruction. Small group time is a time for working with children at their ability level. In my experience the children who are inclusion students usually do better than some of their peers who are not classified. No child should stand out and be seen as different!
6/23/2014 6:17 AM

Students with IEPs and without IEPs receive instruction in the same classroom; students are all assisted equally with academic tasks and concepts. Students receive differentiated instruction based on their individual needs; IEP or no IEP.
6/23/2014 6:00 AM

Inclusive education means that students are receiving grade level material (and standards) with modifications based on the student's needs. It means that they are included in the classroom as age appropriate peers but receive an additional support.
6/23/2014 5:31 AM

All students regardless of disability or ability share the same academic space with services to meet their needs. Students become experts in diversity, 'normal' becomes a word that has little meaning.
6/23/2014 4:58 AM

educating all students regardless of their disability or learning needs
6/22/2014 6:31 AM

All students able to be given the same opportunities.
6/21/2014 4:03 AM

Just teach the way you teach all students and modify your presentation and assignments for some students.
6/20/2014 7:06 PM

Inclusion to me is a setting throughout a school where every classroom is diverse with both sped and gen ed students, as well as students receiving all services possible in their natural setting (the classroom)
6/20/2014 5:37 PM

Q3

On a scale from 1-10, how easily do students transfer strategies learned from recourse room, PT, OT, or other special education services to the general classroom?

- Answered: 27
- Skipped: 0

Answer Choices–	Responses–
– 1- cannot transfer from one environment to another	3.70% 1
– **2- extremely difficult to transfer strategies**	**0.00%** 0
– **3- difficult to transfer strategies**	**18.52%** 5
– **4- some difficulty transferring strategies**	**29.63%** 8
– **5- can sometimes transfer strategies**	**29.63%** 8

Answer Choices–	Responses–
– 6- generally has little trouble transferring strategies	**7.41%** 2
– 7- easily transfers SOME strategies	**0.00%** 0
– 8- easily transfers ALL strategies	**0.00%** 0
– 9- I don't know	**3.70%** 1
– **Responses** Other (please specify)	**7.41%** 2

Showing **2** responses

Depends on student's abilities and IEP goals
6/25/2014 7:58 AM

the gen ed teacher needs to know what strategies are being implemented so they can incorporate into the child's day. this takes a lot of communication by the adults
6/22/2014 6:31 AM

Q4

How often do classroom teachers and special education services and related services cover the same content at the same time during student pull outs?

- Answered: 27
- Skipped: 0

Answer Choices–	Responses–
– **Always**	**0.00%** 0
– **Sometimes**	**51.85%** 14
– **Never**	**11.11%** 3
– **Often**	**0.00%** 0
– **Responses** **Other (please specify)**	**37.04%** 10

Showing **10** responses

IDK
6/25/2014 10:20 AM

Depends on student's IEP goals and needs

6/25/2014 7:58 AM

I don't have access to this information
6/25/2014 7:26 AM

I'm not sure
6/24/2014 6:47 AM

idk
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

Not really sure
6/24/2014 3:55 AM

I honestly do not know the answer to this one...I've seen where they cover the exact same thing, but I've also seen where they supplement. It depends on the adult providing the

Answer Choices–	Responses–
service and how well the two teachers consult/plan. 6/23/2014 6:00 AM	
rarely 6/23/2014 5:31 AM	
Rarely 6/23/2014 4:58 AM	
Mostly service providers for sped students cover what is specific to the IEP, not necessarily the content going taught at the present moment in the classroom. 6/20/2014 5:37 PM	

Q5

If you have students that receive special education services, on average how many times per month do you and the special service teachers sit down to determine growth or need?

- **Answered: 27**
- **Skipped: 0**

Answer Choices–	Responses–
–	**48.15%**
1-2 times	13
–	**7.41%**
3-4 times	2
–	**0.00%**
5-6 times	0
–	**0.00%**
7-8 times	0
–	**11.11%**
Never	3

Answer Choices	Responses
	33.33%
Responses	9
Other (please specify)	

Showing **9** responses

not a classroom teacher
6/25/2014 10:20 AM

not applicable to me
6/25/2014 10:06 AM

Daily if needed/ongoing no set time
6/25/2014 7:58 AM

I am support staff so this doesn't apply
6/25/2014 7:26 AM

I'm not sure but I would guess at least quarterly but would guess maybe even weekly
6/24/2014 6:47 AM

n/a
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

We talk on the run. There is no allotted time for planning.
6/23/2014 6:17 AM

In my position I do not regularly see special education services
6/23/2014 6:00 AM

never - we usually have quick conversations while the class is present
6/22/2014 6:31 AM

Total	27

Q6

On a scale of 1-10, (1 being the most difficult and 10 being no difference) how difficult is it to manage the needs of a special education student related to the needs of a general education student? Justify your response.

- **Answered: 27**
- **Skipped: 0**

Showing **27** responses

Needs are more apparent - sometimes there are other students in the classroom with the same needs that are not classified
6/25/2014 8:09 PM

7, I would say a seven because, once you learn their learning styles, you should be able to easily integrate their work for them. However, there are many students whom have social behaviors that also come with their learning differences.
6/25/2014 2:24 PM

9
6/25/2014 11:22 AM

6
6/25/2014 10:56 AM

IDK
6/25/2014 10:20 AM

2, As a para in the computer lab that would be up to the teacher to decide.
6/25/2014 10:06 AM

5 You need to take the time to scaffold instruction
6/25/2014 9:08 AM

All students have needs. It depends on the student.
6/25/2014 7:58 AM

8 depends on severity of their needs though
6/25/2014 7:53 AM

Back when I was a special education teacher, the staff used to joke that the regular education students were more difficult because they were more streetwise. Don't know if that still holds true.
6/25/2014 7:26 AM

3
6/25/2014 7:24 AM

9
6/24/2014 1:12 PM

4 - Sometimes you must move on before the special ed students have mastered the subject material.
6/24/2014 9:13 AM

5 sometimes the special education students need to be put in a different location for a small portion of time to meet their needs but many times they can be accommodated in the classroom

6/24/2014 6:47 AM

6
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

2 because there are so many varying needs with the regular ed students...then no time to collaborate with the special ed. teacher to discuss the special ed. students
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

8
6/24/2014 3:55 AM

5...testing accommodations takes time, adjusting homework and assignments, catching up work missed when out w/sp.ed. teacher...
6/23/2014 7:32 PM

3. It is hard to plan for so many different needs and modifications and do justice to all students.
6/23/2014 4:19 PM

I believe there is a need to discuss certain special ed students because: disrespective and disruptive behaviors are detrimental to the classroom environment. General ed children often suffer from lack of attention because of the disruptive behaviors. There should be a method besides CSE to get more help quickly for the children who cannot work in this environment.
6/23/2014 6:17 AM

4...I think that it is very difficult to manage some students' needs as opposed to others'. It depends on the level of service the student receives within the classroom; at times there are other adults sharing the responsibility of instruction. The most difficult part would be coordinating all extra services that the student receives and then catching that student up if important information has been missed.
6/23/2014 6:00 AM

General education students sometimes require just as much support educationally as well as behaviorally.
6/23/2014 5:31 AM

5 - they all require management.
6/23/2014 4:58 AM

5 it depends on their needs. just because they are a special education does not mean they will have a behavior problem. Some are very difficult and others are not.
6/22/2014 6:31 AM

5. They need more support due to their iep. But there are some hard to manage gen Ed students also.
6/21/2014 4:03 AM

10 no difference, kids are kids.
6/20/2014 7:06 PM

Managing the needs of sped students is not as difficult as one jay think because differentiation calls for fitting the curriculum to all students, and every student gas different needs to succeed regardless of sped needs.
6/20/2014 5:37 PM

Q7

> **During meetings between yourself and special education service providers, what is generally discussed and or planned?**
> - **Answered: 27**
> - **Skipped: 0**

Showing **27** responses

areas in which the students are having difficulty or new areas of instruction to be covered
6/25/2014 8:09 PM

success of the student and future direction and implementation
6/25/2014 2:24 PM

How are the students doing.
6/25/2014 11:22 AM

student's growth and or needs
6/25/2014 10:56 AM

IDK
6/25/2014 10:20 AM

student behavior.
6/25/2014 10:06 AM

how to approach the next week's lessons and what strategies will be used
6/25/2014 9:08 AM

concerns with students and progress
6/25/2014 7:58 AM

The child's strengths and weaknesses are discussed and plans are made to help them where needed
6/25/2014 7:53 AM

NA
6/25/2014 7:26 AM

differentiation
6/25/2014 7:24 AM

N/A

6/24/2014 1:12 PM

how best to service the special ed. student/s to show positive gains
6/24/2014 9:13 AM

I don't sit in on those but I would guess it would be plans & what the special education students need
6/24/2014 6:47 AM

n/a
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

how to manage the student's academic and behavioral needs if necessary, ways to present curriculum so the student understands
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

Student's goals, strengths, and weaknesses
6/24/2014 3:55 AM

Special services, interventions that are working, parent/teacher conversations...
6/23/2014 7:32 PM

Progress and content being covered.
6/23/2014 4:19 PM

Many times we discuss management techniques and strategies to help out in the classroom. As stated earlier, there is never any time allotted for all the teachers involved to meet and have a formal planning time.
6/23/2014 6:17 AM

Student's strengths/needs/learning styles; program modifications and testing accommodations. Interventions for both behavior and academic. Progress monitoring both academic and behavioral
6/23/2014 6:00 AM

6/23/2014 5:31 AM

Goals for month/week, academic topics. Usually it's me given information.
6/23/2014 4:58 AM

behavior management, goals, strengths and needs, growth
6/22/2014 6:31 AM

Planning And strategies to help certain students.
6/21/2014 4:03 AM

How to modify assignments or what are you teaching
6/20/2014 7:06 PM

During meetings with providers the student's growth is always discussed and the student's present needs are discussed based on accomplishments. In addition the current need fir classroom transference is also discussed.
6/20/2014 5:37 PM

Q8

On average how much additional time is spent per week to plan for the needs of a special education student to thrive in the general education classroom with their non-disabled peers?

- Answered: 27
- Skipped: 0

Answer Choices–	Responses–
– **1-2 hours**	**29.63%** 8
– **3-4 hours**	**29.63%** 8
– **5-6 hours**	**7.41%** 2
– **7-8 hours**	**3.70%** 1
– **9-10 hours**	**0.00%** 0
– **None**	**3.70%** 1
– **Responses** **Other (please specify)**	**25.93%** 7

Answer Choices	Responses

Showing **7** responses

not a classroom teacher
6/25/2014 10:20 AM

Depends on how many students and Special Education position the teacher is in.
6/25/2014 7:58 AM

I don't plan anything different. I try to use a lot of visual and auditory cues throughout my teaching to help them.
6/25/2014 7:26 AM

Working in small groups often with our entire class population, so student's needs are met.
6/24/2014 3:55 AM

It depends on the specific child.
6/23/2014 6:17 AM

I am not a classroom teacher so I am not certain how much planning time takes place, but I would imagine planning for a student with special education services takes over 5 hours per week.
6/23/2014 6:00 AM

Only sever needs cause additional planning time because every student is taken into consideration when planning even if gen ed.
6/20/2014 5:37 PM

Q9

Where is the best place for a student to receive special education services for the student to be most successful: a) a self-contained room b) pull out from a general education classroom, c) push into a regular classroom. Explain your answer.

- **Answered: 27**
- **Skipped: 0**

Showing **27** responses

depends on the student and how well they can learn the information
6/25/2014 8:09 PM

push in: I feel that this is where they are going to feel the most confidence. In a surrounding, with their own peers.
6/25/2014 2:24 PM

c
6/25/2014 11:22 AM

I truly believe it depends on the student and their needs.
6/25/2014 10:56 AM

IDK
6/25/2014 10:20 AM

B. I prefer pullout, as I did that and it worked well, at a fifth grade. smaller reading group.
6/25/2014 10:06 AM

push in so students can be working on the same things their peers are working on scaffold for them
6/25/2014 9:08 AM

Depends on the needs of each student
6/25/2014 7:58 AM

push into a regular classroom where the students can be working on the same assignments as the class but getting extra support
6/25/2014 7:53 AM

It really depends on the student. Some special ed. teachers can thrive in a regular ed. class, while others have such extreme academic or behavioral needs they can't function in a large class environment. I've worked with both.
6/25/2014 7:26 AM

c
6/25/2014 7:24 AM

A. It only depends on the specific need of that individual student.
6/24/2014 1:12 PM

generally best to keep the student in class working along with classmates but providing them with the motivation they need to stay on task.
6/24/2014 9:13 AM

at they may need a different setting
6/24/2014 6:47 AM

c
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

if the student has moderate to severe needs then I believe they would be best serviced in a self-contained classroom... too many different needs in a reg. ed room
6/24/2014 5:58 AM

uccessful. It does depend on their disability.
6/24/2014 3:55 AM

A because they get specialized attention all day long

6/23/2014 7:32 PM

Pull out. I think it allows for the student to get as close to one to one instruction as possible. The instructor can modify lessons on the spot as needed.
6/23/2014 4:19 PM

It depends on the needs of the child. Some do well with one scenario and others need a mix of settings. Some children who receive medications do not always take it and then there is a whole different arrangement for that time and instructional time is lost!!!!!
6/23/2014 6:17 AM

Any of these may be the "best" for that student. Placement is on an individual needs basis; students are given programs that meet their needs and cannot be compared to peers.
6/23/2014 6:00 AM

push in If students are pulled out you cannot guarantee that they are receiving the content instruction that they need with the modifications in the way that needs to be done. With APPR I would want that service as push in.
6/23/2014 5:31 AM

c-with qualified and motivated teachers all students can function in a general education classroom. It would be a utopia requiring consistent support staff including administration.
6/23/2014 4:58 AM

b and c depending in the student. Students that are extremely behind need the pull out.
6/22/2014 6:31 AM

All students are different. Depends on individual needs.
6/21/2014 4:03 AM

self-contained, it is more consistency and the student is able to develop a relationship with two adults rather than a 1/2 of one.
6/20/2014 7:06 PM

All students should be able to receive died services in their classroom for their least restrictive area that benefits the whole class. However the idea of this and the reality of hiring the staff to provide these services is very distant.
6/20/2014 5:37 PM