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ABSTRACT

The demand to teach more culturally and linguistically diverse student populations, coupled with an increase in students identified with special learning needs, has presented teachers with the challenge of how to meet all students’ unique and individual learning needs in a heterogeneous general education class. This research inquiry addressed this question by studying the inclusion classroom where students with special learning needs are taught with their peers in the general class, and specialized instructional supports are brought to the student.

This qualitative study consisted of case studies of two English classes at two secondary schools in Hawai‘i. Each implemented different models of inclusion to provide specialized instruction in the general classroom for students with mild learning and emotional disabilities. Key research questions focused on: What does the inclusion model look like in two classrooms in Hawai‘i public schools and what characteristics positively or negatively affect student academic achievement? Each case study revealed how inclusion functions for the teachers and students in their classrooms. Research methodology included daily observations throughout a semester; informal interviews with key stakeholders such as teachers, students and administrators, and document study.

The findings suggested that there are key components for effective inclusion that were lacking in the classes that were studied. These components are adequate collaboration between the special education and general education teachers, appropriate class size, professional development to build teacher knowledge and skills, and the use of accommodations and instructional supports to meet students’ needs, such as differentiated learning strategies and cooperative learning. The results of this study
suggest that future efforts towards the inclusion of secondary students with mild learning disabilities in the general classroom should consider stronger classroom supports, improved teaching strategies, fully-licensed special education teacher support, and administrative oversight at the state, district, and school levels.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This study has stemmed from a research vision based on my experience in teaching students with diverse special learning needs in Hawai‘i public schools. The demands to reach more and more culturally and linguistically diverse student populations, coupled with an increase in students identified with special learning needs, has been a challenge for most teachers. An important question is: What helps these students to learn, and the teachers to teach, in classes with a wide and increasing range of unique academic and social learning needs? A pedagogical challenge is how teachers meet all students’ unique and individual learning needs in a heterogeneous general classroom. This research inquiry will address this overall question by studying the “inclusion classroom” where students with various and diverse learning abilities are taught with their peers in the general classroom.

This study consists of two case studies that describe two classes at two secondary schools in Oahu, Hawai‘i each following its own, differentiated and customized version of “inclusion” in providing special education services within the general classroom. For the purposes of this study, the term inclusion refers to specialized education provided for students eligible for special education within the general class environment, with appropriate supports for the teacher and the student (Giangreco & Putnam, 1991; Lipsky & Gartner, 1997; McLaughlin, Henderson, & Rhim, 1998; and others). Qualitative descriptive data were obtained through classroom observations, informal interviews with teachers, students, school resource personnel and administrators, and a review of related information from Hawai‘i Department of Education (DOE) records and documents.
Statement of the Problem

The numbers of students having diverse learning needs have increased tremendously and continues to grow nationally and locally. Statistics show that 49% of the total student population in Hawai‘i public schools is classified as disadvantaged. This term includes students who are receiving special education service, or are English as Second Language (ESL) learners, and other factors such as living in poverty (Hawai‘i DOE, 2002b). Additionally, the numbers of students eligible for special education services in Hawai‘i doubled from 10,000 students in 1990 to 20,000 in the year 2000. Most of these students are in general classrooms resulting in a greater need for teachers to build professional capacity to meet a wider range of student academic and social abilities.

Inclusion is a way to meet individual and differentiated student needs by bringing instructional supports to the special education students in the general classroom. However, there are few models of effective inclusion in secondary schools in Hawai‘i. The study attempts to explore how two schools have implemented two different and unique models by studying the inclusion classroom.

Each case study tells a story about the way inclusion functions for the teachers and students in their classrooms. The key question is: What does inclusion look like in two Hawai‘i public schools and what characteristics positively or negatively affect student academic achievement? Additional questions in the schooling of students with diverse learning needs are: Are the students academically engaged and challenged? What learning strategies and classroom peer and teacher interactions seem to help the students to learn? What is the quality of the work or curriculum?
The main components of this study were the following:

1. *Individual case studies of two classrooms* included (a) a 7th grade English class at Kulanui Intermediate and High School and (b) a 10th grade English class at Sherman High School. Pseudonyms are used in place of the actual names of the schools to assure anonymity. The common thread of the participant classes was that special and general education students were taught in a class considered to be an *inclusive* classroom. This study looked at perceived levels of success in teaching students with diverse learning needs, characterized by factors, such as improved student grades, social acceptance, student self-direction, student perceptions about their educational experiences, and the perceptions of others in the field, and other factors. Field notes of daily observations during a twelve week period at each school offered rich descriptions of student and teacher activities and interactions that describe teaching and learning in each “inclusive” class setting.

2. *During the data collection phase, new questions emerged* concerning literacy curriculum and instruction, statewide inclusion efforts, and the impact of a lawsuit filed in the state of Hawai‘i relating to the education of students with special learning and emotional needs.

3. *Issues, concerns, or conflicts between federal policy, state directives, educational research, school vision plans, and actual classroom practice* were examined. Outcomes of this study may reveal teaching practices and school and support resources that may be more or less effective than others in helping students of diverse instructional needs to learn. Informal interviews with key
stakeholders such as teachers, students, school and district resource personnel and administrators, expanded the discussion of the findings.

It is important to note that this study explored the characteristics of teaching and learning in two inclusion classes and not on specific programs based on categories of “problem” or “needy” students such as alternative learning centers, remedial tutoring, or resource support programs. This study focused on the general classroom, taught by general and special education teachers, and students with mild learning disabilities in two typical Hawai‘i public schools in urban and rural settings.

Rationale and Significance of the Study

This qualitative study was designed to reveal how inclusion functions by studying the myriad forces and systematic efforts that shape classroom life. A starting point in formulating the key research questions of this study was to investigate an apparent inconsistency between “theory” and the actual practice of inclusion that I found, based on my observations and experiences in classrooms. Much is discussed in educational reform circles concerning inclusion as an ideal learning environment, but a fundamental question is: What is feasible and what does inclusion look like in the classroom? This study explored the everyday challenges faced by the teachers, schools, and students in the two inclusion classes of this study.

Hawai‘i schools are at various stages of implementing inclusion-type programs ranging from a total lack of inclusion, to partial implementation of inclusion, to full inclusion being attempted by some schools. However, the majority of schools continue to use the pull-out or resource room model for students certified in mildly handicapped categories and fully-self-contained classes for students with more severe learning
problems. Students identified with needs in the mildly handicapped categories include those with learning disabilities, mental retardation, emotional disturbance and hearing, visual or health impairments. There is much confusion in the field about the implementation of inclusion along with a need to build the knowledge base of how it works in classrooms (Slaughter & Long, 1992; Yap, 1992; Catlett, 1999). This study describes some of the characteristics, events, aspects of life, activities, and features of the inclusion classroom. Research findings may offer possibilities for positive action and school improvement.

As a teacher and educator in Hawai‘i schools for twenty-eight years, I have struggled with the questions addressed in this research study for many years. My interest in this study stemmed from my experience as a general classroom teacher in elementary, intermediate and high schools, and as a district and state resource teacher. I taught students of predominantly of Hawaiian and other Polynesian and ethnically mixed backgrounds, who had unique and diverse learning needs. In my role as a resource teacher, I have observed many classes in schools throughout the state and I noticed very little consistency and continuity among programs that provide specialized instructional services for students with special learning needs. Furthermore, there appeared to be a lack of focused movement toward inclusion programs. State and district supports to the schools have focused predominantly on legal accountability and its mounting documentation for individual students. I wondered whether the intent of special education law, which is to educate students to maximize student learning and potential, could get lost in the paperwork shuffle. I wanted to explore how students with special learning needs actually learn in the general classroom and I was especially interested in
inclusion efforts. For many classroom teachers in Hawai‘i, there seems to be little
direction or discussion on how to manage and teach a large general class of students with
diverse learning abilities and needs. The outcomes of this study may be of interest to
educational policymakers and Department of Education stakeholders and can contribute
to knowledge about meeting the challenges of “inclusive” teaching in Hawai‘i and
possibly other locations.

I chose the two classes to participate in my study because both were in schools
that developed a specific plan for inclusion, and I felt that there might be much to learn
by taking a closer look. Two of the participant teachers played key roles in planning and
implementing inclusion in their classes and schools. These teachers welcomed the
opportunity to share, to be a part of this study, and they expressed a desire to find out
more about inclusion. Thus, each teacher played a key role in the research process as
professionals in their field with first-hand knowledge.

Research Questions

The main research questions were:

(1) What were the process of implementation and the model of inclusion at each
school?

(2) Were factors that were thought to lead to successful inclusion visible in the
classes studied?

(3) What were the curriculum and instruction, especially related to literacy, in the
inclusion classes?

(4) What were the perceived needs identified by the key participants in order to
effectively implement inclusion?
These questions will be addressed in the format of descriptive narrative to create a portrait of each learning environment. During this study the participant teachers and I engaged in dialogue about the impact of inclusion on the teachers and the students. In studying the two cases, my goal was to describe the inclusion classes, compare differences, and look for patterns. Categories of recurring ideas were established to code groups of observational data. Initially, these included the key questions listed above, and were expanded to reflect emerging ideas revealed in the data. The researcher was not looking for a "formula" or a "one size fits all" set of instructional methods or models. Questions revolved around: What is happening in this setting and what patterns do I see?

As the world of special education in Hawai‘i has been rapidly changing, this study explored how teachers respond and adapt to these changes involving inclusion through the day-to-day issues and challenges that may emerge.

In the next chapter, I present a review of relevant literature about special education, inclusion, Hawai‘i’s system of special education, and other related issues. The researcher built a rationale and framework for this study by looking at what current research tells us about inclusive classrooms and the gap areas of what may be missing in the research literature. Chapter 3 provides a description of the research methodology including data collection, data analysis, and reporting methods. In Chapters 4 and 5 the findings of the study are presented through a narrative about each inclusion classroom as the unit of investigation in the case study. Finally, the patterns prevalent in the two interconnected case studies will be discussed in the final chapters, which are related to current research, relevance of the findings, common themes that emerged from this research, and implications for further research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of related literature to frame this study is presented in three major areas to accommodate the wide spectrum of issues revolving around theory and practice of inclusion. These three major areas are

1. A historical background of special education, its laws and movement from separate services to mainstreaming in the 1980s, and efforts leading to inclusive education in the 1990s. This provides a general description of what inclusion is and how it relates to compliance with federal law.

2. A description of Hawai‘i’s system for identification, eligibility, and placement options to provide appropriate specialized instruction and support services to students;

3. A review of research on special education practices including inclusion, trends, placement issues, and efficacy studies on the outcomes of inclusion, teaching practices, and the implementation process for inclusion programs.

Sources for this literature review include articles in peer-reviewed journals of education, computer internet sites, electronic articles, professional books, and Department of Education federal and state documents.

What is Special Education?

Special education is a broad term indicating a wide array of specialized instructional services for students identified with mild to severe learning problems. Such instruction is usually very individualized, intensive, structured, goal-directed, carefully monitored, and delivered under precise procedural and legal guidelines. This study focuses on students in the mildly handicapped categories, which include learning
disabilities, emotional disturbance, mentally retarded, and health, speech or language impaired categories. In any discussion of special education, it is important to keep in mind that special education is not a place, or a person, or a program, but the delivery of individualized instructional services to help students with special needs to learn.

Legal Background of Special Education

In reviewing the literature on special education in order to frame this study, it is important to look at key legal events in the United States and in Hawai‘i. The most important and influential was Federal Law, PL 94-142, of the Education for All Handicapped Act, enacted in 1975, which required public schools to educate all students with disabilities to the maximum extent possible with their non-disabled peers. The law was reauthorized in 1990 as PL 101-476, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). IDEA mandated a free and appropriate education (FAPE) to provide special education and related services to students with unique physical, mental, emotional, or sensory impairments in the “least restrictive environment” (LRE).

A 1997 amendment to IDEA emphasized a quality education for all students through placement in the least restrictive environment, involvement and participation of general education teachers and parents in the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) process, interagency coordination of services, and increased accountability through formative assessments (U.S. DOE, 1999). Students, who are perceived to be in need of more intensive instruction through special education and related services, are referred for diagnostic evaluation based on set criteria for IDEA eligibility and classification.
**Eligibility and Classification Patterns**

Upon completion of an evaluation by school, district or outside professionals, a school-based team meets to determine eligibility and an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) is developed for students who meet the classification criteria. A written IEP is developed that includes current levels of academic and behavioral performance, instructional goals, placement decisions, necessary accommodations, supplemental services and evaluation procedures to assure that the student's learning needs will be met.

Statistics indicate that the past twenty-five years have seen tremendous growth in the United States in the numbers of students certified to receive special education services, from approximately 8.3% of the total school population in 1977 to 13.3% in the year 2000 (US DOE, NCES, 2003). Special education programs receive separate and extensive federal funding. National expenditures for special education was $78.3 billion in 1999-2000 representing over 21% of the entire budget for all education expenses (President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002).

Students are eligible for IDEA educational services according to 15 disability categories in accordance with federal guidelines, which are described in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Eligibility Classifications for IDEA Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in Hawai'i according to federal guidelines (Federal Register, 1992) are eligible for IDEA educational services according to 15 disability categories:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Indicates mildly handicapped categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-Blindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairments*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Delay (Ages 3-5)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Delay (Ages 6-8)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Language Impairment*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The categories that include 'mildly handicapped' conditions are noted with an asterisk in Figure 1. Students in the participant classes were classified as having learning needs in the mildly handicapping categories, predominantly in the categories of specific learning disability and emotional disturbance. National and local trends show that the classification category with the largest increases is that of students certified in the category of learning disability. The term learning disability is defined as "a heterogeneous group of disorders manifested by significant difficulties in the acquisition and use of listening, speaking, reading, writing, reasoning, or mathematical abilities (Stainback, 1999, p. 32). A student who is shown to have an emotional disturbance may display inappropriate types of behaviors, social interactions, feelings, fears, an inability to maintain personal relationships, or have a pervasive mood of unhappiness (Hawai‘i DOE, 2002a). In this study, approximately 50% of the special needs students in the participant classes were classified as having specific learning disabilities.

Statistics show that the disabilities over 80% of the students serviced in special education between the ages of 6 to 21 are in the four categories of learning disabilities, speech and language impairment, mental retardation and emotional disturbance. National statistics for the year 2000-2001 indicate that 45% of special education students are classified under Specific Learning Disabilities; 17% had Speech/Language Impairments; approximately 10% showed needs for Mental Retardation; and 8% were considered to have an Emotional Disturbance, which accounts for 80% of the special education student population (U.S. DOE, 1999). Students with less incidental and more severe disabilities (such as autism, educationally mentally-retarded, deaf and/or blind, multiple disabilities, and severe health impairments) usually exhibit greater learning problems.
There has been much criticism of the evaluation and classification process in determining special education status for a student, especially for those students classified in the mildly handicapped range. Ysseldyke's (1987) findings from long-term studies indicate that this process is outdated and does not meet the criteria of reliability and logical consistency. Some critics claim that the emphasis on classification, categories of disability and placement are not pedagogically sound (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989; McLaughlin & Henderson, 2000; Ysseldyke, 1987). These critics believe that there is no reliable psychometric methodology for differentiating students into categories, or assuming that students in specific categories learn differently. Furthermore, many educators believe that only a small number of students eligible for special education have a quantifiable disability and that the use of such labels does not inform Individualized Educational Programs (IEPs) or translate to identifiable needed instruction accommodations (Choate, 1997). Generally, the characteristics of students with a learning disability include a wide range of overlapping learning problems, which will be discussed in the next section.

On the other hand, some researchers argue that the increases in numbers of IDEA eligible students are real because of increases in poverty, substance abuse, separated families, and others societal problems (Hallahan, 1992). Hallahan also speculates that the increases in learning disabilities may be partially explained by the increase in academic expectations and the decrease of literacy activities in the home and community because of children's over-involvement with television and video games, sports, and after-school activities.
Characteristics of Special Needs Students

Since most of the students in this study who were eligible for IDEA services were classified as having learning needs in the mildly handicapped categories of learning disabled and emotional disturbance, this section will discuss student characteristics as they relate to these categories. As noted earlier, these students generally do not exhibit a set of common, universal, or specific characteristics in any one special needs category that can be used to plan differentiated instructional practices. In actuality, student performance, based on standardized, norm-referenced assessments, is used to determine eligibility and is usually of little value to the teacher in daily or long-range instructional planning. A common perception about the regular education initiatives, such as mainstreaming and inclusion, is that there is little difference between identified special education students in the mildly handicapped categories and their peers, and that these students should not be separated for instruction (Lipsky & Gartner, 1990; Sigmon, 1990; Stainback & Stainback, 1989; Thousand & Villa, 1992; and Winzer, 2000).

The findings of Ysseldyke (1987), Benner (1997), and others found that students classified as having a learning disability have overlapping characteristics with those perceived to be academically at-risk, marginal, hyperactive, and remedial. Some common characteristics of these students were that they showed poor attendance, failing or low grades, and negative attitudes toward school. An alarming finding in the literature is that hyperactive children, males, students with behavior problems, and students of cultural and linguistic diversity are often over-represented in the ‘learning disabled’ population throughout the country (McLesky, Henry & Axelrod, 1999; Salend, 1998; Ysseldyke & Algozzine, 1987; and others). This trend is also prevalent in Hawai‘i. For
example, students of part-Hawaiian ancestry have been over-represented in the special education statistics when compared to the total school population. In 1997, part-Hawaiian students comprised 23% of the total school population and 36% of the population of special education students in the state (Kamehameha Schools, 1999). This raises important questions about culture, learning, and testing that are beyond the scope of this study.

Ysseldyke, Algozzine & Thurlow (1992) concluded after a series of studies that the most important decision made in special education certification is the decision to refer the student for testing (usually based on low or failing grades, underachievement, or behavior problems) and that this initial referral most likely leads to identification and continued placement in special education throughout the student’s school years. An earlier study by Ysseldyke (1987) found that 92% of students who are referred are tested, and of those tested, 73% become eligible for special education services. Critics of traditional special education practices believe that mild learning and behavior problems should not be used interchangeably or under the umbrella terms of disabilities or handicaps (Lipsky & Gartner, 1990; Sigmon, 1990; Stainback & Stainback, 1989; Thousand & Villa, 1992).

Students with Academic Needs Not Eligible for Special Education

Many students in today’s classrooms have special learning needs but may not be eligible to receive IDEA services because they do not meet specific eligibility criteria. For example, the eligibility criteria that, “students must demonstrate a severe discrepancy between achievement and intellectual ability” in order to qualify for services under the category of learning disability can be vague and arbitrary (Hawai‘i DOE, 2002a). States
define the meaning of what “severe” in different ways. In Hawai‘i, a student who performs substantially below his or her peers in academic achievement in basic literacy and mathematical skills will qualify for special education services if this discrepancy is below his or her intellectual ability (based on intelligence test scores).

Often, students do not qualify for special education services because they may have a low intellectual potential and low achievement and thus do not show the discrepancy between cognitive functioning and achievement. However, these students may have learning problems and are frequently referred to as the “gap” group of students. These students may also be labeled as “504 cases” (explained below), “low achievers”, “slow learners”, “marginal”, “troubled”, or “at-risk.” With the certification of more and more students (partly due to the threat of lawsuits), this gap may be narrowing, and there is the possibility of ‘over certification’. However, this gap does exist and was evident in the inclusion classes that were studied in this research. The range of diversity in general classrooms are increasing, as there are more students with cultural and linguistic differences, emotional and behavioral problems, and various learning abilities creating greater school challenges for the teacher.

Another important federal law in the literature is Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disabilities by any institution that receives federal funds. Students classified under “Section 504” may have a physical handicap, attention deficit disorder, dyslexia, or other disability for which accommodations need to be made in order for the student to make adequate progress in school. A Modification Plan (MP) is developed for these students, which is similar to an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) that describes modifications and
accommodations needed to meet the students’ learning needs. These “504” educational services and accommodations do not come with federal funding and these students are always taught in general education classes. However, there has been little data or research during the past three decades since the Rehabilitation Act was enacted on the effectiveness of the modification plans for students (President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002).

As educators learn more about appropriate placements and instructional practices in the general classroom, which is the focus of this study, it is hoped that all students will benefit. It is not uncommon to have students with varying needs in one classroom, such as diverse language and cultural differences, emotional or behavioral problems, a “504” handicap, a specific learning disability, and those with histories of poor achievement or failing grades. Both classes in this study had a large proportion of students with varying and diverse learning needs.

Placement Patterns

It is important to review placement patterns in understanding the movement towards more inclusive class settings. Once a student is identified as eligible for special education, a placement is planned during an IEP team meeting for where, when and what specialized instruction will take place. The IEP team includes key people who have a stake in the student’s education such as parents, teachers, administrators, outside service providers, school counselors, and other staff involved with the delivery of services. Appropriate placement for the provision of specialized instruction should be provided to each student based on his or her learning needs.
A continuum of placement options from the least to the most restrictive environment has been described in the literature (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2000) and in Hawai‘i Department of Education documents. A placement indicates where the needed specialized instructional services and supports will be provided. The IDEA law was worded in such a way to end the segregation of students with disabilities into separate classes or programs in its mandate for education in the least restrictive environment. The Annual Report to Congress (U.S. DOE, 1991) lists six placement options: a general education classroom, resource room, separate class, separate school facility, residential facility, or home/hospital environment.

The National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (1993) of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), in a policy statement on inclusion, stated that the availability of placement options required by law at each school should include:

- Special classes to provide intensive, highly individualized instruction;
- Resource assistance that provides specific skill instruction daily or several times each week focused on individual needs;
- Consultation to provide support to general education teachers who have students with learning disabilities.
- Accommodations and modifications in the general classroom that provide the less-intensive support needed for individual students to meet group expectations.

The National Education Association (1992) also called for appropriate inclusion characterized by practices and programs that provide a continuum of services within each placement option, professional development, adequate coordinated and collaborative planning time, reasonable class sizes, and staff and technical assistance to meet teacher
and student needs. In order to make adequate progress in school, students with learning disabilities may need consultation, support services, or direct instruction by a specially trained teacher in a general or separate setting.

It is interesting to note that placement patterns in schools throughout the nation vary from state to state by disability category. For example, Iowa placed 1% of its students with specific learning disabilities in regular education classes while Vermont placed 95% (Lipsky & Gardner, 1997). The Hawai‘i Department of Education (DOE) compiles data indicating the amount of time students spend in general and separate educational settings (which will be provided in a later section) but does not have data on numbers of students who are taught in inclusion classes. However, in visiting schools in Hawai‘i in my role as a resource teacher, I observed that placement patterns varied from schools where all special education students were pulled out for individualized, specialized instruction to schools where no students were taught in separate settings.

This inconsistency in placement patterns nationally and locally raises interesting questions. Furthermore, a review of data and current research indicate no discernible instructional rationale or continuity between disability classification, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), and placement decisions (Benner, 1997). A pertinent question to ask in relation to this study is: How prevalent is inclusion? However, this is a difficult question to answer, as much of the data on numbers of special education students taught in general classes are inconclusive or unclear. According to Reynolds, Wang, and Walberg (1987), the lack of consistency in defining and reporting categories and placements of students adds to large disparities among states.
Literature and statistics on more recent placement and instructional delivery patterns show an increase in inclusion efforts since the mid-1980s; however, it varies from school to school and state by state. Statistics reported in the *Twentieth Annual Report to Congress* (U.S. DOE, 1999) found that 45% of students, ages 6-21, with special needs attended general classes, 29% attended resource or pullout classes; 22% were in separate classes; and 4% were in separate schools or settings. Another analysis found that placements of students with special needs have changed little during the past twenty-years (Kluth, Villa, & Thousand, 2002). From 1977 until 1990 the number of students in general classes and resource rooms increased by only 1.2% (68% in 1977 and 69.2% in 1990). This is also confusing since Hawai‘i doesn’t collect this data and other states most likely do not collect it either. It is also important to keep in mind that these statistics include students who spend any amount of time in any general class or resource room yet this data doesn’t specify whether these settings are inclusion classes. Additionally, these placement categories may be too broad and misleading, as many students who attend inclusive general classes also attend resource room settings. Furthermore, the location of special education services can be grouped together as separate special education classrooms or as general classrooms on the student’s IEP without differentiating how much time is spent in each setting.

The trend in Hawai‘i shows that elementary inclusion programs are more common with more secondary schools implementing or moving towards inclusion. However, more students classified as having a learning disability or emotional disturbance are in general classes at the secondary level, but these may not necessarily be inclusion classes. Hawai‘i statistics were not available for students who are serviced in
inclusion classes or for schools that have implemented inclusion. Although there has been an increase in mainstreaming and inclusive class arrangements, most special education is still delivered in the form of separate class instruction for students with special learning needs.

Least Restrictive Environment

With the passage of the Education For All Handicapped Children Act (PL-94-142, 1975), the term least restrictive environment (LRE) was established to place students as close to mainstream general education with non-disabled peers as possible to provide a "free and appropriate education (FAPE).” Amendments in 1990 and 1997 changed the name to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Initially mainstreaming was the answer to this call for students who were determined to be “ready and able” to learn and who could function appropriately in one or two general education classes throughout the school day. Usually these were elective classes such as music and art where the least amount of accommodations would be necessary. It is important to keep in mind that a continuum of services and placement options should be available when determining individual student placement rather than a “one size fits all” school policy. Any standardization in educational placement may not be in compliance with the IDEA law, if it does not provide a continuum of available placements to meet a variety of student needs and disabilities.

Movement from Separation to Inclusive Practices

In reviewing the literature tracing the movement of special education towards inclusion, it is necessary to describe some key events. In its early history, special education was provided in separate schools to meet the educational needs of handicapped
students (deaf, blind, severe mental retardation, multiple disability) in the United States. The underlying belief was that disabled students needed separate, special instruction in different settings taught by specially trained teachers. The evolution of special education as separate programs towards less restrictive teaching environments for students with special needs paralleled civil rights events in the United States. The civil rights movement during the 1950s and 1960s raised awareness of individual rights, human dignity, equal opportunity and respect for all Americans. A landmark case, *Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) declared that separate education was not equal for African-American students who were excluded from some schools. This raised public awareness to question all educational exclusionary practices. As more students with learning and other disabilities attended public schools, ‘special’ education was provided in separate classes in schools.

Some landmark court cases questioned the large numbers of minorities and students with disabilities in low-level, special classes (*Pennsylvania ARC v. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 1972; *Larry P. v Riles*, 1979; *Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia*, 1972; and *Oberti vs. the Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon School District*, 1993). Since the passage of PL 94-142 (Educational for All Handicapped Act, 1975), when federal funding was provided for the education of students with disabilities, more and more students became certified in all categories, especially the mildly handicapped categories.

The reauthorization as IDEA (1990) sparked an increased awareness of the term *least restrictive environment* (LRE) and the provision of a *free and appropriate education* (FAPE). As more students became eligible for special education services, there was a
greater awareness of the need for delivery of specialized instruction and placement of students closer to the educational mainstream, the general classroom, as the least restrictive environment.

**Mainstreaming**

In the 1980s, common interpretations of *least restrictive environment* used by many educators were found in the use of the terms *integration* and *mainstreaming*. Integration and mainstreaming usually refer to educating students with disabilities for a portion of the day in one or more selected general classrooms with their peers, usually during non-academic times such as art, physical education, or music (Clark, Dyson, Millward, & Skidmore, 1997). The underlying belief was that students who spent their day in special classes should be exposed to some general classes, especially those who showed that they were capable of participating in general class activities.

Mainstreaming is described as educational placement for special education students based on the conviction that each child should be educated in the least restrictive environment in which his educational and related needs can be satisfactorily met (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2000). Levels of mainstreaming can range from social mainstreaming through planned social interactions and academic subject mainstreaming to system-wide mainstreaming. Historically, mainstreaming became a prelude to inclusion as special education students were moved to general classes throughout the day. An underlying and unfortunate belief for mainstreaming was that these students needed to prove or earn their right to show how they function in a general classroom. If a student could not “keep up”, he or she would be sent back to the segregated special education class. Mainstreaming emphasizes social goals whereas the needed academic
accommodations and instructional supports may or may not have been provided in the mainstreamed classes. On the other hand, inclusion maintains in-class accommodations and supports to meet students’ academic goals, which will be discussed in the next section (McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998; Wade, 2000).

A movement known as the regular education initiative (REI) advocated for a merger of special and regular education. Advocates for students with mild learning disabilities supported the regular education initiative (Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1988). The rationale was that students with mild handicapping conditions such as learning disability speech and language impairment and emotional and behavioral handicaps were indistinguishable from other low-achieving and marginal students and that these students should not be separated for instruction. REI advocates emphasized academic goals and a movement into general education classes. A program to support REI was the ALEM, the Adaptive Learning Environments Model (Wang, Reynolds, & Zollers, 1990). This movement raised awareness of collaboration between regular and special education teachers and the use of instructional practices to modify and adapt teaching and learning to meet individual student’s learning needs.

What is Inclusion?

In order to frame this study, a definition of the term inclusion is needed. The term inclusion creates challenges for a researcher because many educators have vague ideas about what it is and practices perceived as inclusive vary from school to school and from study to study. This creates confusion in the field. For example, some schools consider themselves “full inclusion schools” and provide general instruction for all students in any
certification category from mild to severe handicapping conditions. Some schools offer inclusion as part of continuum of placements as appropriate to student needs.

Many educators use the terms integration, inclusion, and mainstreaming interchangeably, which also leads to confusion especially for researchers studying inclusion efforts in schools. Philosophically, inclusion is not merely placing students with special learning needs into general classes but providing them with the tools to be successful. An underlying rationale for inclusion for all students reflects the values for equality and quality in education and society and that it is the student’s right to be taught the same academic content and to have the same expectations as their peers.

Inclusion programs have been referred to as full inclusion, integration, unified system, integrated system, supported education, inclusive education, and heterogeneous education in the literature (Salend, 1998; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996). Many educators also use the terms mainstreaming and regular education initiative (REI) in discussing inclusion. While these initiatives raised awareness of inclusion, perceptions differed about the level of specialized instruction and supports that were provided in the general classes to meet the diverse learning needs of all students. With mainstreaming, many students also attended other separate special education classes during the school day.

Fuchs and Fuchs (1998) discussed a different view of inclusion in use of the term full inclusion as total school inclusion. Full inclusion represents an “all-or-nothing” view that regular classes are where all students should be regardless of their disability or needs, and that the main goal should be social acceptance and skills. Full inclusion is in contrast with inclusion where students are taught in general classes based on their learning goals.
Inclusion classes are usually offered as one option on a continuum of placements, whereas there are no separate classes for any students in full inclusion schools.

Proponents for inclusion and full-inclusion seem to have different agendas in that they advocate for different children with different needs (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1998). Inclusion for high incidence mild disabilities such as learning disabilities, behavior disorders and mild mental retardation has focused mainly on academic skills (Wilson, 1999). On the other hand, educators who advocate for full inclusion tend to represent students with more severe handicaps. Statistically the students who are least likely to be placed in general classes are those with severe handicapping conditions such as multiple disability, mental retardation, deaf-blind or autistic (U.S. DOE, 1996). There are presumptions in the belief that regular classroom can meet all needs and concerns.

As mentioned earlier, there is much variation in the literature defining and characterizing inclusion. It is important to note that as more schools implement inclusion, perceptions and definitions may change through more direct experiences. During this study, the researcher asked many educators in Hawai‘i about their definition of inclusion. Their answers were vague, and many thought it was the same as mainstreaming or asked the researcher for a definition.

An analysis of definitions and perceptions in the literature on inclusion indicates that most educators perceive inclusion as a merger of special and regular education in offering specialized instruction in the general heterogeneous classrooms. I analyzed definitions from thirty articles by researchers and educators about inclusion and found the following elements were most commonly used in defining inclusion:
Catlett (1999) provided a definition that was developed from an analysis of definitions that were reviewed by a panel of experts who came to a consensus on one definition. In Catlett’s study inclusion was defined by five components: (a) students attend their neighborhood school, (b) categories are used only for determining eligibility for services rather than labeling students, (c) support including adaptations and modifications are individualized and consistently used, (d) all students receive education and needed services in a general classroom, and (e) students follow the same daily routines, activities, and schedules as their classmates and any modifications are justified by the student’s individualized educational program. The panel further agreed that the inclusion is ongoing and should not be sporadic or episodic (Catlett, 1999). It is interesting to note that most researchers and practitioners discuss inclusion in terms of placement. However, the significance of any definition of inclusion is how it is implemented in actual practice in the classroom.

In this study, teachers and their students with mildly handicapping conditions in two inclusion classes in Hawai’i at the secondary level will be the major focus. The
following definition will be used in this research inquiry:

An inclusion classroom is one in which students identified with learning needs and eligible for IDEA services receive specialized instruction in the general classroom along with their peers as a legal, ethical, and an educational right to a quality appropriate education through the joint efforts of special and general education teachers (Giangreco & Putnam, 1991; Lipsky & Gartner, 1997; Wilson, 1999).

Research on Inclusion

As described above, much of the influential literature in the field of special education has been about federal legislation, its legal mandates, and statistics related to numbers and categories of students throughout the years. While the legal mandate is to move toward more inclusive programs, it has not dramatically changed student placement patterns. The inherent philosophy of inclusion is that students are most appropriately educated along with their same-age peers to prepare them to be contributing members of a diverse society, and that separate education is perceived as inequitable and unethical. This view has gained increased support not only from legislation but also from critics of traditional special education programs (Will, 1986; Lipsky & Gartner, 1989).

Although efficacy studies on inclusion have not shown specific achievement data, its proponents emphasize the negative effects of separate, resource services such as low-level instruction and the stigma of tracking. For many educators inclusion relates to a student’s right to be part of the general school community and transcends merely placing students with special learning needs in general classes (Wilson, 1999). Educators have asked: Is inclusion a civil right for all students or is it one avenue on a continuum of
many ways to educate students to achieve their academic potential? In discussing inclusion, it is always important to keep in mind that every student has a right to a free and appropriate education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) with appropriate instructional services and supports.

Most educators agree that general and special educators should be working together in the inclusion classroom to offer differentiated, individualized and intensive instruction based on a student’s learning needs. Special education teachers in general class settings are frequently considered the “experts” in meeting diverse individual learning needs. For example, they may know multiple ways to teach reading or how to make adaptations to accommodate the student’s learning needs. As general and special education teachers collaborate more, perceived roles may change through instructional partnering in inclusion classes, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Positions of Professional Organizations

Various professional organizations have presented position statements on student placement in general classes to meet least restrictive environment (LRE) mandates. The Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE, 1993) said in a position statement that they do not support inclusion for all students, but do support the goal of a unified educational system to prepare all students for full participation in an integrated and diverse society. CASE believes that the schools should be accountable for meeting the educational needs of all students and that the trend has moved from focusing on placement setting towards delivery of instructional services.

Additionally, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC, 1993) prepared a policy that supports inclusion as a meaningful goal for educating all students. CEC states that
students eligible for IDEA services should have available a continuum of placement options and be taught in general education classrooms only when supported by specially trained teachers and support practices to meet their individual needs. The Council for Learning Disabilities (1993) also has stated that they cannot support the indiscriminate full-time placement of all students with learning disabilities in the regular education classroom or any policy that minimizes service options to meet the educations needs of students in need of special education. Generally, these professional organizations support inclusion (conditionally) with adequate instructional supports to meet students’ needs.

Inclusion and Legal Mandates

As described earlier, inclusion has been a structural, philosophical, and educational policy decision, based on a requirement to place students who qualify to receive special education services in the least restrictive environment (LRE). However, federal guidelines for implementation of LRE are vague and are interpreted at schools in various ways ranging from resource room services (pull-out during part of school day), mainstreaming (student attends some special education classes and some regular education classes during school day), to inclusion classes (students receive specialized instruction in regular class). Neither terms inclusion, mainstreaming, nor integration are used in the definition or wording of IDEA law.

The IDEA law not only mandated that students be taught in the least restrictive environment but also that schools offer specialized instruction on a continuum of placement options. The law requires that placement be based on individual student needs to determine what the least restrictive environment to the maximum extent possible is for each student. Furthermore, the law states that schools will educate children with
disabilities in the setting that they would be in if they had no disabilities, except when the nature and severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be satisfactorily achieved (IDEA, 1990). IEP teams must specify what this means for each student.

As discussed earlier, there is great disparity and variety of placement patterns among schools nationally and in the state of Hawai‘i, which raises questions about why this is so. One speculation is that placement may be based on school resources and staffing rather than on individual student needs. Other factors such as philosophy of staff and desires of parents may impact placement decisions. Many educators believe that funding is a major determinant of eligibility and placement decisions. Another common practice is to use categories of disabilities to determine placement (Ysseldyke, 1987). For example, a school may place all students who are severely handicapped in separate or fully self-contained classes, and place all students categorized as learning disabled in general classes. In Hawai‘i some schools haven’t even started to discuss inclusion while others have planned and implemented various inclusion programs.

Again, it is important to keep in mind that student services within a continuum of placement options are intended to be unique to individual student needs. Many educators believe that each student should have a basic “floor of opportunity”, including supplement supports, to benefit from general education, and that all students should first be placed in the regular classroom (Lipsky & Gartner, 1997). Whether inclusion should be the first placement or the only placement is an important decision for schools to address. In the Hawai‘i schools that were studied, most students were given a ‘floor of opportunity’ to be placed first in general classes.
Kauffman & Hallahan (1995b) suggests the provision of specialized, intensive, individualized instruction is the key factor for student success rather than a student's placement as the location of specialized education. Critics of general class placements argue that students who are eligible for IDEA services need to be taught differently in order to succeed, and that separate classes and resource rooms actually help many students with learning disabilities make greater academic progress (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1998.) This rationale is based on the idea that special education is specially designed instruction based on individual student needs that must be planned and carefully coordinated and delivered, rather than indiscriminately. Fuchs and Fuchs (1998) suggest three guiding principles that characterize the relationship between regular and special effective instruction (a) high expectations of all students, (b) valid accountability systems, and (c) implementation of best instructional practices. Crockett and Kaufman (1998, p. 76) ask an interesting question: Can the inclusion pendulum settle somewhere in middle ground where educators can have multiple perspectives coupled with a greater understanding of what specialized instruction is?

Research on Efficacy of Special Education Programs

Much of the literature on special education programs has emphasized legal compliance, identification and classification of students, and placement issues. A key question relates to the academic achievement outcomes for students. Much of the research on efficacy of special education programs has had mixed and contradictory results. There have been very few studies on measured achievement for students receiving special education services (Clark, Dyson, Millward, & Skidmore, 1997; McLeskey, Henry, & Axelrod, 1999; Salend, 1994; Vaughn, Klinger, & Hughes, 2000;
and others). Generally, findings indicate that whatever the placement, students receiving special education services continue to achieve at lower levels than their peers and show higher drop-out rates, absenteeism, and post-secondary unemployment. Crockett & Kaufman (1998, p. 77) claim, “Where we’ve gone wrong in special education is that we haven’t followed how students have done. We have not interpreted ‘appropriate’ as empirically derived by student outcomes.”

Algozzine, Morsink, and Algozzine (1986) reviewed efficacy studies of traditional separate special education programs and concluded that there is little evidence of academic accomplishment. Their findings indicated that some of the problems with segregated programs included stigmatization of labeling, lack of student progress in relation to peers, and unconnected course content in separate, lower level instruction especially for students with mild learning disabilities. Furthermore, it is estimated that approximately 80% of students with specific learning disabilities have reading difficulties (President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002). Some researchers believe that separate education through special education has had more negative consequences for these students. Studies have shown that when special education students are provided with instructional supports and appropriate accommodations they can achieve more in integrated classes than in separate classes (Salend, 2001).

Studies of Special Education in Hawai‘i

At the time of this study, the state of Hawai‘i kept very little data on student outcomes and or the efficacy of special education programs. Other than the attainment of IEP objectives, data are not reported on overall program impact. One study of special education programs in Hawai‘i focused on the identification of eligible students, and the
provision of specialized instructional services and its effectiveness, rather than on the attainment of IEP objectives (Yap, 1992). Yap concluded that definitional confusion about classifications and an emphasis on low academic achievement has led to overrepresentation of students certified in Hawai‘i as having a learning disability and on a lesser scale certification for an emotional disturbance. Yap claims that the identification process is unclear, inconsistent and may be biased in over-certification of culturally and linguistically diverse students. In 2000, 45% of special education students in Hawai‘i were classified as having a Learning Disability (Hawai‘i DOE, 2002b).

In interviewing 300 elementary and secondary students in all school districts Yap (1992) found that students generally liked their special classes for the following reasons: (a) the teacher talked slower; (b) classes were smaller; (c) the work was easy; and (d) the student received more rewards and more individual help. The students also felt that they would never leave special education and did not feel confident in a regular class. Intermediate and high school students expressed a greater desire to be in general classes with their peers. High school students felt the work was too easy in pullout or resource classes and they worried that they were falling too much behind in mastering general content. The positive aspects of the special education programs were that the teachers were caring, dedicated, and committed.

Yap (1992) concluded that the attributes of separate special education classes such as slower pace, individualized attention, and simplifying steps to learning became the barriers for success in mastering grade-level curriculum standards, and that the students need more rigorous learning at an accelerated pace in order to catch up. Compounding these instructional and identification problems has been a lack of certified trained
teachers, large class sizes, and inadequate resources. Yap recommended reform of special education programs in Hawai‘i toward integrating special and regular education to meet the student need, especially learning needs in the mildly handicapped categories. He suggests that students with mild learning disabilities can be successful in a regular classroom with appropriate instructional supports and that there was not sufficient empirical data to support the effectiveness of separate special education programs.

*Efficacy Studies of Inclusion*

While there is much in the research about teacher attitudes and legal ramifications in the movement toward inclusion, there is little discussion about the indicators of successful inclusion programs. Many studies on inclusion have focused on the social benefits and humanistic ideals of inclusion versus traditional separate class placements and procedures to comply with special education laws (Lipsky & Gardner, 1997; McLesky, Henry, & Axelrod, 1999). However, some research on inclusion during the past five years has moved from these debates to more promising studies on academic and social gains and effective teaching and learning practices in inclusion programs.

The data of research reports about the efficacy of inclusion programs appear inconclusive (Lipsky & Gartner, 1989; Manset & Semmel, 1997; and others). It is important to keep in mind that many findings are difficult to interpret because each study varies according to where, when, how, who, and what is being studied. Factors that affect research on inclusion include varying definitions of inclusion, varying needs of student participants with mild to severe disabilities, varying settings, and varying educator perspectives. Moreover, it has been difficult to study academic student outcomes of inclusion classes compared to segregated classes because the settings of
these studies have different instructional structures. Usually separate special education classes are smaller and more conducive to intensive, direct, individual and small group instruction.

Many traditional special education programs emphasize breaking tasks into small parts, positive reinforcement techniques, fragmented and decontextualized instruction, and the use of structured learning strategies. Little data and contradictory results show that it is unclear whether traditional separate placements are effective. Later in this dissertation I will discuss the issue of individualization and specialized instruction in the inclusion classes revealed through the findings of this study.

In reviewing studies relating to efficacy and best practices of inclusion programs, I found that many studies focused on teacher attitudes, student attitudes, collaborative teaming issues, school and district reform efforts, and inclusion in elementary classes. As mentioned earlier, there have been few studies on inclusion at the high school level. While studies on the efficacy of inclusion programs have had controversial and mixed findings, many do indicate a strong trend toward improved student outcomes (academically, socially, and behaviorally) and more equitable instruction (Benner 1997; Nieto, 1999; Salend, 1998; and others).

What is consistent throughout the literature is that students in inclusion classes are exposed to more rigorous curriculum and experience greater social acceptance. Hunt and Goetz (1997) reviewed 19 inclusion programs and concluded that students with all types of disabilities benefit through increased self-esteem, confidence, and more positive, social relationships and increased academic achievement. Social benefits of inclusion include greater tolerance, self-confidence, and self-reliance in settings where co-teaching
took place (Walter-Thomas, Korinek, McLaughlin, & Williams, 1999). Salend and Duhaney (1999) found that academic performance of students with special learning needs in inclusion classes was equal to that of general education students. Baker and Zigmond’s (1995) meta-analysis of effects of inclusion found that there was a small to moderate positive effect on academic and social skills in elementary schools. Logan, Bakermans, and Keefe (1997) conducted a qualitative study of 29 inclusion classes in four schools and found that variables such as small group, one-to-one instruction, and independent work activities showed a higher engagement rate than whole group instruction.

Various studies on the most effective placements for students with special needs found that students with all types of disabilities show greater social and academic outcomes in general education classes than students in separate special education classes which were viewed as remedial programs (Thousand & Villa, 1999; Collier, 1995). Another study (Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis & Goetz, 1994) found that special education students in inclusive classes had higher quality IEPs and higher levels of academic engagement compared with students in segregated settings. McLeskey, Henry and Axelrod’s (1990) studies on inclusion also found that benefits for students were improved self-esteem, increased social growth and acceptance, higher expectations from teachers, and exposure to a broader range of academic content. Successful co-teaching and collaborative teaming between special and general education teachers have been shown to have a positive impact on student outcomes in inclusion classes. Studies have shown that positive effects occur for both special and general education students as they reap the benefits of having two teachers (Slavin, Karweit, & Madden, 1989).
There are few qualitative studies on effective practices of inclusion programs at the secondary level. A qualitative study (Ferguson, et al., 1992) conducted at six secondary schools during a two-year period, examined the roles of teachers in facilitating inclusion. Findings showed that consultative and collaborative roles facilitated social and academic outcomes in inclusion classes. Mastropieri and Scruggs (1994) have studied effective instructional practices in teaching secondary students in the content areas.

Research Trends Related to Inclusion

An important trend has been that integrated and long-term inclusion programs have become part of overall school reform efforts. A key component for school improvement is a shared vision of clearly defined school goals especially on the expectations for inclusion. This involves teachers having a clear conceptual understanding of inclusion and the tools in which to implement such a program. Inclusion requires shifts in basic beliefs, philosophies, and a “buy-in” of all staff to work towards their shared inclusion goals through teaming, professional development, utilizing adequate resources, and other steps towards effective inclusion. Most teachers would agree that the term *inclusion* represents a more democratic, equitable, inclusive and humanistic ideal in schooling. However, many educators are uncertain if inclusion is method, a goal, a philosophy, a right, a model, a treatment, a policy, or a placement.

Giangreco and Doyle (2000) describe how new ideas are slowly replacing common misconceptions about special education, such as (a) the idea that general education teachers are not capable of teaching students with special needs, (b) that only special education teachers have the specialized training to teach these students, (c) that special
education is a separate place, a type of student or a room, and (d) that all students should be taught a specific curriculum based on their grade level.

As described earlier, there is a wide array of literature affirming the efficacy, humanism, and idealism of inclusion programs but few studies on how to effectively implement inclusion and deliver effective instruction in the school settings (Baker & Zigmond, 1995; Hines & Johnson, 1997; Salend, 1998; and others). Instructional practices have the greatest potential for improving student achievement.

*Instructional Practices and Student Supports for Effective Inclusion*

Characteristics of effective teaching and learning (Lezotte, 1990; Nieto, 1999) are frequently described in studies of effective inclusion practices. These studies identified some critical, key instructional components to look for in the participant classes. Effective strategies for inclusion teaching emphasize the idea that “good teaching is good teaching” for all students. What we know about effective instruction such as cooperative and collaborative student learning, scaffolding techniques, appropriate classroom management, and differentiation refers to good teaching for all students.

Scruggs and Mastropieri (1995) studied effective instructional practices in teaching secondary students in the content. They developed a plan for teaching students with learning disabilities in general classes called the PASS variables. These include

1. Prioritize objectives;
2. Adapt instruction, materials, or the environment;
3. Use systematic instruction variables during teaching (structure, clarity, redundancy, enthusiasm, pacing, engagement, questioning and feedback);
4. Implement systematic evaluation procedures.
In any classroom study, it is also important to explore the mode of learning, such as through direct instruction, transmission of facts, or through mutual discovery by teachers and students. Cooperative learning has been identified as one of the most important instructional strategies for inclusive education. However, the term cooperative learning can be too broad and should involve more than merely putting students in a group and assigning roles to complete an academic task or project. Effective collaboration is dependent on how the teacher promotes interactions to enable students to build on their language, experience, and thinking in learning new knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978). Nieto (1999) discussed the idea of instruction within a framework of social justice where the interactions between students and teachers are more important to student success than the content or the instructional method.

Interactive, inquiry-based approaches to learning promote active and social construction of knowledge. Activities that draw on a student’s prior knowledge, experience, language, and thinking are usually more meaningful and thus more engaging. Skinner and Belmont (1993) examined reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement over the school year and found the structure, support, and involvement offered by teachers had a strong impact on student engagement. The more supports through teacher and peer interactions that the students received resulted in higher academic engagement and achievement. Furthermore, participatory approaches can be more consistent with a student’s culture and language. Wade & Zone (2000) and others discuss the value of participatory cooperative learning projects and differentiated instruction through strategy instruction, coaching and cueing (e.g., concept mapping and think aloud strategies) and opportunities to apply new knowledge. Giangreco and Doyle
(2000) also discussed emerging new standards that incorporate the principles of good teaching and learning that should be the same for all students whether they have a disability or not. Challenging curriculum content and modality of teaching plays an important role in students’ motivation, engagement, and their ability to make meaningful connections between learning and their own experience. A common goal of teaching and learning is to build opportunities for discussing, sharing, and mutual discovery.

Some ways that teachers can help students attain curriculum goals are through multi-level instruction and curriculum overlapping (Giangreco & Doyle, 2000; McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998). Through multi-level instruction and curriculum, all students in the same class can have access to the same curriculum content but objectives and tasks may vary to meet individual learning needs. Individual student needs can be addressed at the student’s developmental level within the standard curriculum content. For example, students can be reading the same novel but the goal for one student might be to comprehend the main events and ideas whereas another student might be writing a critical review. Curriculum overlapping is another way to make accommodations with curriculum and instruction. Students can work together in shared activities but have different expectations for learning outcomes that overlap. For example, a goal for one student could be to learn to cooperate socially with others, and another student might be working on content objectives. It is important not to underestimate what a student with special needs can achieve when given equal access and opportunity to a quality curriculum. With differentiated instruction, students can be given more time or can approach learning activities in different ways. Other effective strategies could be coaching the students using a “think aloud” (a form of modeling), accessing students’
prior knowledge, using visuals and hands-on activities, and explicitly teaching new concepts.

The quality of instruction in the classroom is the key determinant of student learning. Gravois, Rosenfield, and Vail, (1999) summarized some of the key aspects of instructional components in inclusion classes:

- Maximize student-teacher interactions (positive, rapport, questioning skills, adequate response time, cueing and coaching strategies, frequent corrective feedback).
- Use cooperative learning to increase opportunities for all students to participate.
- Conduct ongoing appropriate formative assessment of student’s strengths and needs.
- Foster academic engagement, which has a strong positive correlation with student learning.
- Classroom management and student behavior intervention skills are a critical prerequisite for student academic and social achievement.
- Foster adequate collaboration among professionals to maximize classroom support.

These elements have been described in the literature as promising practices for effective inclusion and will be explored in this study. Inclusion aims to provide specialized instruction and accommodations to meet individual student needs while meeting whole class teaching and learning challenges. Without effective instructional supports, special education students in general classrooms can be set up for failure. On the other hand, some characteristics of heterogeneously grouped instruction, such as whole class presentations and the use of common materials and evaluation methods for all students, may not be effective in inclusion classes.
Supports for Teachers

One of the most important components for successful inclusion is teacher support. Good collaboration between the general classroom teacher and the special education classroom teacher has been shown to be a critical part of teacher support (Thousand & Villa, 1992; McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998). This type of collaboration involves new roles for both teachers in the inclusion classroom, which have been described in the literature as co-teaching, team teaching, or collaborative teaching.

Teacher collaboration. Collaboration occurs when various people cooperatively plan and implement activities. Co-teaching is defined as two or more professionals delivering substantive instruction to a group of students with diverse learning needs; both are jointly responsible for evaluating student progress (Lawton, 1999). Research has shown that effective teaming increases instructional options, delivers substantive instruction to students with diverse needs, and provides support to professionals. Co-teaching also minimizes stigmatization since the same teachers teach all students, which increases acceptance (Slavin, Karweit, & Madden 1989). Furthermore, all students can reap the rewards of being taught by two or more teachers in the same class.

There is much variation in how teachers fulfill their roles and responsibilities in inclusion classes, and varying levels of teacher support. For example, the special education teacher can have a primary, secondary, or coequal role in helping students in general classrooms. Giangreco, Vandercook, and MacDonald (1992) identified four types of support among school staff: resource, moral (trust, sharing feelings), technical (concrete instructional strategies, methods or ideas), and evaluative. The type and intensity of support varies based on teacher and student needs and school resources.
Hargreaves (1997) identified attributes of teacher collaboration as being spontaneous, voluntary, development-oriented, pervasive across time and space, and unpredictable. Hargreaves contrasts these attributes of collaboration with features of "contrived collegiality" which are administratively controlled, regulated, compulsory, implementation-oriented, fixed in time and space, and predictable. These ideas will be explored in the discussion of the findings on collaboration among the inclusion teachers.

Wood (1993) described three stages in the process of changing teachers' roles as they accept special education students into regular classes. These three components of change are physical changes, role changes, and collaborative changes. In the beginning stages of inclusion, the teachers maintain specific role boundaries through an informal clear division of labor. Throughout the year, the role perceptions become less rigid as the teaming becomes more cooperative. Initially, the regular education teacher is appreciated for opening the doors to their class and helping students with special needs to increase academic and social opportunities. Wood (1993) notes that, at first, the burden or main responsibility is on the special education teacher for curricular modifications and academic outcomes. However, as time progresses, both teachers arrive at a place in shared teamwork, less role rigidity, more cooperative teaming, and true collaboration, rather than merely an exchange of information.

Gravois, Rosenfeld, & Vail (1999) discussed the value of an interdisciplinary model called *instructional consultation teams* that incorporate components of effective school literature and best practices in professional development. Teams of school-based professionals plan systematic delivery of services to support the classroom teacher. McGregor and Vogelsberg (1998) describe three models to support general education
teachers: (a) consulting teacher model, (b) collaborative consultation model, and (c) co-teaching model. In the consulting teacher model, a consultant who responds to immediate concerns provides ongoing support to the general teacher. However, a lack of time, lack of administration support, too brief consultations, and a lack of professional development can be barriers in implementing this model. In the collaborative consultation model, all teachers are experts and can share ideas and collaborate in the best interests of the students. For example, the general education teacher usually has more training and experience in whole class instruction, whereas the special education teacher has more experience and training in individualized instruction.

Co-teaching exists when both teachers share the whole class instruction by presenting simultaneous or shared instruction (Weiss, 2002). A variation of co-teaching is supportive or complimentary teaching. Complimentary or supportive teaching exists when one teacher presents the content, and the second teacher provides assistance or strategies to individuals or groups to enhance the same learning content. The second teacher may teach the same content to a separate group (Cook & Friend, 1995).

One study evaluated the effectiveness of co-teaching models in 23 schools in 8 school districts (Walter-Thomas, 1997). Findings indicated positive student social and academic outcomes and a greater sense of community and collaborative support among teachers. This study found that co-teaching creates more teacher time and attention for students with special needs, shared professional growth for teachers, greater motivation and personal support opportunities for reflective collaborative problem solving.

There is an increasing range of students of diverse social, cultural, and academic background in every classroom, which creates a greater need for all school professionals
to collaborate to coordinate services to maximize the learning potential of all students. There is much in the literature on inclusion about collaborative teaming, consensus decision-making, open communication, co-teaching, and coordinated service delivery.

**Professional Development**

Teachers with more formal training and staff development are better able to facilitate successful inclusion. Professional development has been shown to be a key ingredient in helping teachers to acquire the knowledge and skills to implement inclusion (Lawton, 1999). A two-year study conducted by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) found that the single determinant for achieving higher standards of student achievement is a teacher’s preparation and support. Another study on the effects of teacher in-service found significant differences in teacher effectiveness between trained teachers and those not trained. This study also found that the special education students in the general classes received more direct instruction than the general students (Brady, Swank, Taylor & Freiberg, 1992). Pugach and Johnson (1995) studied similar teacher issues and found that 88% of 191 teachers in the study reported being better able to solve classroom management problems after training in coping and tolerance strategies.

A national survey has shown that only 21% of public school teachers have indicated that they feel prepared to teach students with special learning needs (President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002). Professional development can also help build positive teacher attitudes towards inclusion through the support of others. Knowledge could be imparted through forums for sharing knowledge and skills in teaching inclusion classes and its challenges. Traditional professional development
models of imparting information may not be sufficient in meeting the challenges in teaching inclusion classes.

Teacher Certification

A qualified teacher is the driving influence in providing appropriate educational and related services for students with disabilities. Certified special education teachers should have the expertise and training in curriculum, instruction, and knowledge about the impact of a student's disability on the learning process. For example, teachers should know how to develop and implement appropriate instructional interventions to meet the student's unique and individual learning needs. A qualified teacher parallels the availability of special education instructional knowledge that is needed to support student achievement. As the numbers of certified special education students have increased, the need for certified and qualified teachers has also increased.

Many states, including Hawai'i, have reported a shortage of certified special education teachers, and schools frequently have to hire substitute or non-certified teachers to meet staffing needs. The President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education (2002) has estimated that there are more than 12,000 openings for special education teachers filled by substitute teachers, and that 10% nationally were filled by uncertified teachers. The Hawai'i Department of Education reports that 25% of special education teachers were uncertified in 2001, and plans to decrease this number through recruiting efforts and an alternate certification program (Hawai'i DOE, 2002b).

Teacher Attitudes

There have been many studies on general and special education teacher attitudes. In preparing for this literature review, I surveyed published dissertations related to
inclusion between 1995 and 2000, and found that approximately 90% were on general teacher attitudes. Studies on teacher attitudes and perceptions of inclusion show that the major concern of teachers is that they will not receive adequate support, resources, or professional development. Scruggs & Mastriopieri (1996) conducted a study of teacher attitudes and found that most teachers are in favor of the humanistic ideals and principles of inclusion, but may not be willing to take students with special learning needs into their classes. Teachers tend to favor inclusion in their classes when it comes with administrative and in-class support. Moreover, teacher attitudes may depend on whether inclusion was voluntary or mandated. The movement toward inclusion may be mandated by the court or by an administrator, which can result in teacher resistance; or inclusion can be teacher initiated, resulting in more positive teacher attitudes.

Planning Practices

Research in the planning practices of inclusion teachers is pertinent to this study because it parallels effective teacher collaboration and ways that teachers meet individualized student needs. Schumm and Vaughn (1992) studied classroom teachers’ perceptions and planning practices for teaching mainstreamed learning disabled students, and found that 98% rated their planning for general education students as either excellent or good. However, only 38% rated their planning for mainstreamed students as excellent or good. Teachers reported little differential planning for mainstreamed and general students except in implementing modifications (e.g., additional time for assignments and tests). A later study found that general teachers, who planned interactively with others and had professional development, were more willing to make accommodations, and that teachers tended not to use IEP objectives to guide their instructional planning (Vaughn,
Klingner, Hughes, & Schumm, 2000). This study also reported that elementary teachers better met and understood the needs of individual students than secondary teachers.

In another study of middle school general education teachers in inclusion classes, teachers reported that they were frustrated because of perceived pressures to cover content quickly, which conflicted with the need to individualize instruction based on students' needs (Vaughn, Bos, & Schumm, 2000). Generally, teachers were successful in creating a comfortable and acceptable classroom climate. However, modifications and adaptations were usually planned for the whole class rather than on an individual basis. Another year long study of secondary teachers on planning found that even outstanding teachers do not preplan for individualization, but provide an academic and social support system for learning disabled students via whole class arrangements.

Benefits of Being an Inclusion Teacher

An interesting question is: What are the incentives for a general education teacher to volunteer to teach special education students in an inclusion class? Salisbury, Palombara, and Hollowood (1993) describe benefits such as smaller class size, training in teaching a more diverse group of students, instructional and attitudinal changes, extra planning time, access to conferences and workshops, and the opportunity to learn from other teachers through teaming and sharing.

Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) studied the strengths, challenges and changes that occurred in the school program while developing inclusive programs. Their findings indicate that the most pervasive perceived changes were on increased positive attitudes of special education students and the biggest challenges for teachers were meeting the instructional needs. Attitudinal barriers and "turf" issues were also hurdles to overcome.
Studies have reported that teachers who were provided more support and training were the most competent and optimistic in teaching special needs students in their general classrooms (Gemmel-Crosby & Hanzlik, 1994). In many schools, as general education teachers gain first-hand experience in teaching special education students, attitudes change towards a more positive perception of the benefits of inclusion.

The general classroom teacher’s resources and expertise are challenged in meeting the increasing needs of inclusion. Some critics believe that teachers are already overburdened by the urgency to improve test scores and meet performance standards and that the additional responsibilities of teaching students with special needs in the general classroom provides a greater burden (Shanker, 1994). Furthermore, it is very difficult to implement a successful classroom inclusion program if the teacher does not believe that he or she can be successful, or if the teacher is negative, resistant, or not willing to make needed accommodations and adaptations to help the students to succeed. As with all teaching, a “self-fulfilling” prophecy can create failure or success. Teachers tend to be more positive and interact more with students whom they expect will achieve.

Process of Implementing Inclusion

Inclusion and School Reform

The evolution of traditional special education programs toward inclusion efforts has paralleled other school reform movements in Hawai‘i. The way in which schools and districts across the country change to meet the needs of special education students often reflects a school’s restructuring and reform efforts to meet the diverse needs of all students. Changes in curriculum content, teaching processes, and school structures have been the desired outcomes of most school reform. Ideally, all changes should be within
the context of total school improvement efforts rather than be viewed as a separate system or program to change. Many trends in teaching and learning are promising in improving inclusion efforts, such as those as related to multicultural issues, multiple intelligences, multi-age grouping, peer mediation, integrated curriculum, differentiated learning, "school within a school" programs, technology in the classroom, collaborative learning, and the use of multiple formative assessments (Thousand & Villa 1999).

During the past two decades educational reform has focused on increasing educational outcomes through student achievement. Some publications, such as *A Place Called School* (Goodlad, 1984) and *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Education* (National Commission for Excellence in Education, 1983), identified critical problems in education such as increasingly low reading and math achievement, especially among minority groups, and mediocre teaching methods and curriculum. In 1994, President Clinton signed into law the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* (PL 103-227), which presented a national vision encompassing eight major goals. Goals 2000 provided funds for states to adopt content standards (what should be taught) and performance standards (what will students do to show that they have learned the content standards). New legislation, the *No Child Left Behind Act, 2001* (US Congress), presented even more specific mandates for high academic expectations for all students, including students with special learning needs. It is important to keep in mind that there are wide gaps between the academic achievement levels of students who are struggling in school and the rigorous and challenging expectations of state and national standards that all students are expected to achieve.
Process of Change

The move to inclusion involves major changes in philosophy, school structure, teacher roles, and teaching and learning practices. Inclusion is a movement towards ongoing school improvement rather than a passing trend. Latham (1988) studied innovative educational programs to find out why so many new programs fail. She suggests that innovative programs start with much interest and excitement and are implemented quickly. They peak in about a year and a half and then the innovation dies about four years later when interest fades. She believes that innovations move in continuous cycles that create the illusion that there is much innovation and change in education but in actuality schools merely move on to new ideas or innovations. Latham discussed some reasons for failure such as (a) practitioner disenchantment, (b) innovation supporters depart, (c) lack of training, (d) diminishing funds, (e) inadequate supervision, (f) little or no accountability, (g) a “take it or leave it attitude”, and (h) no consequences for termination. In its day-to-day operation, Latham believes that classroom practices of teaching and learning have not changed in the past fifty years (Latham, 1988).

Process in Becoming an Inclusive School

Lipsky & Gartner (1998) summarized the findings of two national studies conducted by the National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion (NCERI, 1994, 1995). This study analyzed data from 1000 school districts that have implemented inclusion programs, and found seven factors necessary for success that were prevalent: visionary leadership, collaboration among teachers and others who teach students, refocused use of assessment, support for staff and students, adequate funding, effective parental involvement, and the implementation of effective program models and
classroom practices. Similarly, Hargreaves (1997) conducted a study on the factors that facilitate inclusion and emphasized the importance of the rationale, scope, pace, resources, commitment, key staff, parents, leadership, and inclusion’s relationship to other initiatives. These were congruent with the key factors found in the two national studies (NCERI, 1994, 1995). Both studies show that inclusion starts with raising awareness through the development and communication of a shared vision and rationale.

Another factor in implementing inclusion in the context of the study is how teachers view change. Rosenholtz (1991) studied teachers’ construction of meaning as it was shaped by the school’s organization. She described high and low consensus schools, and the degree to which teachers had a say in instructional goals and decision-making or whether they worked in isolation. High consensus schools were characterized by active involvement, high academic expectations, focus on learning, sense of community and personal identity, non-routine supports and high morale. Low consensus schools were characterized by feelings of isolation, negative talk about students, sharing and support that focused on personal (rather than educational) issues, routines, focus on behavior, external control (responsibility), and helplessness, and freedom from stress.

Lipsky and Gartner (1998) describe how attitudes and practices at schools move from “first generation” to “second generation” issues within implementation stages of inclusion. A first generation issue might be that students are perceived as belonging to special or general education teachers; whereas a second-generation issue might be how general and special education teachers assume a shared responsibility for all students. The researchers believe that first-generation issues are more prevalent, but second-generation issues become more evident within the context of actual classroom practice.
Inclusion in Hawai‘i

Changes and Reform Issues in Hawai‘i’s Special Education Program

The Felix-Waihee Consent Decree resulted from a class-action lawsuit, and placed special education in Hawai‘i in the spotlight. A summary of this litigation is described:

On May 24, 1994, the State of Hawai‘i acknowledged to the federal district court that it had failed to provide necessary services to a class of children, who were entitled to, but not receiving special education and related mental health services. On October 25, 1994, an out-of-court settlement was reached and Judge David Ezra approved the Felix Consent Decree. The Felix Consent Decree requires that the Departments of Education and Health establish a new system of care by June 30, 2000 for a class of children that satisfies federal law [i.e., Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act] and which embodies the principles of the Child and Adolescent Service System Program (CASSP). The Plaintiff Class is “all children and adolescents with disabilities residing in Hawai‘i, from birth to 20 years of age who are eligible for and in need of education and mental health services.

With the implementation plan of the Felix-Waihee Consent Decree, schools have been under tremendous pressure to be in legislative and legal compliance, under the threat of sanctions and reprimands with much media scrutiny. Many teachers feel that they have been asked and required to “do more with less” (less time, classroom resources, support and training), especially as the paperwork trail becomes broader and more comprehensive. An outcome of this lawsuit is that schools have become more cautious in following the evaluation, identification, and the IEP process, which has resulted in large increases in the student certification for special education services.

The special education population has doubled in many schools during the past six years. For example, the percentage of certified students at one public high school in this study rose from 9% in 1997 to 10% in 1998 to 14% of its total school population in the year 2000 (Hawai‘i DOE, 2001a). Special education funding and resources in the state of
Hawai‘i have increased in order to meet the state mandates, benchmarks, and sanctions of the Felix-Waihee Consent Decree to expand mental health and special education services. During the 2000-2001 school year, the DOE focused much personnel and resources to meet compliance by providing school-based mental health services, and an internal review process to assure greater accountability. It has yet to be determined, however, if this is making a difference in the classroom in terms of academic and social outcomes.

Statistics Relating to Special Education in Hawai‘i

In the year 2000, at the time of this study, the number of students eligible for services under IDEA or Section 504 totaled approximately 14% of the total student population (Hawai‘i DOE, 2002b). Of these numbers, approximately 88% received special education services and 12% receive 504 accommodations. Approximately 27% of these students receive educational supports or services to address social, emotional, or behavioral needs in order to make adequate progress in school. In Hawai‘i, 49% of students received special education under the category of Specific Learning Disability, 13% under Emotional Disturbance, 9% Mental Retardation, 6% Developmental Delay, 8% Other Health Impairment, and 7% Speech/Language Impairment. The remaining 8% were in the less incidental categories of Deaf-Blindness, Hearing Impairment, Visual Impairment, Orthopedic Impairment, Autism, Traumatic Brain-Injury, or Autism.

Placement data shows that 54% of special education students in Hawai‘i received specialized educational services in integrated self-contained classrooms (at least half of day students go to separate special education classes and the other half attended regular education classes). Twenty-seven percent (27%) of special education students received resource services (at least one period a day is a segregated class), and 15% of special
education students received services in separate, self-contained classes for most of the school day. Some students also received services in which itinerant providers (e.g., occupational or physical therapy) provided educational services periodically. While these data shows that a large number of students are taught in general classes, it does not tell us much about inclusion classes. The data shows only the percentage of time that a student is in a general class or indicates that special education services are provided in both the general and separate special education class. Thus, data on students moving to least restrictive environments were incomplete or not available.

*Department of Education Policy on Inclusion*

The Hawai‘i Board of Education, which is the decision-making body of the statewide educational system, has issued the following policy statement on inclusion: Guided by the belief that all children can learn, the Department of Education should establish a system of inclusive schools to ensure that all children are educated in general education classrooms to the maximum extent possible. Students of all ability levels learn together in the same classroom with necessary services to meet their needs and support the teachers.

(Hawai‘i BOE, 2001)

It further states that inclusion requires the following:

- The participation of all members of the student’s educational team.
- Appropriate staffing and adequate time to plan. (This has not been defined.)
- The development and dissemination of teaching strategies to match student’s strengths and needs and promote relevant and meaningful learning experiences and mutual respect.
- Recognition of the needs of all students in the classroom.
- Maximum cooperation between the home and the school.
Conclusion and Summary of Literature Review

The principles of special education have been upheld through legislation and court case rulings to provide individualized and specialized education to students with varying disabilities in the least restrictive environments. Research and trends of special education have moved from debates as to whether students should be included in the general education mainstream, to the question of how educators accomplish this, and the implications for classroom teaching practices.

In concluding this review of key literature relating to inclusion, inclusion can be viewed as a “paradigm shift,” requiring a change in the vision of educators for educating students with special needs and its requisite classroom instructional practices. A standard model or blueprint for inclusion has not been defined or described in the literature, and there have been few qualitative studies on actual classroom practices.

Throughout this review, I searched for prevalent theories and constructs relevant to inclusion in the literature. My initial question was whether there is a theory about inclusion and if so, what is it? Knowles (1986) has described a theory as what a given author says about it. Kerlinger (1986) discussed how theories integrate pieces of information into a whole, summarize what is known, and offer a general explanation of what is being studied. Bogdan & Biklen (1982) have described a theoretical perspective as a way of looking at the world based on the assumptions that people have that are important. These assumptions can be in the form of definitions, constructs or propositions. It appears that inclusion is still a new concept to researchers and educators in the field; constructs (themes, ideas, beliefs) are emerging and shifting, as inclusion practices become more prevalent. This study attempts to explore some of the constantly
changing constructs about the implementation of inclusion by studying two inclusion classes. The following chapter will describe the research methodology of the two case studies.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The goal of this research was to explore the classroom experiences of teachers and students in two classrooms in two Hawai‘i secondary public schools to describe the complexities of the inclusion classroom. Qualitative and naturalistic methodology was chosen in an attempt to study the daily happenings of the inclusive classroom. Qualitative and naturalistic methodology provided data in the form of detailed descriptions of situations, interactions, and the perceptions and voices of those involved in the field. The researcher chose questions that could best be answered by describing a slice of the educational world based on the idea that education is what happens in the classroom as the teachers and students construct its reality. This chapter will describe the basic methodology used to collect and analyze the data, and the ways credibility and validity were checked to assure trustworthiness.

Qualitative Research

Qualitative research was chosen to explore the world of the teacher and the students in the inclusion class. The investigation is an in-depth study of the secondary inclusion classroom in a public school in Hawai‘i. I chose to study two cases to be able to compare each case to one another and to explore patterns and themes that may suggest patterns of inclusion in other locations. If the readers infer that other school contexts are sufficiently similar, the study may have applicability or transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Qualitative research methodology, used in this study, follows an interpretive epistemology approach, in which aspects of the human environment are constructed by the individuals who participate in it (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 1996). In many ways, the reality
of the phenomenon being studied (inclusion) cannot be separated from the meaning that
the participants bring to it. Rich detailed description showed the relationship of the
inclusion vision to actual observed implementation at the study site through the
experiences of the students and teachers. One goal of this study was to explore whether
some discrepancies emerged among ideas of what people think they are doing, what they
say they are doing, and what they are actually doing.

This study included common elements of naturalistic inquiry, such as the
involvement of the researcher as the primary source of data collection, the use of the
participant's tacit knowledge, purposeful sampling, emergent design, negotiated
outcomes, case study reporting mode, ideographic interpretation, and rich descriptions.

The Case Study

The research design for this study was a non-experimental, qualitative study in the
framework of two case studies. A case study has been defined as "interpretation in
context" by concentrating on a single entity, the case (Merriam, 1991). Description of
the case as an entity (the classroom) can show the interaction of significant factors
characteristic of the topic being studied, which is inclusion. Yin (cited in Merriam, 1991)
defines case study as a design suited to situations where it is impossible to separate the
phenomenon's variable (inclusion) from its context (classroom) as it is described and
unfolds over a period of time through raw data such as observations and interviews.

The two case studies follow a "disaggregated" single case study design, with the
individual classroom as the in-depth unit of analysis (Kennedy, 1979) and description.
The classroom is considered a "bounded system" which allowed the researcher to study
an instance of inclusion through studying one inclusion class. While the researcher was
immersed in the study of the classroom, a level of detachment was attempted through the triangulation of data from a variety of sources (Strauss, 1991).

Case study design was chosen to address the research questions of this study to explore the secondary inclusion class. Research findings from this study and its implications can offer insights and expand educators’ experience in understanding inclusion by providing a view of the inclusion classroom that cannot be revealed through quantitative or experimental methods. Findings can inform future research and expand the knowledge base in the field to foster greater understanding of the successes, barriers, processes, and program, in order to improve classroom practice.

*Elements of Case Study Research*

Merriam (1991) describes four special features of case study research that are: particularistic, descriptive, heuristic, and inductive. These key elements were applied to this study in the following ways:

1. *Case study research is particularistic.* The specificity of focus on a particular phenomenon allowed for more holistic views of a situation to evolve. In focusing on inclusion in one classroom as the “case”, a general or holistic perspective was established in order to highlight specific problems or barriers of inclusion and offer suggestions for other schools implementing inclusion.

2. *Case study research is descriptive.* The end product of this study was rich, detailed description. In the beginning, as many variables as possible were included in field notes to describe daily classroom interactions. Details were carefully recorded to ensure that all variables were considered in presenting a complete picture of the inclusion
class in its natural setting. Vivid material included experiences, feelings, quotations, activities, challenges, and other details.

3. **Case study research is heuristic.** This study can expand the reader’s comprehension of the phenomenon being studied by extending the reader’s experience and initial understandings. Findings were summarized and conclusions generated through comparison and discussion of current theories and alternatives.

4. **Case study research is inductive.** Concepts and theories may emerge during and after the data collection and analysis phase through inductive reasoning. Contextual description in this study was concrete and vivid, rather than abstract, which allowed the readers to bring their own experiences, knowledge, and interpretation to it, in order to arrive at their own conclusions and relevance.

   Qualitative research assumes that there are multiple realities with an emphasis on processes and interactions rather looking at an end product. I attempted to depict the case, an inclusion classroom, by describing and incorporating its many realities into a “whole”. There were no predetermined hypotheses and no manipulation of variables. Merriam (1991) describes a qualitative case study as a holistic description and analysis of a single phenomenon, or a social unit, that leads to interpretation in context.

   This case study was descriptive and heuristic as it explored new meanings and offered insights into what was being studied. The findings became the representation of both my perspectives and the participants’ perspectives filtered through the lens of one’s thoughts and experiences. Data were collected over an extended period of time of twelve weeks at each school through several methods of data collection. Ongoing classroom observations, informal interviews, and document study were conducted.
Qualitative researchers have described a variety of purposes for case study research including descriptive, interpretative, analytic, and evaluative (Merriam, 1991; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 1999). The purpose of this research study was to provide ‘thick’ description of the context of the inclusion classroom, and describe the many meanings that are brought to it. This study can also be considered explanative as it looked for patterns or themes within a case and across cases. These patterns and themes of the two cases of this study will be explored in Chapter 6, Discussion of the Findings.

Case study researchers often look for constructs to bring order to descriptive data and to help them to relate their findings to other research reported in the literature. Constructs can expand existing theory in which to classify data in the study. Grounded theory (Janesick, 1994; Strauss, 1991) may emerge or be reconstructed during the study. As the researcher, I looked for themes recurring in the findings as emerging constructs. According to Gall, Gall & Borg (1999, p. 291) a theme is a “salient, recurrent feature of a case.”

Merriam (1998) illustrated the use of theory in research as a set of interlocking frames. The outer frames, the body of literature, is related to the research question or topic; next to that is the problem statement, which may represent a “hole” or missing factors in the research, found in the literature review. The inner frame is the purpose of the study. The inductive nature of research adds to or modifies current theory, and thus there is the possibility of developing a new model. Emerging ideas from the data can clarify, refine, test, or extend current theory as the participants’ and researcher’s perceptions are expressed, analyzed and interpreted in the context of presupposed ideas about inclusion practices. Merriam (1998) developed a model to show the relationship
between constructs and emerging ideas in a qualitative study. A framework for this study that is similar to Merriam's model (1998) can be described in Figure 1.

**Figure 1. Framework of Inclusion: Constructs and Emerging Ideas**

Therefore a case study can build theory by using an inductive way of thinking about the problem and analyzing the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p 33). The researcher does not enter the investigation with a blank slate. It is the researcher who selects details and facts to be included, and searches for a pattern of ideas to understand the whole picture. Qualitative research may reveal or build theory based on tacit knowledge of the participants, idiographic interpretations, and negotiated reporting and findings. In this study I reviewed existing constructs that were described in this literature review, which formed the basic research questions and design. As the study progressed, it shaped and extended existing ideas on inclusion.

The term *ethnography* is frequently synonymous or used interchangeably with qualitative fieldwork. Case study qualitative research methods are derived from anthropology (Merriam, 1991) and relates to how data is collected in ways such as
interviews, researcher notes, participant observation, and document analysis.

Ethnography indicates a socio-cultural interpretation of the data, and creates a picture of the shared beliefs of the participants through patterns of social interaction. In this study, ethnographic techniques for data collection and analysis were used in studying the culture of the secondary language arts inclusion classroom.

**Researcher as the Main Data Collection Instrument**

The researcher was the main communicator and the main instrument for data collection and analysis, through which all data was gathered, checked, processed, and chosen to be included in the final report and. The presuppositions, philosophy, attitudes, and experiences of the researcher became the lens that filtered observation, interview, and document data. As the researcher, I was highly involved with the context and data sources of the study on a personal basis. My views on education affected the entire research process from conceptualizing the problem, to collecting and analyzing data, and to interpreting the findings. It is important for the qualitative researcher to reveal how one's personal biography, presuppositions, and beliefs influenced the research process, which I will describe in this section.

Case study and qualitative research attempt to present the researcher's views and the participants' views. The participants' views were revealed through observation of behaviors in the classroom and informal conversations with the participants during the data collection phase. I constructed a framework for the case and reported the findings that I anticipated would make a contribution to the field. It is important for the participants and the readers of the study to know about the "lens" of the researcher
through which observations, understandings, judgment, and experiences created new meanings in this study.

Here I will describe some of my experiences and personal history that were significant in bringing me to this study:

- I was a general education teacher in intermediate and high school in Language Arts, a reading specialist, an elementary teacher of grades 1 to 5, a special education resource teacher, a district behavior management resource teacher, a special education literacy state resource teacher, a professional development and teacher certification state resource teacher for special education licensing, and a lecturer in Teacher and Curriculum Studies in Literacy at the University of Hawai‘i, and at Chaminade University in Honolulu, Hawai‘i.

- I had two nephews who had a learning disability and received special education services. I was involved in planning their Individualized Educational Programs (IEP) and in their education.

- I had assisted teachers and schools in different phases of implementing inclusion, which can be considered part of an informal preliminary exploration. This helped me to articulate gaps in the research literature and practice and to focus on inclusion in proposing this study.

- I had visited the teacher participants’ classes prior to this study as a resource teacher to provide assistance and support to the teachers. This provided initial information on the two inclusion classes and established a positive rapport with the participant teachers.
I volunteered to teach an inclusion class in an elementary school, as the general education teacher, and through first-hand experience was aware of the challenges involved in meeting diverse student needs in the general class. My visits to inclusion classes and my own experience as an inclusion teacher became a preliminary pilot study, which helped me to articulate the case study design. The research questions arose from my concerns about gaps between the vision and practice of inclusion. My preliminary study helped me to shape the investigation around concrete experiences rather than speculation. Because of my direct experience with inclusion in elementary and secondary schools, and numerous visitations of inclusion classes prior to this study, I had a vision of inclusion as a positive element in teaching and learning. My beliefs and values relevant to the study were made explicit to the research participants and the members of my doctoral committee. Since I had experience in inclusion classrooms, which seemed successful, I did have a predisposed view that inclusion can work successfully. However, I had observed incidents in my role as a state resource teacher where inclusion was actually detrimental, and may have hindered students’ progress. Thus, the key research questions centered on the characteristics of effective inclusion and the process of putting inclusion theory into practice.

Frequently, during this study, I have had to put aside biases and suppositions to replace my own perspective with that of the insiders’ perspectives. However, in some ways the researcher was also an insider. At times, as the researcher, I could say, “I have walked in their shoes,” due to my extensive classroom experience. Every effort was made to be truthful about my values, experiences, and philosophy and to maintain an open mind in order to gain greater knowledge, understanding, and new insights into the
inclusion process. One wonders whether adequate researcher objectivity may be possible
to achieve as I am a teacher with extensive and varied experience in the Hawai‘i
Department of Education conducting a study in Hawai‘i public schools. This will be
discussed in a later section in this dissertation on limitations of the study.

Sampling Procedures

The sampling for this study was purposeful and non-random. The researcher
developed general criteria of an average case and then looked for cases that fit.
Purposeful sampling was chosen to select information-rich cases from which I felt that
the reader could learn the most. A typical case in the study would be a secondary school
where there was a model for inclusion in place. Since there was a small number of
secondary schools on Oahu that were doing inclusion in a systematic way, the selected
cases were chosen because they met the criterion of having an inclusion model in place as
a structure for teaching general and special education students in the same class.

Participant and Site Selection Descriptors

The two schools and classrooms were purposely selected for the following reasons:

1. Each class was considered to be “inclusive” where special education services
   were provided in the general class where students with and without learning
disabilities are taught.

2. The researcher had access to the schools, classes, and teachers because of
   prior visitations and observations in my role as a state resource teacher. The
   researcher had observed similar inclusion classes taught by the participant
teachers at the two schools. Trust and rapport was established when the
participant classes were previewed for their relevance to inclusion education
during the previous year.

3. The participant teachers were perceived as ‘strong’ teachers with positive
   reputations in their schools and community who had the potential to highlight
effective inclusive teaching practices. These teachers frequently expanded their knowledge through professional development and were interested in widening the research base in this field. Each perceived their inclusion program as important and valuable in affecting their students’ school lives.

For example, at Sherman High School, the first case study, the class was chosen because the special education teacher was a dynamic and effective teacher whom the researcher had observed teaching other inclusion English classes the year before this study. However, when this teacher was moved to teach a different class, the researcher decided to continue studying the original class selected. Similarly, the participant class at Kulanui Intermediate & High School, the second case study, was chosen because the researcher had observed the general education teacher during the previous year to be a strong and effective teacher of inclusion classes and noticed positive teacher collaboration and teaming in meeting the needs of the students.

4. Each class selected represented a variation of inclusion (e.g., co-teaching and collaborative teaching) and its unique aspects in the individual classrooms and the school culture.

5. The students in each class represented diverse learning needs and ethnic characteristics that were typical of other classrooms in Hawai‘i’s public schools. At Sherman High School the students were of Caucasian, African-American, Spanish, and Polynesian background. At Kulanui Intermediate and High School, the students were predominantly of part Hawaiian, Polynesian and other mixed ethnicities. Most of the special education students had varied learning needs related to mild disabilities.

The students in the participant classes were eligible for special education services, through the mildly handicapped categories of learning disability, mild mental retardation, speech and hearing impairment, other health impairment, and emotional disturbance.

Also, some students in these classes were not eligible for special education services but were considered having marginal, at-risk, or poor academic performance indicators.
Some students were identified as being eligible to receive “504” modifications (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973) because they had an established disability that affected their learning or other life activity. A description of the participant schools, teachers, and classes will be provided in Chapters 5 and 6, the Findings.

Data Collection

The primary data collection method was observations supplemented with informal interviews and records and document study. Triangulation was established through these multiple methods of data collection that strengthened the focus of this study. Multiple views emerged through this data triangulation.

Observation and interview notes were taken during field visitations to attempt to capture how the teachers and the students were affected by inclusion. The research moved from a broad to a more specific focus as the study progressed. Emerging new understandings of aspects of the inclusion classroom were explored using multiple data sources and in the analysis of common characteristics and recurring experiences.

Data sources were observations, interviews, and document study:

1. **Observations** of two classes at two schools took place for a period of 12 weeks (averaging 35 observations for each class) to look for continuity of teaching and learning patterns.

2. **Informal interviews** were conducted with key stakeholders such as administrators, teachers, state or district resource personnel, and the students themselves. Initially the interviews were formal but became informal as the study progressed. Interview questions were developed by the researcher and are provided in Appendix A of this report.
3. Records and Document Study provided individual and group student data such as ethnicity, family and social background of students, standardized test scores, report card grades, Department of Education statistics on special education students, ethnicity, disability categories, service placement patterns and other relevant information.

The triangulation of collected data from observations, interviews, and records review formed the basic methodology of the study. At times, data collection instruments were revised to match new constructs that emerged as the study progressed. For example, interview questions were modified, as appropriate to the time and setting during the study. I gathered information following the design plan yet was flexible in adaptations based on my intuition, hunches, and relevance as the study progressed.

Classroom Observations

Each classroom observation generated narrative-type, descriptive notes of each visit throughout a twelve-week period. Each school averaged 35 visits. Direct data gathering on a daily basis took place from September through January 2000-2001.

Observational notes contained extensive descriptions of situations and events. A timeline of the observations is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Timeline of Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Visits</td>
<td>38 Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Observations &amp; Visits</td>
<td>Dec. 1 – March 31, 2001; 5 Visits</td>
<td>Feb. 1 – March 31, 2001; 5 Visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In studying the two inclusion classrooms, the researcher observed and interacted in spontaneous ways with the teachers, students, and other staff through informal conversations as appropriate to the time and place. Observational data provided detailed descriptions of situations, lessons, events, people, interactions, schedules, routines, teaching responsibilities, activities, and student and teacher behaviors. These varied from formal to informal, planned to unplanned, and from verbal to nonverbal. Informed consent was obtained from the teachers, school personnel, and students. Participants were assured of anonymity in the final report and that their names would not be used, through the use of pseudonyms.

Daily observation was a way to systematically record a typical day in the inclusion classroom. Through ongoing observation throughout a period of time, I attempted to be as close to the subjects as possible. The key purpose in my mind at all times was to describe characteristics of the classroom that shed light on the inclusion issue. The researcher primarily focused on the educational and social experience of the special education students in the inclusion class during the observations. At times the observations shifted from a wide-angle lens to a narrow-angle view, from whole-class structure to specific one-to-one interactions of students and teachers. I also observed whether or not the students were engaged in academic tasks. I recorded levels of engagement by using an intermittent tally system. This method will be described in a later section of this chapter.

Informal interviews and conversations were interwoven with observations and fieldwork. These were recorded on an interview sheet and included in the ethnographic summaries and field notes. Throughout the study, interpretative sequencing of ideas
(interpretations, feelings, hunches, speculations, and reflections) developed as the questions and emerging issues were redefined or established. Initial findings were later crosschecked with the perspectives of the participants through further conversations about the prevalent ideas.

During the observation phase the research moved through various phases of interaction. At the beginning stage, I wanted to gain entry to the class and to feel comfortable in the role of an observer. I also wanted the participant teachers and students to be comfortable having an observer and an outsider in their classroom. During previous preliminary visits at both schools I became familiar with each class as an inclusion class. As mentioned earlier, I had observed the participating teachers' classes during the previous semester and noticed that there was a model of inclusion in place and that the special and general education teachers were co-teaching the inclusion class. As the observations continued, my main role was that of a researcher and observer.

Generally, I attempted to be a neutral person who did not change the situation or affect the data. The researcher was not a participant in the class. I chose to stay as much as possible in the "researcher/observer" role in order to focus on the observations and to take detailed and thorough notes. I was personable and friendly and attempted to develop a sense of trust that was established early in the study and continued throughout the data collection phase.

Informal Interviews

Informal interviews with key stakeholders allowed multiple voices to be part of the conversation to reflect upon practice, analyze strengths and weaknesses in the system, and discuss the impact of inclusion in the classroom. One of the objectives of this study
was to “speak” to the concerns of teachers and the real conditions in the classroom. Informal interviews generated discussion of the major research questions and other ideas that emerged during the study.

These informal interviews were conducted with teachers, administrators, school staff, students, and others who were stakeholders in the students’ education. These people were interviewed for approximately one hour at the beginning of the school semester. Interviews with various staff members who worked with the same student provided multiple voices (especially when views may have been different) for crosschecking and comparison, and allowed the researcher to be able to go back and validate the ideas as they emerged during the study.

**Interview format and questions.** At the beginning of each interview, the purpose of the research study, and an assurance of confidentiality and anonymity, was provided. I attempted to listen more than talk and refrain from judgments. Teachers and others shared their perceptions of the inclusion experience and were anxious to tell me about their students. Probes were occasionally necessary to encourage the respondent to give more details, to stay focused if the discussion got off track, or if it became a forum for complaining. I attempted to frequently rephrase and reflect back to the respondent what he or she seemed to be expressing and to summarize remarks as a check of understanding. Interview summaries were written up within a few days after each interview to highlight the key points and researcher reflections.

The key components of effective inclusion teaching and learning that were prevalent in the literature generated the key research questions of this study. Questions about how, why, what, when, and who were asked during the interviews to look at the
dynamics of the school and the classroom as inclusion was implemented. Most of the questions were open-ended and informal. Some questions were hypothetical such as "What is your wish list to improve inclusion?" At times probe questions were asked. For example, if the interviewee said, "We need fewer students in the class," the researcher asked, "How many would be workable?" Another example occurred when a teacher shared that the students have behavior problems, the probe question was, "How do you deal with it?"

Interviews started with a common core of questions to uncover the process and effects of inclusion at each school. However, many of the questions were open-ended, which allowed for new questions to be generated during the initial interviews. The complete list of initial interview questions for each participant group is provided in Appendix A. A sample of the common core of questions for the teachers was:

- What is your understanding of inclusion? Tell me about inclusion at this school. How is this different from mainstreaming?

- What helps you to meet the needs of all of the students in your class?

- What adaptations/accommodations do you make for students with learning disabilities in your class?

- What methods or learning activities have the students responded positively to?

- What school practices foster or undermine successful inclusion and student academic and social achievement?

- What are your needs as a teacher in order to successfully implement inclusion?

- What are your goals for long-term inclusion? What are your opinions?

- What do you say that may help another school in implementing inclusion?
• Describe any professional development or resource support provided to help you as an inclusion classroom teacher.

A closure question was provided to open the door for follow up conversations, to add anything that was left out, that needed clarification, or to ask if anything else was important. The informal interviews were a way to have a conversation to understand the participants’ thoughts, experiences, and perspectives about the inclusion class.

Records and Document Study

Document study was a third major source of data for this study. Qualitative and quantitative information gathered from records and documents were reviewed based on the context and purposes of the study. Statistics on special education in Hawai‘i, demographics of each school, student categories, classifications, and ethnic patterns helped describe special education in Hawai‘i. Other records that were reviewed included reports on compliance and legal guidelines, curriculum and performance standards, teacher certification data, special education procedures, Department of Education (DOE) and school websites, and special education reports. Other DOE documents were examined along with school, teacher, and classroom data such as testing data, report cards, unit plans, Individual Educational Programs, progress notes, and samples of student work.

Data Collection Instruments

Specific data collection instruments were developed and revised during the study as necessary. These included a narrative form to record classroom ethnography notes, and an initial interview summary sheet.

Ethnographic protocol for classroom observations. Classroom observation notes were written in the form of descriptive ethnographic protocols to record detailed
descriptions of the teaching, learning, and social interactions of the classroom participants (Slaughter, 1989). A sample of the protocol “Narrative Form for Classroom Ethnography” is included in Appendix B. Notes were then typed from these hand-written narrative forms within a few days. Researcher notations and codes were written in a space on the left side of each page. A separate ethnographic summary was written as soon as possible after the observation, and a subsequent typewritten narrative protocol was created to summarize ideas, pose new questions, and reflect on the significance of collected data for initial theorizing and coding. This summary included ideas relevant to research questions and the larger patterns of interactions in the classroom.

Additionally, during every observation the researcher would use an intermittent tally method of time on task to look at class engagement. Research has shown that time on task is a good indicator of student achievement (Logan, Bakeman, & Keefe, 1997). Increased engagement is positively correlated with achievement; on the other hand, students who are frequently off-task don’t achieve as well as others who are actively engaged. The researcher did a simple tally check intermittently every five minutes and tallied the results. The tally record would be:

N for Not Engaged

E for Engaged

T for Transition Time

Engagement would be recorded if the students were doing what they were supposed to do, or looking and attending to the teacher; similarly, non-engagement and off-task behavior was also recorded. Transitions would be noted if the students were in between activities.
Interview summaries and school visitation logs. Most of the initial informal interviews were written verbatim rather than being audio taped to ensure ease and comfort for the participants, especially for those conducted in the classroom. Later follow-up interviews became more like conversations, which were spontaneous, informal, and appropriate to the moments in time. For example, most teacher interviews took place in the classroom outside of the instructional class period. This brought the conversation closer to the participants' natural setting and allowed for less intrusion on the teacher's time. Descriptive field notes provided date, school, name of informant, detailed notes, and my initial reactions following the interviews.

Interview summaries were written as soon as possible after the interview from the field notes to identify emerging themes and highlight the information that addressed the research questions. These informal conversations revealed the emerging perspective of the respondent and helped to formulate new questions or ideas for further exploration.

A Framework for the Study

A framework was developed to help structure the study as the “map” of what was being investigated (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This included labels for settings, processes, and theoretical constructs (Huberman & Miles, 2002). Descriptive details of this case study were checked with predominant conceptual categories to support or challenge theoretical assumptions related to inclusion and special education. The framework that guided the study is shown in Figure 2.
### DATA SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>September, 2000 – February 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 observations of each class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 – 70 minutes each day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 – 14 weeks each class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Study</th>
<th>Individual Educational Program (IEPs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State and District Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance Review Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testing Data and Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOE and School Web Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report Cards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kulanui Inter. &amp; H.S.</th>
<th>Sherman High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade English</td>
<td>10th Grade English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 5 - 60 minutes</td>
<td>Period 6 - 65 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher Assistant</td>
<td>Special Education Co-Teacher Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 student 5 sped students</td>
<td>33 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 '504' students</td>
<td>6 sped students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource study skills class</td>
<td>2 '504' students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHY

- What were the process and model of inclusion in place for each case?
- Were the elements of effective inclusion present?
- What were the curriculum and instruction teaching, especially in literacy, in each inclusion class?
- What were the perceived needs on how inclusion could be improved at this site?

Figure 2. Framework of the Study

Data Analysis

Data analysis for this study involved interpretation by coding and categorizing the data to show the themes and patterns that were brought out. As described above,
interview and observational data were transcribed, summarized, and reviewed through frequent re-readings to identify common trends and themes that occurred as the schools worked on inclusion. These procedures of interpretational and reflective analysis were carried out manually by the researcher and crosschecked by another person who had a background in education. This will be discussed later in this chapter. In reporting this case study, findings revealed through interpretational analysis, were weaved into a narrative in the findings. The steps that I took leading to data analysis were the following:

1. I organized the database of field notes, transcripts, and records collected during the study.
2. I reviewed each line or paragraph of observation or interview notes and divided it into meaningful separate segments.
3. I developed relevant categories by looking for recurring patterns.
4. I coded each segment by the categories that applied to it.
5. I culminated all segments that had been coded by a given category.
6. I generated constructs that emerged from the categories.

I followed Glaser & Strauss' (1967) suggestion to do constant comparative analysis in four stages. The first stage was when incidents were compared to one another and tentative categories were defined. During the second stage, the researcher reviewed each incident (negative or positive) with the tentative categories. In the third stage, similar categories were reduced to a smaller number as the data was checked again and put into a framework. The fourth stage was the actual writing of the findings and subsequent discussion using the new constructs that emerged from the coded data. This section will describe the process of reviewing, summarizing, categorizing, coding, analyzing, and reporting the findings of this study.
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Categories were initially developed which addressed the research questions relating to inclusion at the school. In analyzing the data, the researcher used a model of seven characteristics of effective inclusion teaching and learning gleaned from the literature. I selected these elements as categories to use as a unit of analysis to describe what I wanted to know about inclusion related each case study. The following categories were derived from the key components of effective inclusion:

1. Administrative and resource support;
2. Adequate professional development;
3. Differentiation and modifications of curriculum and teaching;
4. Positive interactions among teachers and students;
5. High student engagement and expectations for academic progress;
6. Adequate special and general education teacher collaboration.

These elements of effective inclusion were used to link and compare the categories and to analyze the data and discussion of findings.

Categories and Codes

During the initial data analysis phase there was a constant comparison of categories to show similarities and dissimilarities using the indicators described above, in order to define categories and the related concepts that seemed most relevant as they emerged. The categories were at first tentative and then revised as recurrent themes emerged until all of the data segments had been assigned to a category. I frequently reread and coded the observation and interview notes in an interactive and flexible process. The preparation of data included omitting irrelevant information so that only
pertinent data was categorized. For example, some interview comments, social talk, and irrelevant information were deleted.

**Reflection and summary log.** As mentioned earlier, the researcher created a summary and reflection log after every classroom or school visitation. Since the researcher was conducting daily observations of over an hour a day for each class, it was important to write the summary reflection log in a timely manner. The summary log was reviewed to capture the main points, to look for emerging patterns, and to identify which became the ‘categories.’ This was the initial step in the process of data analysis.

**Categories.** The categories became significant based on patterns or linkages within the case, their potential for generalization to other schools working towards inclusion, and the purpose of the study. In the later stages of analysis, I explored new ideas about being an inclusion class that could expand the knowledge base or that could be generalized to other schools.

Guba and Lincoln (1985) describe this process as unitizing, categorizing, and integration. Unitizing and categorizing allowed for analysis of emerging ideas that started with the smallest unit of information, which were then categorized into a meaningful unit that was related to the same content or linked by common themes. An example of this process is described below using data related to the separation of roles of the inclusion teachers, and the steps that were involved in forming a category.

**Emerging idea → Pattern → Category**

**Units of information (Emerging Idea):**

- Special education teacher is giving out student papers.
- Special education teacher is redirecting students to complete their work.
General education teacher lectures the class. →

**Pattern:** Roles of special education teachers
Roles of general education teachers. →

**Category:** Separation of roles of inclusion teachers.

Frequent rereading of field notes, outlines, side notes on observation and interview sheets, notes in different colored pens, and summary logs helped the researcher to establish internal consistency.

During data analysis, I asked questions about whether pieces of information could be placed into a specific category, subcategory, form a new category, or be divided into subcategories. At first, units of data were categorized by how they addressed each research question. The categories addressed commonalities and differences across the two sites that were common and could expand the provided the discussion about the inclusion classes.

Critical final analysis involved a comparison of results with characteristics of effective inclusion. Some emerging themes suggested recommendations and implications, for future research that will be discussed in the final chapter of this report. Since this study attempted to look at the myriad of forces that affect the classroom, with the classroom as the unit of study, deciding what information was important, interesting, and related to main research questions was the main task.

A sample of a category (recurrent theme) and codes (smaller units related to the category) is:
The complete coding scheme, including 120 codes and 30 categories, is presented in Appendix C. In essence, the stages of data analysis involved a constant movement back and forth between the data sources and ongoing analysis.

Credibility, Reliability and Validity

In the tradition of interpretive epistemology, the researcher, the participants, and the readers of this case study will bring their own meaning and applicability of results to the study. The credibility and trustworthiness of this study can be reflected in the findings and the methods. Credibility checks for this study were obtained through triangulation of data from multiple sources, which served as a check for discrepancies and points of confusion. Credibility involved questioning whether the research findings accurately portrayed reality to assure internal validity. I constantly asked, “Are my data credible?” Data were checked for validity through the following methods: (a) triangulation, (b) peer examination, (c) acknowledgment of researcher’s biases, (d) member checking, and (e) long-term analysis.

(a) Triangulation involved exploring different viewpoints through multiple perspectives and varied data sources. I crosschecked ideas through data triangulation to maintain a nonjudgmental and respectful stance in reference to the participants’ views, as much as possible. “Multivocality” refers to the idea that participants don’t speak in a
unified voice but have diverse views. Tacit knowledge refers to the implicit meanings that the individuals being studied either cannot find the words to express or they didn’t refer to them in everyday speech or interviews. Qualitative researchers have found that case studies that reflect multivocality and tacit knowledge are likely to be more complete and credible (Gall, Gall, Borg, 1999). The study aimed to reveal both multivocality and tacit knowledge.

(b) Peer examination occurred by having an objective assistant, who was an educator and researcher review the data to assist in cleansing, coding, integrating, and categorizing. This integrity check identified any discrepancies or points of confusion in the data and categories. A full list of the categories and codes of data gathered from observation and interview notes and document study is provided in Appendix E. The prevalent categories are discussed in the findings and discussion chapter of this report.

(c) It is important for the reader to know that the researcher’s presence did not skew the findings. I attempted to be honest in making the reader aware of any biases that may come through. For example, the reader could ask, “Did the researcher’s previous experience in inclusion classes color the interpretations?” I selected what to include which can become a view through “one lens” if my perspectives or biases are not revealed to the reader. While I did acknowledge and share my experience and views throughout this study, I attempted not to extensively share my own values, philosophy, assumptions, and expectations related to inclusion or special education with the participants so that it would not influence the data. As mentioned earlier, a reflection summary was written after each observation by reviewing the narrative ethnographic protocol. The summary described the participants’ feedback and my reactions to the data.
at different points during the study. Writing the summary helped to separate some of the nonjudgmental, neutral, observational data from researcher interpretations and theorizing.

(d) Member checking occurred when the researcher shared some of the observation and reflection summaries of class visitations with the participant teachers in an attempt to uncover any of my biases, predispositions, and attitudes that may color what was reported. Slaughter and Chilcott (1981) found this type of design and analysis to be advantageous in a study of a mathematics project implemented at multiple sites. During this study of inclusion, ongoing debriefings in the form of conversations between the teachers and the researcher served to check for discrepancies in data recording, to reaffirm the participant teachers' perspectives, and to share tentative findings with the participants. Member checking can help to reveal the participants' perspectives as they reviewed some of the data (e.g., ethnographic summaries of observations, interview summaries) for accuracy and comprehensiveness. Sometimes member checking resulted in the participant remembering more or adding new information.

Another form of member checking was through my numerous conversations with colleagues and others in the field, including special and general education teachers, resource teachers, administrators, and educational assistants. Discussions centered on the emerging ideas of the study and its relation to current aspects of inclusion in Hawai‘i’s schools. I wanted to check that the conclusions developed during the data analysis and final stages of the study were sound and typical to the case and to obtain other perspectives and objectives views.

(e) Daily ongoing observations over a twelve to fourteen week period provided data that were complex, detailed, comprehensive, and thorough. Although an extended
study would have provided additional data over a longer time period, I felt that I was able to capture the major events, class climate, and instructional interactions of the inclusion class within the data collection phase. I attempted to provide comprehensive conceptualization of the case through the qualitative methods, which added to the study’s credibility.

**External Validity**

Finally, as the data were collected, the researcher reflected on the key questions related to external validity: Does the quality of the research help to develop and improve practice and add to professional knowledge within the limitations of the study? Again, limitations relating to external validity may occur due to the small, self-selected sample and the lack of time to create a more in-depth study. The findings and discussion of the study reflect my construction of the data and analysis with the understanding that the readers will use their own experiences and beliefs to form their own construction of the reported findings.

External validity asks about the applicability of research to other situations. In the final discussion chapter, the researcher will discuss generalizations and their possible applications to other schools implementing inclusion. Questions will be asked such as: Is it possible that the case studies oversimplified a particular issue or problem? The reader should keep in mind that what is presented in this case study is not the “whole” picture of inclusion in Hawai‘i, but only a slice of life in two classrooms in Hawai‘i. Erickson (1986) described the goal of qualitative research as not to show “proof” but to show “plausibility”. The writer and researcher cannot tell everything there is to know. This case study will be useful if it provides new insights for the readers or if it empowers
the readers to be more effective inclusion teachers. The presence of cross-case generalization can strengthen to the application of this case to other settings. It is the readers who attest to the similarity and applicability of the cases to their own situations.

**Criteria to Assure Credibility**

Gall & Borg (1999) describe three sets of criteria to ensure the trustworthiness and credibility of a case study. This section will describe how I attempted to meet these criteria. The criteria reflect (a) sensitivity to readers needs, (b) the use of sound research methods, and (c) the thoroughness of data collection and analysis.

My goal was to provide relevant links between the research questions, the database, analysis, and conclusions. I attempted to provide a “strong chain of evidence” by including documentation of the research process shown in the findings. Samples of the data collection instruments are provided in Appendix A and Appendix B of this report. Trustworthiness was established to assure the reader that the descriptions and portrait of the inclusion class are reflective of what the case study proposed to achieve, and what Adler (cited in Ambert, Adler, Adler & Detzner, 1994) refers to as “verisimilitude”, a style of writing that draws the reader to feel what it is like to be part of the participant’s worlds.

Reliability was sought though categorization and consistency in coding so that the reader can understand the connections that were made and how conclusions were formed. The researcher continually asked: How can I show credibility, connectivity, value, and relevancy of the data?

As discussed earlier, criteria that reflected the use of sound research methods was checked through triangulation of data sources. Informal interviews strengthened
observations; observations strengthened informal interviews; records and documents
strengthened interviews and observations. Each method became a way of corroborating
evidence or data.

Criteria that reflected the thoroughness of data collection and analysis were
reflected in contextual comprehensiveness, on-going daily observation, member and
representative checks, and researcher’s self-reflection. As the case became more detailed
and descriptive, I anticipated that greater credibility and trustworthiness were established.
My rapport with the participants added to the credibility of the study, as they frequently
shared more than usual in a non-threatening and supportive manner.

Ethical Considerations

Since Hawai‘i is considered a small island in which many people are connected
through family and community ties, the question of anonymity and confidentiality is
important. Pseudonyms for the participants and schools were used throughout this report.
Informed consent was obtained from the teacher participants, school administrators, and
students and submitted to the University of Hawai‘i Committee on Human Studies. An
application of this research study was submitted and approved by University of Hawai‘i
Committee on the Study of Human Studies. Participants were told that their participation
would be anonymous and that pseudonyms would be used in the final report.

Reporting the Findings

The findings of this study were reported as a topic-centered narrative involving
snapshots of events linked thematically. There are characters and settings but no plot or
peak in action. Labov (1982) says that narratives have six properties that are part of this
dissertation: an abstract (summary), orientations (time, space, place, situation,
participants), complicating action (sequence of events), evaluation (significance and meaning), resolution (what finally happened) and code, a return to the perspective of the present. Levels of interpretation started with the researcher through self-representation and then are represented again through the reader. The goal is to present a meaningful interpretation of the experiences of the inclusion classroom through the narrative. Erickson (1986) describes a narrative as a vivid portrayal of events in everyday life described in their natural settings. As the story is told to different people it will become reconstructed through personal interaction and reflection. Generally, the units and categories developed during the data analysis phase of this study formed many of the headings and subheadings in reporting the findings in the following Chapters 4 and 5 of this report. Samples from the field notes such as interview comments, student and teacher responses during class, and documents reviewed helped to create the portrait of the inclusion class. This portrait is shared as a narrative with some interpretive commentary to help the reader make connections between the details and generalizations.
CHAPTER 4
INCLUSION AT AN URBAN HIGH SCHOOL

A goal of this research is to construct a narrative about inclusion in two Hawai‘i public schools. Clandinin and Connelly (1996) describe how sensitive ideas in education and school reform can be addressed in a “professional knowledge landscape” where school and teacher stories can be placed in three categories of sacred, private or secret, and cover stories. Sacred stories are what researchers, policy makers, and administrators say in the form of policies, vision and mission statements, standards and improvement plans. This theory-driven view of practice shared by practitioners, policymakers and researchers has the quality of a “sacred” story, or the ideal plan.

This chapter and the next will present a narrative of two inclusion classes at two different public high schools. In each, I will describe the sacred story that was involved and also the secret story. Secret stories are about what happens behind the closed doors of the classroom that tell about actual practice. Teachers may share these stories with peers or friends, but they usually are secret, and beyond the scrutiny of administrators or the public. Cover stories are the stories teachers tell when they are out of the classroom in their professional communities of meetings or workshops that portray themselves as characters in the “sacred” story (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996).

In this dissertation, I will discuss sacred and secret stories as a way to structure the findings of the two case studies to address the epistemological dilemma of being a Department of Education (DOE) teacher and a researcher in order to portray the stories of research and DOE ideals and actual classroom practice. Conceptualizing the professional context as a landscape provides a language to discuss events in time and place.
This chapter will describe the findings of a high school’s inclusion class in an urban area of Oahu, Hawai‘i. The school is Sherman High School and the participant class was a tenth grade English class. General information about the school, the history and model of inclusion that was implemented, description of teaching and learning in the inclusion class, and the perceptions of the participants will be described. As described in the literature review, an inclusion classroom is one in which students identified with learning needs and eligible for IDEA services receive specialized instruction in the general classroom along with their peers, through the joint efforts of special and general education teachers (Wilson, 1999, Lipsky & Gartner, 1996; Giangreco & Putnam, 1991).

Each section and subheading in this chapter was derived from the questions, categories, and key ideas that emerged during the data collection and analysis process. Further discussion of the findings described in this chapter will be shared in Chapter 6. A framework of the data sources of this case study is provided in Figure 3.

| Observations     | - November 1, 2000 – January 30, 2001  
|                 | - 35 observations of each class (case)  
|                 | - 50 – 70 minutes each day  
|                 | - 12 weeks time span  
| Interviews       | - Teachers and students  
|                 | - Administrators  
|                 | - Other Staff  
| Document Study   | - Individual Educational Programs (IEPs)  
|                 | - School and district reports  
|                 | - Student progress reports and grades  
|                 | - Student work  
| Participants     | - 10th Grade English class  
|                 | - General education teacher  
|                 | - Special education co-teacher assistant  
|                 | - 33 students (6 special education students)  
| Research Questions | - What were the model and process of inclusion?  
|                  | - Were the elements of effective inclusion present?  
|                  | - What were the curriculum and instruction?  
|                  | - How can inclusion be improved?  

Figure 3. Data Sources for Case Study of Sherman High School
The School Context

The setting of the case study was Sherman High School, which is located in an urban area of Honolulu, Hawai‘i. The school had a population of 1,320 students of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds consisting of approximately: 32% Caucasian; 24% Filipino; 11% Afro-American; 6% Part-Hawaiian; 1% Native American; 4% Hispanic, 5% Samoan; and 2% Japanese; and others (Hawai‘i DOE 2001a). Many of the students were military dependents, and the school had an estimated transient rate of approximately 25% of its student population each year. Additionally, many students had only one parent at home with the other parent deployed for up to a year.

During the 2000-2001 school year approximately 8% of its student population or 98 students, were identified as having special learning needs and were eligible for special education services. These numbers have steadily increased each year. Approximately 25% of students qualify for participation in the free or reduced cost lunch program. This figure may actually be higher because many secondary students are eligible but do not apply for this program. Forty-eight students were identified as second language learners, and eleven students were eligible for “504” (designed for students who were identified as having a disability). A 1999 accreditation report found that the school meets the needs of its diverse population through a variety of programs such as its academic motivation program, advanced placement courses, English As a Second Language (ESL), military youth advisory councils, new student orientation program, and the creation of a multimedia production academy. Students also received additional support during a common period scheduled at the end of the day such as tutoring, study skills, and student activities.
Further student support was provided through the extensive services of the special education department, outreach counselors, athletic coaches, class and club advisors, and educational assistants. Most students at Sherman High School attended school regularly; the average daily attendance rate for 2000-2001 was 92.8%. Sherman High School had consistently increased its graduation rates from 92.8% in 1996 to 99.6% in the spring of 2001, which is considered an above-average rate based on statewide attendance.

The general school climate at Sherman High School appeared warm and supportive to newcomers. The campus was orderly and attractive; students seemed generally polite and respectful of each other. In visiting other classes, the researcher observed students engaged in learning activities such as discussing political views, engaged in drama, or working in literature circles. The school security and the administrators were visible throughout the day on campus. The military was a vital part of the school and visible on campus through programs such as the Junior ROTC. Generally, Sherman High School students, staff, and teachers showed a great deal of school pride especially in ROTC and academic honors such as speech and debate, National Honor Society, and athletic accomplishments in wrestling, basketball, and football.

Sacred Stories of Sherman High School

As mentioned earlier, sacred stories on the professional knowledge landscape are described as the visions, the policies, and improvement plans that describe an ideal learning environment (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996). Sherman High School's sacred story, as most schools in the statewide school system, has focused on academic reform. School-wide academic data gathered from standardized achievement test scores had
shown no significant increases or decreases in achievement during the three years prior to this study. The school’s annual progress report stated that there was better communication among teachers and staff, a new master plan, more technology, and more community partnerships. Areas needing improvement included efforts to reform curriculum, instruction, and assessment to increase student achievement.

The mission statement for Sherman High School was, “To educate all students in an integrated setting to become responsible, literate, thinking, and contributing members of a multicultural society through excellence in teaching and learning” (Hawai‘i DOE, 2001a). These statements describe the “sacred story” about student outcomes and school improvement plans. It can also be noted that most schools have similarly worded vision and support plans and that many of the goals are vague and difficult to measure.

The Inclusion Model

Special Education Services at Sherman High School

A department of ten special education teachers serviced approximately 100 students who were eligible for specialized instruction at the school. Five teachers were not certified in teaching special education and were required to enroll in a state endorsed teaching certification program. While some of the teachers taught in self-contained classes in the core subjects for part of the day (for students whose needs could apparently not be met in the general classes). Most of the special education teachers taught in inclusion classes in the core subjects of language arts, science, math, and social studies for at least part of the day. Nine educational assistants supported the special education teachers and students in the classroom.
The majority of the students receiving specialized education were classified in the categories of specific learning disability (SLD) and emotional disturbance (ED). The percentage of special education students at Sherman High School by category during the school year 2000-2001 were: Specific Learning Disability (51.7%); Emotional Disturbance (21%); Mental Retardation (11.2%); Other Health Impairment (7%); Multiple Disability (2.8%); Visually Impairment (2.1%); Hearing Impairment (2.1%); Deaf (.7%); Speech-Language Impairment (.7%); and Autism (.7%) (DOE, 2001a).

The Special Education Department was co-chaired by two special education teachers and a full-time Student Services Coordinator (SSC) who coordinated the evaluation and eligibility processes and support services. When a teacher requested assistance for a student who was having academic or emotional problems, the SSC facilitated a "student support team" meeting to review student needs and request additional school level supports or pursue other testing as necessary. A request for further testing started the eligibility process for special education. During the year of the study twenty student support meetings were held.

Implementation of Inclusion at Sherman High School

It is important to trace the process of implementation in order to understand inclusion at Sherman High School. In the fall of 1997, Sherman High School, like most schools in Hawai'i, offered students with special needs only two types of learning environments: fully self-contained classes and mainstreaming. The fully self-contained classes consisted solely of special education students. Students who were mainstreamed attended general education classes for part of the school day with little or no support or specialized instruction in the classroom. Some teachers and administrators believed that
this approach limited the students' educational opportunities and did not meet the legislative mandate to teach students in the least restrictive environment. Sherman High School initiated plans to implement a multiphase inclusion program in order to provide instructional supports in the general classes.

Phase I of the inclusion program began in 1998. The goal that year was to introduce the concept of inclusion to the faculty and to build awareness that special education students can be successful in general classes. The planning team consisted of administrators, a curriculum specialist, and teachers. The first step was to place some special education students in general classrooms and to find teachers who were willing to try inclusion. Students who were considered to be most able to succeed in general classes were identified based on grades and teacher recommendation and referred to be part of the inclusion class.

During Phase I, a pilot class was created to teach special and general education students in a cohesive setting in which special and general education teachers shared teaching responsibility. The implementation plan highlighted joint ownership of the general class through the teaming of special and general education teachers to be the model of a successful inclusion class. However, during this initial phase, many teachers expressed discomfort, anxiety, or negativity toward inclusion.

During Phase II the following year, the school planned to create more widespread inclusion by focusing on the core academic subjects. Seven teachers expressed interest and were committed to the inclusion program. Some issues were addressed during this phase, which included cooperative teaching, the role of the administrator, professional
development and accountability. Guidelines were established and each department in the school implemented one inclusion class.

A resource class was created to provide additional individual or small group instruction to support student’s learning needs beyond the inclusion classroom. Here, materials were readily available to assist students in completing work from other classes, such as textbook and study guides from the general content area classes. General and special education teachers staffed this resource classroom and communicated regularly with the students’ content area teachers. The content area teachers provided the learning materials, assignments, projects, and other curriculum activities. This resource room was used by all students and staffed by general and special education teachers throughout the day.

By the third year, Phase III of implementation, most special education students with needs in the mildly handicapping categories of learning disability, emotional disturbance, other health impairment, and speech or language impairment received their specialized instruction in general classes in which special and general teachers were assigned to co-teach. At the time of this study 2000-2001, inclusion was a school-wide mandated program implemented in every department.

*Sherman High School’s Model and Plan for the Inclusion Program*

The model or framework, which is part of the “sacred or ideal story” for the inclusion program at Sherman High School, included the following key components:

- Special and general education students were taught together in the general education class;
- Special and regular education teachers co-taught the inclusion class;
Administrative commitment, support, and involvement was a key component;

Collaboration meetings were held between general and special education teachers to monitor student progress and share concerns;

Ongoing professional development was provided to build professional capacity;

Curriculum modifications and accommodations were made to meet the diverse needs of all students.

Additional student support was provided through the common study period at the end of the day or through resource skills classes during the school day.

Table 4 describes the supports for teachers and students according to the inclusion model that was planned. It is important to keep in mind that the school set forth this ideal plan as the "sacred story" to ensure effective inclusion. Later in this chapter I will describe actual classroom practice that tells the "secret story".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Supports</th>
<th>Teacher Supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class modifications and accommodations</td>
<td>Support of a co-teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource class for one period</td>
<td>Collaboration meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-group/individual help as needed</td>
<td>Administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of school study period</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Teachers available in class</td>
<td>Common preparation periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized instruction and program</td>
<td>Department meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In describing the model of inclusion implemented at Sherman High School, it is important again to define the term co-teaching. The school referred to co-teaching or team-teaching as "cooperative teaching". For the purposes of this report to adhere with
terminology discussed in the literature, the term 'co-teaching' will be used. Co-teaching occurs when two teachers share in instructional planning and delivery for all of the students usually through a whole-class teaching format (Slavin, Kurweit & Madden, 1989; Fedman, 1998). The special and general education teachers at this school co-taught the same content to the whole class. Special education co-teachers were expected to work with all students in the classroom during the entire class period, and to play an active role in direct instruction and the implementation of appropriate curriculum adaptations. Students also received additional assistance through the resource class during the day, or at times when the special education assistant took the students out of class to work in a resource room. However, while the ideal plan called for the inclusion teachers to co-teach, in actual practice, the general teacher had assumed full responsibility.

The school's vision for inclusion emphasized that the responsibility to meet the student's needs should be shared equally among all the stakeholders. To ensure success, the administration planned an accountability system to focus on compliance monitoring, student performance, and the quality of the teaching and learning. However, this was not implemented once inclusion became an ongoing school-wide program.

Initially, there was greater administrator and district support in assisting the inclusion teachers to work out areas of concern. During the beginning phases of inclusion, data were collected about special education students' progress and analyzed for indicators of success, based on the state teaching standards and the desire to plan integrated, meaningful curriculum. Areas of concern were identified and modifications were made prior to Phase III. During the early phases of inclusion, the main barriers to
overcome were teacher attitudes toward acceptance of special education students into the
general education classroom and the provision of appropriate professional development.
The school's plan for accountability for inclusion involved checks for a positive
instructional climate, professional development, alignment of curriculum with standards,
and monitoring of student achievement. However, these findings showed that the ideal
plan (the "secret story") for inclusion was not implemented to provide optimal support to
the teachers or the students, which will be described throughout this chapter.

Case Study of Actual Classroom Practice: The Teachers

Three teachers were involved in teaching this inclusion class and will be
described in this section: Mr. Tom Matthews, Mrs. Sandra Stanton, and Mrs. Theresa
Grant. The general education English teacher was Mrs. Sandra Stanton. The first special
education teacher assigned to work with Mrs. Stanton was Mr. Matthews. I observed and
interviewed Mr. Matthews during the first three weeks of the observation period. As
mentioned earlier, I had observed Mr. Matthews teaching an inclusion class with a
different English teacher during the semester prior to this study, and noticed elements of
effective inclusion. Thus, he became a participant in this study. However, Mr.
Matthews was moved to teach in another class during the data collection phase of this
study, and Mrs. Theresa Grant became the special education co-teacher in the class.

The General Education Teacher

Mrs. Stanton, the general teacher of the inclusion class, had been teaching for
twenty-three years. She was originally from Texas and had taught for ten years in
Hawai‘i, including seven years at this school. She was certified in teaching secondary
English and Mathematics. This was her first year teaching an inclusion class. When
Mrs. Stanton was first approached to co-teach an inclusion class, she was reluctant but agreed to give it a try when she was told that she would be given support and a special education co-teacher. She said that she loved teaching, especially teaching English, and that she liked to try new things and wanted to learn more about teaching. However, Mrs. Stanton questioned her decision when she realized that the promised support had diminished and she was told that a new uncertified teacher was assigned to work with the class, and that the special education teacher was assigned to teach in another class. Neither teacher was happy about the move. In this report, Mrs. Stanton will be referred to as the classroom teacher.

The Special Education Teacher and Care Coordinator

Mr. Tom Matthews, was the first special education teacher in this class during the first weeks of data collection. He was a general and special education licensed teacher who had been teaching for five years in the Hawai‘i Department of Education (DOE). The year before this study, Mr. Matthews received special education certification by completing the DOE teacher-licensing program. Mr. Matthews was also a certified secondary English teacher, who had previously taught theatre at a Los Angeles high school. At Sherman High School, he directed and produced school plays and taught advanced history, and general English classes. During a preliminary study the year before, the researcher observed Mr. Matthews teaching in an inclusion class, and noticed that he fostered high level thinking in his classes through interesting projects and activities such as publishing a newspaper, writing poetry, and producing a play. At the time of this study, Mr. Matthews was also the co-chair of the special education
department. He was also the care coordinator for four of the students in the participant
class and was responsible for planning and monitoring their IEPs.

New Special Education Teacher/Assistant

Mrs. Theresa Grant was newly hired and assigned to co-teach with Mrs. Stanton when Mr. Matthews was reassigned. Mrs. Grant was an immigrant from the Philippines. At the time of the study, she was not a special education trained teacher but had completed training in secondary teaching in English the Philippines. Mrs. Grant had lived in Hawai‘i for two years and was not yet licensed to teach in the state of Hawai‘i. However, she planned to start a DOE teacher-training program to become licensed in special education.

Mrs. Grant shared that she did not want to be a special education teacher but took the position because it was the only one available since the school year had already started. She had previously taught at a private all-girls’ high school and in an elementary school in Hawai‘i. Mrs. Grant was hired to fulfill a temporary long-term assignment as the special education teacher and co-teacher in inclusion classes. During the school day, she also taught in a resource room and co-taught in two other inclusion classes.

Roles of Special and General Education Teachers in Co-Teaching

The school’s model for inclusion involved a co-teaching format in which a general education teacher and a special education teacher shared teaching responsibilities. The vision was that the general teachers and the special education teachers would share ownership and be mutually responsible to maximize student learning in the inclusion class. In the beginning phases of implementation, the co-teachers would meet on a consistent basis during their common preparation periods to extensively plan out every
aspect of the class. During this meeting time, the teachers had the opportunity to address
important issues such as the role of each teacher in the classroom, planning a course
outline, creating curriculum units, and daily lesson plans that focused on individual and
diverse student academic and social outcomes and appropriate assessment.

Additionally, the inclusion teachers also met once a week with administrators and
other resource staff. Teachers were asked to share examples of co-planning in curriculum
and instruction and to address any problems with inclusion. During the time of this
study, scheduled time for teachers to meet decreased significantly from weekly to
monthly. Also, many teachers did not have common preparation periods. Once each
quarter, the teachers were provided with a substitute teacher to cover their classes for
one-half day for the special education department teachers to collaborate and articulate.

Common guidelines of the inclusion plan that described the roles and
responsibilities of the inclusion teachers were:

- *Regular education teacher roles and responsibilities.* Regular education teachers
  would determine curriculum, concepts and the standards covered, develop test
  materials, plan daily lessons, and do record keeping and grading.

- *Special education teacher roles and responsibilities.* The special education
  teacher would develop IEPs and monitor student progress. The special education
  teacher’s role was to create supplementary instructional material or study guides,
  provide additional instruction needed to enhance instruction, and to modify
  assignments and assessments as outlined in the students’ IEPs.

- *Special and general education teacher roles and responsibilities.* Responsibilities
  shared by both teachers included monitoring attendance, parent contacts, and
  lesson presentation. Teachers were expected to collaborate to determine their
  specific roles in the planning and delivery of lessons. Learning activities were
  expected to address diverse student learning styles and needs.
In visiting other inclusion classes during earlier school visits in my role as a resource teacher, I observed that the co-teachers performed unique and different roles, which was dependent on the interpersonal relationship and strengths of each teacher.

**Changes in Actual Practice**

In actual practice, there were major changes and deviations from the original inclusion plan. These will be described in detail throughout this chapter. A comparison of actual classroom practice (the “secret story”) and the inclusion plan (the “sacred story”) is presented in Figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Plan</th>
<th>Actual Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education Teacher</strong></td>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaches with special education teacher to share class responsibilities.</td>
<td>Assumed role of lead teacher who took total responsibility for teaching, planning curriculum, and the grading of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-Term Substitute/Special Education Teacher</strong></td>
<td>Substitute/Special Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaches with general education teacher and offers expertise in meeting student’s needs.</td>
<td>Fulfills duties similar to an Educational Assistant, such as collecting papers, helping to keep students on task, offering one-to-one or small-group assistance as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Teacher</strong></td>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaches class and is a resource in meeting student’s special learning needs.</td>
<td>- Care Coordinator of special education students responsible for implementing their IEPs and monitoring progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supervises a resource class to offer supplemental additional instruction and assistance in academic core subjects (at a period other than that of the English class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. Model of Inclusion in Actual Practice Compared to Inclusion Plan*
The Class

The participant class was a 6th period tenth grade English class of 33 students. Six students were eligible to receive special education services and two students received educational services through 504 accommodations. There were 8 girls and 25 boys in this 10th grade class, which appeared to be a very large class and to have an imbalance of more boys than girls (due to random scheduling). The ethnic characteristics of the class included Caucasian, African-American, Hawaiian, Filipino, Samoan, and other ethnicities. The class period consisted of sixty-five minutes.

Classroom Environment

The classroom was set up in a traditional way with student desks in rows and the teacher desk in front of the room. A student assistant usually sat next to the teacher in a smaller desk and assisted in record keeping. There was no teacher desk for the special education teacher. The daily agenda, vocabulary words, and assignments due were usually written on the board throughout the week. Some posters were displayed on writing and student motivation. However, there was no student work displayed.

The classroom climate seemed to be comfortable and warm as students openly expressed their feelings and asked questions. There was a work-like, task-oriented tone. Rapport between students seemed to be cliquish with small clusters or partners of students relating only to each other. Some students seemed to keep to themselves and did not interact much with other students. At the end of the class period, students would leave quickly, with the exception of one or two students who needed to stay back for discipline matters.
Resource Room

It’s important to note that all students, not only the special education students, had access to the resource room where general or special education teachers provided small group study skill and tutoring support. Here, textbooks and materials were available from every content course. The students usually came to the resource room with their assignments. The teachers kept a resource log for each class with updated assignments and answer keys and other pertinent information to provide the resource room teachers with the tools needed to assist the students when they come in for extra help.

The resource room was used for test-taking, behavioral time-out, and additional support to help students to understand class content and complete assignments. Teachers were asked to provide a copy of daily assignments and materials when sending a student to the resource room. The special education co-teacher accompanied the special education students once or twice a week to work on assignments. Students were also provided supplemental and resource support, such as tutoring, through the common period at the end of the day.

The Students

As mentioned earlier, there were six students eligible for specialized instruction in this inclusion class. Three of these students showed needs in the category of Learning Disability; two showed eligibility under Emotional Disturbance; and one student had needs in the category of Other Health-Impairment as shown in Figure 5.
A short description of special education student characteristics and learning accommodations are described below:

1. Michele received special education instructional services through the category of Learning Disability. She had frequent unexcused absences and rarely completed or turned in her class assignments. Michele frequently talked in class and was very social. She required extended time for class work and tests. Michele's progress was monitored through biweekly progress checks to assist her to self-monitor her progress, and to keep her care coordinator abreast in how she was doing.

2. Henry was a student considered to have an emotional disturbance. He received special education instructional and counseling services through the school-based behavioral health therapist. Henry was very sensitive, did not express his feelings well, and frequently displayed inappropriate emotional reactions in class when he felt frustrated or had negative interactions with the teacher or classmates. His learning accommodations included frequent checks of understanding and preferential seating. His reading and writing skills were well below the level of his peers.
3. Sean was receiving specialized instruction because he had a learning disability based on low skill levels of reading and writing. He completed a minimal amount of class work and had poor grades. His accommodations included having tests and quizzes, read aloud to him in a separate room; providing extended time for class work, quizzes and tests; and modifying assignments as needed. His teachers were also asked to simplify steps and repeat directions.

4. Charles was made eligible for IDEA services under the category of “Other Health Impairment” because he was diagnosed as having attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. His accommodations included preferential seating near the teacher and being given extended time for tests and assignments. Charles’ reading abilities were high but he did not follow-through with class or homework assignments.

5. Marvin had a learning disability, based on his low reading and writing academic skills. He struggled to complete homework and class work. Needed accommodations included modifying assignments and tests as needed; providing extended time for class work, quizzes, and tests; and simplifying steps and repeating directions.

6. Ivan was considered to have an emotional disturbance due to depression and self-mutilation tendencies. He received specialized instructional and related counseling services through the school-based behavioral health therapist. Ivan participated in the school’s Academic Motivation Program, which was an intervention alternative program for students at risk of failing or dropping out of school. He had high a cognitive and academic ability but did not make sufficient academic progress in most classes at school. His accommodations included providing extended time for assignments and tests.
All students except Ivan showed deficits in reading and writing and required school organizational goals on their IEPs. In reviewing the student written work and listening to students read aloud, I found the special education students to be far below the level of their peers in academic and social skills.

The Curriculum, a Representation

*Hawai’i State Content and Performance Standards*

The “sacred” or ideal story of instruction and curriculum was that all instruction and assessment in the inclusive classroom (and most classes) was based on measurable outcomes that were aligned with the state standards. Ideally, these should also be aligned with the students’ individual learning goals and objectives that were outlined in their IEPs as benchmarks for learning opportunities. Every goal written on a student’s IEP was derived from a state standard (Hawai‘i, 1999). For example:

**Standard:** Language Arts

*Comprehension Process:* Use strategies within the reading process to construct meaning.

**Measurable Annual Goal:**

_Student will improve his reading skills one grade level to be able to read and comprehend materials at 8th grade level._

**Benchmarks/Short-term Objectives.**

_Given a reading assignment at 8th grade level, the student will be able to independently read the assignment and answer five comprehension questions successfully on 4 out of 5 occasions._

These standards were created to set high expectations for all students and were communicated to teachers and students through the use of detailed rubrics identifying criteria for desired outcomes. Teachers were encouraged to give assessments that
addressed varied learning styles and multiple ways to show evidence of student learning. While assessment methods were expected to be used to track progress, there was very little monitoring of special education student academic achievement except for indication of progress on IEP goals and report card grades. It should also be noted that the expectations of the standards were far above the academic ability level of most of the special education students in the class who struggled to keep up with their assignments. The basic content of the language arts benchmarks consisted of vocabulary, literature study and writing. The Hawai‘i Content and Performance Standards for Language Arts for Grade 10 were expected to drive the instruction in the class. The following sections will describe typical units of each of these major instructional components.

Vocabulary Study

Vocabulary study was a major component of this class. The general classroom teacher emphasized vocabulary study throughout each lesson. Each day the teacher taught specific vocabulary words selected for that week and provided practice in various ways. Many of these words were taken from a novel that the class was reading. Students would be asked to try to guess the meaning of new vocabulary words in sentences containing rich context. For example, the students would be given new words in sentences such as:

Our vacation plans are still tentative.

An obscure figure can be seen in the dark.

Our meticulous housekeeper never forgets a thing.

The teacher tried to choose interesting and useful words to engage the students (e.g., arbitrate, diction, belligerent, intermittent, euphemism). Mrs. Stanton also taught
mnemonics (memory clues) as a spelling strategy and attempted to build on the students’ language and experience to understand new concepts.

TEACHER: Who has a definition for ‘superficial’?
TEACHER: Yes, also ‘shallow or skin deep’. Superficial has letters (fic) that look similar to the word ‘face’. This is a mnemonic.

While the students seemed to enjoy the discussion of words, many students were slow and reluctant in completing the written worksheet assignments, especially the students with special learning needs. This practice was provided solely through worksheets and class discussions, but the students but the students were not given opportunities to use the words in their own speaking or written vocabulary.

Reading and Literature Study

Reading and literature took place through reading a class novel. The class read the novel, *The Family Nobody Knows*, by Helen Doss. The teacher would read aloud first and then the students would volunteer to read. The class would stay on the same chapter and read in whole class format. During the entire observation period of thirteen weeks, the class read and discussed the same novel. During the read aloud time, the class seemed more interested, engaged, and attentive than at other times. However, as the weeks went on, the students seemed to be getting bored and disinterested with the book. Some students would put their heads down or have side conversations with one another. Reading the same book at the same time with the whole class for many weeks seemed to be “elementary” for some students, especially those who were avid readers. Furthermore, one can read faster silently than following along with oral reading. Thus, oral reading can slow down the better readers and interfere with comprehension.
Usually the class moved to the reading lesson midway through the class period. The teacher read aloud first to engage the students in the story by reading with expression and checking for understanding. Then students would volunteer to read and there would be intermittent class discussion of the content and vocabulary. The special education students usually were eager to read. Although some of the special education students read at a slow pace with poor fluency, they were always encouraged to participate. This process seemed to hinder engagement of the better readers in the class.

During and after the class reading of a chapter in the novel, the teacher would ask comprehension questions. Many of the questions were of a literal nature. For example, “What did Helen forget to do in the storeroom?” and “What was the children’s problem?” However, at times there was discussion involving higher-level reflective thinking such as:

“How could the family manage without a turkey on Thanksgiving?”

“Has anyone ever belittled you because of your race?”

“Do you agree with Helen Doss (the author) that all people are basically alike?”

To initiate discussion, Mrs. Stanton shared her own experiences. One example was when she explained, “I had a friend who was of a different race and the police would think that he broke the law because of the color of his skin. Did this ever happen to you or one of your friends of a different race?” Mrs. Stanton would relate this discussion to the novel. However, the students generally seemed to be disengaged rather than being challenged or motivated to read independently and gain deeper meanings. This may have been a result of the students being bored, since they had been reading the same book throughout the semester.
Writing

Writing was an integral part of the language arts in this class and was included throughout the weekly lessons. Writing included Daily Oral Language (DOL), journal writing, and compositions. Mrs. Stanton modeled correct sentences on the board and used circled concept webs to demonstrate how to organize a writing piece. She tried to tap into the students’ language and experience to initiate discussion and help the students to find ideas to write about. All writing was graded on the point system. There was very little sharing of the finished products during the observation period. Most of the teacher’s feedback centered on earning points for the grades and the number of words required for the writing piece. It seemed that Mrs. Stanton and the students enjoyed the pre-writing class discussion, but she did not bring the student’s writing or their ideas into these discussions. This could have helped students improve the quality of their writing, especially since so many students had poor writing skills and seemed unmotivated to write.

Journal writing. Journal writing was an ongoing part of the class. The teacher would write a topic on the board and initiate pre-writing discussion to help the student’s draw on ideas to write about. The journal topics usually involved a personal theme or current issue to reflect upon in the form of a question. For example:

When you have a project to do, is it better to do it yourself, or to have someone help you?

What makes people racist or prejudiced? Are people today less racist or prejudice than they were in the past? Explain.
Mrs. Stanton also used "word count" criteria to grade student journals. She frequently asked the class to count the words to make sure that the journal had at least 100 words. Grading followed a point system based on the number of words which was:

- $30 - 40$ pts = A
- $20 - 30$ pts = B
- $10 - 20$ pts = C
- $10 - 0$ pts = D

Mrs. Stanton would remind the students throughout the lesson to count their words in order to get the most points. There was minimal sharing among the class or teacher feedback on the content or quality of the journal. Generally, the students did not seem to have a purpose for writing or an audience in mind other than that it was required for the class or for a grade. When I asked Mrs. Stanton why she had focused on the number of words, she explained her rationale, which was to help the students to get into the habit of writing. Five of the six students with special learning needs had a difficult time starting and completing the assignment. The overemphasis on the number of words on a page seemed to indicate lower academic expectations for writing.

*Composition writing.* Compositions were due every quarter and were a major part of the student's final grade. The guidelines for the composition were that it contains 300 words. The teacher would give students a daily word limit to guide them to complete the composition by the due date. For example, on one day students would be asked to write 100 words during the class time; those who didn't finish were to continue the assignment for homework. However, usually the students who needed to finish the writing would not complete it for homework and fell further behind. Some students didn't do anything during the class writing time.

The teacher tried to motivate the students by allowing twenty points for extra credit to those who showed their drafts with the correct number of words. Each day, up
until the due date, the teacher checked that the students were writing up to the added number of words. Students were allowed to use the computer to type their composition if they had one at home, but it was not mandatory. Once, the special education teacher took students to the computer room to work on their writing.

As it got closer to the composition due date, Mrs. Stanton would check for understanding and student progress in completing the task. The researcher observed that the students were at varying levels of completion. For example, one special education student, Ivan, said that he had 100 words at home so he couldn’t write the next 100 in class. During the writing time, he read a book and the teacher seemed to allow this. A few students had not even started the assignment. Many students were having difficulty and it was obvious that some of the necessary accommodations that were listed on their IEPs were not implemented. Instructional accommodations could be modifying assignments, providing extended time, preferential seating, or providing visual or verbal cues. These could have helped the special education students to understand and complete the writing assignments. During the writing lessons, the special education teacher would walk around the room to cue the students to start or to continue their writing.

Generally, students didn’t seem to understand the assignment and asked many questions. These students may not have had much prior practice in moving through the steps of the writing process to create a finished product. While Mrs. Stanton tried to make the assignment very clear with simple steps and tasks, some students didn’t seem to know what a composition involved. The teacher drew three webs on the board for each paragraph and modeled good beginning sentences. Mrs. Stanton provided this outline:

*First paragraph*: Write about the first thing that you value. What are the three most important things in your life that you value?
Second paragraph. Write about the second thing that you value.

Third paragraph. Write about the third thing that you value most.

The students first created a list of ten things that they valued and then narrowed it down to three. Although Mrs. Stanton tried to take the students step by step to the finished product, there were still students who did not complete the composition, mainly because they did not keep up with the daily writing. Some turned in a composition but lost points because they did not have the right amount of words. As mentioned earlier, the researcher did not observe any sharing of the final finished composition.

Mrs. Stanton said that large projects were difficult for this class because the students seem overwhelmed, especially the special education students in the class. The teacher commented, "They need more time and materials to plan. The students keep getting interrupted and have not developed the study skills to do quality projects." I wondered why the teacher did not adjust the assignment to make it more meaningful and appropriate to the student's language and experience and also why the planned IEP instructional accommodations and accommodations that were not implemented. The students viewed writing as "work to be done" which was read only by the teacher to gain the points or the grade.

The classroom teacher provided mini-lessons on the craft of writing. Students frequently were given worksheets to practice a specific writing skill. An example of this is when the class completed a "Being Specific" worksheet to practice how to make their writing more interesting by adding specific details. This lesson is provided in Appendix J. Another structured skill-building lesson on grammar, spelling, punctuation, and
capitalization skills was “Daily Oral Language (DOL)”. This is described in the next section as a sample of a typical lesson.

**Oral Presentations**

The students had a short project to share poems or stories in an oral presentation to build speaking skills. This was one of the more interesting and meaningful activities that I observed because the students had a choice in their selection and seemed to be empowered and actively engaged. The students were given time to prepare for their presentation and two class periods were devoted to the oral presentations of the poems or stories.

The teacher presented a list of traits of a good audience. The first element was ‘to be ready’. The teacher waited before each presentation for the class to be a good audience and used points, rewards, and consequences to keep the students on task as a presenter and as the audience. For example, “This oral presentation is worth forty points. If you talk during someone else’s presentation, then you will lose points for your presentation.”

The students were anxious to do their presentations. One student read a poem “In Contempt” by Christopher Darden. Another students shared the poem, “Beware, Do Not Read This Poem” by Ishmael Reed. The teacher asked him why he chose this poem. The student answered, “I like the attitude. It is like a poem about philosophy too. I like to study philosophy. It is more like a way of life then like a series of poems.” After the oral sharing, the students and the teacher provided positive feedback; the students clapped and then asked questions of the presenter. The teacher tried to build motivation by bringing in the student’s language and experience in her feedback which was very positive and encouraging. The class was generally very polite, interested, and attentive during the
presentations of the poems and stories that were very poignant. When the students interacted with their peers in meaningful ways, their attentiveness and behavior were right on target. In comparison to the other reading, writing and vocabulary routines, this activity was more meaningful to the students because they were able to choose their own poems and interpretations, thereby they were more actively involved in their learning.

A Typical Lesson

This lesson was chosen to describe a typical lesson because it contained some of the key components of teaching and learning in this class. This was an actual lesson that was chosen because it represented common tasks, lectures, and activities that the class was engaged in. It will also reveal typical student and student interactions to so give the reader an idea about the flow of the class. Another typical lesson is provided in Appendix F.

The class time consisted of 65 minutes during the last period of the day. The 33 students entered and sat in their usual self-selected seats. Most of the lessons involved ‘work-oriented’ tasks rather than steps in the student’s learning process. The agenda was very rigid emphasizing “the work.” The agenda for the day was posted on the board:

- DOL (Daily Oral Language)
- Vocabulary
- Read-Aloud chapter in novel
- Discussion/Answer questions
- Discuss assignments and homework

Everyday Mrs. Stanton, the general education teacher, started the class by putting a short assignment on the board for students that was considered “bell-work” so that the
students would have something to do as soon as the period started and to settle down. This assignment was also a chance to review a previous lesson, to study for a quiz, or catch up on homework. Every other day, the bell-work consisted of an assignment called “DOL” for “Daily Oral Language” lesson. This involved the teacher writing one or two sentences on the board, which contained grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors.

The following sentence was written on the board before class begins:

\textit{yesterday dad told us that whoever uses the gas have to fill up the gas tank}

The students were given time to correct the errors and to rewrite the sentence. This mini-lesson continued for twenty-five minutes. It was difficult for the students to settle down; the class was very loud and noisy. Mrs. Grant, the special education co-teacher walked around to ask specific students to take out their paper, find a pen or pencil, and to focus on rewriting the sentence. It took the class at least ten minutes for most of the students to start working on this assignment. Some students finished quickly and then found something else to do such as drawing on a page in their notebook, reading a book, or just putting their heads down. Mrs. Stanton took attendance and kept telling the students to settle down to get started. The researcher noticed that only three of the six special education students, and 60% of the class, were engaged.

After fifteen minutes, Mrs. Stanton started the discussion, in whole class format, to correct the sentence. She asked, “Who wants to share their corrections?” Each error provided an opportunity for the teacher to review a writing convention or grammar concept. The students seemed anxious to share. Some were raising their hands to volunteer, and some were shouting out.
STUDENT A: You should replace the word ‘dad’ with a name.

TEACHER: If you replace ‘dad’ with a name, do you have to capitalize it?

STUDENT A: Yes.

TEACHER: What if you keep the word ‘dad’ do you have to capitalize it?

STUDENT B: No, keep the word ‘dad’.

TEACHER: Let’s have a discussion about this.

The teacher reviewed the rules for capitalization involving special names and proper nouns. Students shared ideas on corrections such as, “put in a period” at the end; “change whoever to whomever”, “change ‘have’ to ‘has’, and ‘put a capital at the beginning of the sentence.” This lesson seemed to go on too long (twenty-five minutes) before moving into the next assignment on the agenda for the day. By the time the lesson was over, students were getting bored. Half of the class were disengaged and doing other things such as talking to each other or doodling on their paper. The teacher ended this segment by saying, “Be sure to put your DOL where you can find it.” The students put their work into their English binder where most of the assignments for this class were kept.

Vocabulary. The teacher reminded the students to make sure that they studied the ten vocabulary words which were listed on the board, with their definitions, for the vocabulary quiz the following day. The words were: inevitable, galvanized, raze, adroit, subtle, malicious, prudent, intermittent, arbitrate, and diction.

Novel/Reading. The next lesson on the agenda referred to a chapter titled “The Sorcerer’s Apprentice” in the novel, The Family Nobody Knows by Helen Doss.

The teacher started this lesson by reading aloud while the students followed by reading silently. The general teacher read the novel with much expression; it was evident that she
loved to read aloud. The special education teacher helped students stay focused or redirected them if they were off-task (usually when they had to follow along listening to a slow reader). The students were very attentive when the teacher read aloud. As she read along, the teacher stopped to discuss vocabulary words that might not have been in the student’s speaking vocabulary such as “Swiss chalet” or “goulashes” and responded to students’ questions.

As the teacher stopped to discuss words that the students may not be familiar with, she used the students’ language and experience to build understanding. For example, in discussing the word “habitual”, the teacher drew on the students’ language and experience and asked if anyone could guess using the word “habit”. The students shared some of their habits and guessed the meaning of the word.

When the teacher called on the students to read, many were shouting out or raising their hands to be chosen to read. It was more interesting for the students to be the reader than to follow along while others read. All of the special education students got a chance to read and seemed to enjoy reading aloud in class. However, after about twenty minutes, all of the students appeared to be bored and unfocused. Engagement diminished with only about 60% of the students being attentive (probably because of the instructional method of whole class read aloud). Some students made comments about reading too long and were talkative, fidgety, or started doing other things. This method was used in all reading lessons and may not have been appropriate in meeting the learning needs of the special education students.

Throughout the lesson, the co-teacher, Mrs. Grant, helped the students to stay on task by walking around the room and redirecting them (similar to the role of an
educational assistant). As soon as Mrs. Grant would move on to help another student, the students would again become off-task. The students were frequently insubordinate or made inappropriate comments such as, "Can't you see I'm working!" It is important to note that Mrs. Grant was not involved in instructional delivery in any way and the students did not view her as their teacher.

Finally, five minutes before the end of the period, the teacher talked about the homework, which was to study for the vocabulary quiz the next day. Students asked some questions about the words that will on the quiz. The teacher pointed to the words on the blackboard and reminded them that they should have written the words and the sentences the previous day for class work. The bell rang and the students quickly left the class.

Class Procedures, Management and Grading

Classroom Management and Discipline

Generally, the students frequently pushed the limits of discipline. Although it was evident that there were many infractions of the rules, few of the consequences that were posted on a chart in the classroom were enforced except the second rule (to conference with the teacher). The discipline plan, with the rules and their consequences, was posted in the classroom on a large chart. The class rules were

1. Be in class on time with material.
2. Keep distractions out of the classroom.
3. Listen to the teacher and follow directions.
4. Show respect for your environment, other people, and yourself.
Consequences were posted on the board for each infraction of the rules:

1. Warning.
2. Student conference with teacher, including follow-up by student.
3. Parent contact.
4. Referral to counselor and vice-principal.
5. Parent conference at school with teacher, counselor, and vice-principal.

Often when the students were distracting to themselves or others, there was no response from either teacher. There did not seem to be an explanation of why some behaviors were ignored and others were not. For example, during one class period a student fell asleep at his desk in the back of the room, and there was no redirection from either teacher. Students frequently made inappropriate comments and gestures, shouted out, and engaged in side conversations (even across the classroom) while the teacher was talking. When students were off-task they would be doing other things such as reading a book or magazine, doodling on a paper, or looking in the dictionary. The teacher frequently needed to talk over the students’ voices during instructional time. Behavior problems often occurred during transition time or when a particular lesson would go on too long. Furthermore, the students often interacted with each other in negative ways, and the environment could even be viewed as an unsafe classroom. When certain students would get very loud and disruptive, the other students stepped in and made loud comments to attempt to maintain order. At times, the class got so loud and out of hand that a physical fight almost broke out after verbal accusations and confrontations.

It is important to note that some of the students in the class had emotional problems, which created a bigger challenge for classroom management. For example, one boy, Henry, had emotional needs that affected his learning, and became very
sensitive when reprimanded by the teacher for not completing his work. Henry would put his head down the whole period and seemed very upset until he was brought to a school counselor. One day another student did not attempt to start any work throughout the class period because he was worried about his grades; he commented to the researcher that he was "having a bad day" and wanted to stay after school to catch up. Generally, a number of students in this class seemed to have other issues going on in their lives that affected their class work, their ability to meet course requirements, and interpersonal relationships with their peers.

During one lesson, Mrs. Stanton attempted to make honoring rules a part of the lesson. She asked students to write a journal about, "What kind of rules and regulations have you and your family had to deal with that caused you problems?" The teacher initiated a pre-lesson discussion by sharing her own experiences as an example and then drew the students into the discussion using their language and experience. The teacher shared, “First of all, if you are a military brat like I was, your family had so many rules to follow that it wasn’t funny. It seems like the military doesn’t allow much freedom.” Mrs. Stanton wrote a model for an opening sentence on the board.

Mrs. Stanton asked the class to share their ideas and to write in their journal what rules were used in their family, what happened, their feelings about it, and what effect the rules had on them. I reviewed their work and observed that the students wrote at varying levels of engagement and had varying levels of quality in their writing. However, there was no real closure to the lesson such as class sharing of journal entries or further discussion related to the classroom rules.
Throughout the observations, it was clear that Mrs. Stanton was solely responsible for discipline. However, she was not effective in maintaining class order. Mrs. Grant, the co-teacher, was so inexperienced, young, quiet, and non-assertive that the students did not comply with her verbal redirections or take her seriously. Students would often make inappropriate comments or take their time in responding to Mrs. Grant. It should also be noted that Mrs. Grant had stepped into a teaching situation in an undisciplined class. Mr. Matthews, who was the special education teacher at the beginning of the semester, had a different discipline style. He was louder and would “count to five” and easily gained the students attention to maintain order. However, Mrs. Stanton viewed his interactions with the students as “getting them riled up.” The researcher did not observe this to be the case. In fact, it seemed that the presence of a strong male helped the students to settle down and attend to tasks.

Mrs. Stanton did share throughout the observation period that classroom management was always a big challenge for her. She also felt that the number of special education students in a large class of mostly boys added to management problems. This was due to computerized scheduling without criteria for balancing classes. Furthermore, she felt that the students were not motivated and that they were noisy, rude and undisciplined. Mrs. Stanton said that her main goal was for students to respect each other and that she always had management problems, as she was not a strong disciplinarian. She definitely realized the need for greater discipline in the class but did not feel that she could adequately manage the class and perhaps needed more in-service in this area.
Class Routine and Procedures

Mrs. Stanton had an organized system for class procedures and routines, which were similar to a “factory model type of work.” While Mrs. Stanton was very explicit and repeatedly explained tasks to the students, the system was also very rigid and students had difficulty “buying in” to the course content and assignments. Class procedures and grading policies were made very explicit to the students. For example, required materials that the students needed to have everyday included lined paper, a binder to keep their papers, dark-ink pens, a red pen for checking, and a school agenda book (provided by the school). Mrs. Stanton was very specific and detailed, such as in explaining the heading for assignments, “The format for papers is it should have a heading written in dark ink and include the student’s name, class, and date at top right. The title of the assignment should be on top line.” In reality, many students barely had a pencil and paper at the start of each class and they were deducted points for not being prepared. Again, the teacher did not implement instructional accommodations to help the students who struggled academically to cope with school. The use of very rigid procedures with points as criteria actually negatively affected student achievement. In general, the majority of the class seemed to understand the class routines; however, the students could not, or would not, conform. Furthermore, they may not have thought that learning the content was important enough.

Course Requirements

The requirements to pass this English class were based on class assignments, projects, tests and quizzes with grades of 60% or higher. Statewide performance and content standards were the overall umbrella of what benchmarks students should meet for
Language Arts in 10th grade. However, many teachers were confused in understanding and implementing them in the classroom. Many teachers found that the standards were too wordy and vague, difficult to measure for student progress, and they did not find them useful in planning instruction. The course requirements were communicated in terms of major course content rather than learning opportunities or processes of learning. As mentioned earlier, course content included compositions, reading a class novel, vocabulary study, oral presentations, journal writing and tests. One composition was required for each quarter and counted as one-third of the total grade for the quarter.

Students were required to have at least a 60% average at the end of the school year to get one credit in English. Four credits of English were required for graduation and no half credits were given for English for semester work. The struggling students had difficulty meeting the passing criteria, especially if they failed one midterm or semester.

*Homework*

The only formal homework students received during the observation period was to study for vocabulary quizzes and to work on the drafts for the composition that was due each quarter. Students would be required to work on the composition at home only if it wasn’t completed during the time for writing in class. However, many of the special education students had this type of “informal” homework. Many of the struggling students who did not finish their work in class also did not complete it for homework. These students needed more time and assistance to complete class assignments (which they did not receive), and they did not work well (if at all) independently. The classroom
teacher did not address the instructional and curriculum modifications that were listed on the special education students' IEPs.

The students copied homework assignments in their school agenda books, which were required for all classes. Students who were absent were responsible for making up missed assignments. For example, students would lose one letter grade for each day a final composition was late or at least 25% of the total points, which severely affected the grades of the special education students. Again, this practice seemed contrary to some of the accommodations that were listed on the students’ IEPs.

Academic Progress and Student Grades

Mrs. Stanton was very clear and specific about how she graded the students. Her grades were traditional percentages translated to letter grades based on a point system. At the beginning of each semester, a sheet outlining the grading policy, class rules, and procedures was sent home and parents and students were asked to sign it to assure understanding and compliance. The following breakdown shows how percentages of grades translate into letter grades:

Grading policy:

A = 90-100%; B = 80-89%; C = 70-79%; D = 60 – 69%; F = 0 – 59%.

Teacher Feedback to Students on Grades

Everyday, the teacher very explicitly discussed grading criteria and expectations. Extra credit was provided for work completed and turned in as part of a make-up folder. Points were added and deducted for everything. For examples, points would be deducted if a student talked during a quiz and would be added if a parent signed a paper that was
sent home. During one period, Mrs. Stanton said to the class, “Your grades change day by day and can go up or down depending on interruptions, procrastination, and results.”

At one point around midterm, the teacher provided time for the students to check their grades. Each student was assigned a three-digit ID number known only to the students, and grades were posted on the bulletin board. Mrs. Stanton read the grades aloud and then gave students the opportunity to check their grades. All students received a “Report to Parents” after five weeks into a quarter. Parents were requested to sign the report and return it to the teacher if their child’s grade was below 70%. The teacher regularly communicated with parents through notes home, student progress reports, memos in the student’s agenda book, and phone calls. However, it was not clear whether the parents had received such information or communicated directly with the teacher, except for sending back a required signature.

Sample Grades

Table 4 presents a sample of grades for a special education student as of November 1, which was approximately midway in the semester. This student’s grades were similar to other students who struggled academically.
Table 4. Special Education Student’s Sample Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/29</td>
<td>Self-quiz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>Memories</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Writing draft</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>Vocabulary Quiz</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15</td>
<td>Reading Quiz</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20</td>
<td>Journal 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/22</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29</td>
<td>Reading Quiz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04</td>
<td>Chapter 5 Quiz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06</td>
<td>Vocabulary Quiz</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>Reading Ch. 6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>Quiz Chapter 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>DOL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18</td>
<td>Reading Ch. 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20</td>
<td>Reading Ch. 7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25</td>
<td>Journals 3-7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Midterm Grade = 68%

The student whose grades were described above, Henry, did show better progress at the beginning of the semester. His strengths were in verbal participation and reading (aloud). The reading grades were based on quizzes containing literal questions, which seemed to be easy for most students (since the class read the book aloud).
However, Henry had a problem with written homework assignments. This was evident in his lower grades for journal and composition writing. A large part of the final grade was for the final composition, which needed to be revised, edited, and completed at home. Henry struggled to keep up with the written work in class and had difficulty doing independent work at home. His reading grades were higher, probably because it was based on reading quizzes involving mostly literal comprehension questions. In school he needed extra support and assistance in understanding and completing academic tasks, and at home he received no help as his father was deployed and his mother worked nights.

Students' Overall Grades

With the exception of one student, Marvin (who did poorly), the special education students in the class all passed with generally low grades, averaging a D grade. Michelle only attended class for eight days during the weeks of observation, had a history of excessive absences, and later dropped out before the end of the school year. The special education students' grades for the first semester and the end of the year grades are provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Final Grades for Special Education Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Midterm</th>
<th>End of Semester/Final Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>62% D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>56% F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuipo</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>63% D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>73% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Left class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63 D-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall grades for the entire class included final grades of 5 As, 4 Bs, 5 Cs, 6 Ds and 8 Fs. The special education students' grades were at the lower end of the scale. When asked if the classroom teacher ever modified grades or requirements based on the special learning needs of the students, Mrs. Stanton, said that she may adjust grades for special education students if they attended class and did most of the work. For example, she said that she might change a grade from an F to a D. It is also interesting to note that most of the special education and “504” students, with the exception of one student, generally had good attendance which probably positively affected grades. However, the low grades of the special education students was an indication that inclusion was not working according to its original plan.

Teaching Methods and Class Interactions

Most of the lessons were delivered in a “top-down” manner in which the teacher instructed and students listened and responded. The general classroom teacher taught one way as the deliverer of information. Some of the teaching strategies that appeared conducive to student learning used by the general teacher included good modeling, use of webs and charts as visual cues, and the teacher frequently drew on the student’s language and experience to build concepts and understanding. Mrs. Stanton also was very warm and encouraging. However, the teacher did not use a variety of instructional strategies to accommodate individual student learning styles and frequently did not build motivation and engagement in meaningful learning tasks. The teacher did not seem to adjust her teaching and course content when it was obvious that she was not reaching many of the students. Additionally, the individual accommodations listed on each student’s IEP were
not implemented so student’s unique special learning needs were not addressed. Furthermore, there was an emphasis on “work processes” such as counting the number of words in a composition and gaining or losing points for each assignment, rather than on the process of learning.

Often, the time allotted for various tasks seemed to be too long and that students would lose interest. Additionally, there was nothing for students to do when they finished a task before the next lesson would start. Some students kept a novel at their desk so when they finished work early, they could read, and others drew on the sheets in their binder. Furthermore, the researcher did not observe lessons in which the students worked cooperatively on group or partner projects. When asked about cooperative learning opportunities in the class, Mrs. Stanton responded that the class was too large and disruptive to do cooperative learning.

Teacher-to-Student Interactions

Most of Mrs. Stanton’s interactions with the students took the form of imparting information or disciplining the students. Although there were severe discipline and management problems, Mrs. Stanton never raised her voice or intimidated the students. She was usually business-like, warm, open, and respectful to the students. Mrs. Stanton frequently provided praise and encouragement to try to motivate the students and had a very supportive manner in her interactions with them. For example,

"Good work. I’m glad you got a good grade”

"You did a nice job with your presentation.”

"I know it’s late in the day and very hot, but let’s finish.”
Mrs. Stanton always responded to the students’ questions even if they were inappropriate, and validated their responses whether or not their responses were relevant to the discussion. She frequently shared her own experiences in teaching new concepts, helped the students generate ideas for writing, and sought the students’ input. The students seemed to respond and participate actively in class discussions; however, they did not seem to have a “buy-in” to completing class written assignments.

Student Participation

Throughout the observation period, the researcher used an intermittent tally method to record levels of class engagement. Generally, engagement data during read aloud time showed that the students would move above the 50% level towards the range of 80%. However, after twenty minutes of reading, the engagement level of the students usually decreased back to 50% towards the end of the class period. For example, towards the end of a reading lesson, one special education student was drawing, two were fooling around, and one boy was reading another book. Generally, the students were more actively engaged during verbal discussions about content than during independent time to work on written assignments, at which time student engagement would drop to below 40%.

The level of student participation for the special education students in completion of class assignments was below that of their peers. However, the level of participation in verbal discussions and activities seemed to be above that of their peers. For example, two particular special education students may volunteer to read aloud, share vocabulary, daily oral language, and other activities in one class period. A possible explanation for
this could be that it was easier for the students to speak up in class than to do written work, which was more difficult for them.

**Student-to-Student Interactions**

The class seemed to become more supportive of each other as the semester went on. At the beginning, some students kept very much to themselves and didn’t interact with each other at all. Some students had frequent negative altercations resulting in students attempting to discipline each other by saying, “Be quiet! Shut up!” However, during the oral presentations, the students showed that they were able to focus when the guidelines were very explicit and they were interested in what their peers had to say. They also received points for responding appropriately.

**Teaching to Varying Learning Modalities**

Although Mrs. Stanton said that student learning through varied learning modalities was an important element of the class, most lessons were conducted in whole class format. The teacher presented information and the students followed in a traditional linguistic and visual mode of expression. One of the few multimodal lessons was when Mr. Matthews, the first special education co-teacher, who had a background in theatre, developed a lesson involving drama at the beginning of the semester. The students worked in groups of three to choose an excerpt from the class novel, write a script, and act it out. Mr. Matthews explicitly covered the rules of being a good audience such as how to project your voice. He used theatre-type language, such as, “Audience ready, actors ready, curtains up!” All of the students were actively involved and were respectful and attentive during the presentations. This was the only time that I observed some form of cooperative learning and learning through group interaction.
Mrs. Stanton attempted to present one lesson during the semester using varied learning modalities in which the class participated in a vocabulary trivia game called “All Aboard”. However, some of the questions made little sense and the level of concepts was too high. The game included lots of trivia that the students had no experiential connection to, and I questioned the object of the lesson. At first the students attempted to participate, but then became frustrated and very disruptive and loud until the activity finally ended right before the bell rang. Teaching through various modalities could have helped to meet the students’ diverse learning styles and abilities.

Role of the General Education Teacher

It was obvious during the observation period that Mrs. Stanton was the teacher in charge and that it was her classroom. She planned and delivered all of the lessons with the exception of the “reader’s theatre” activity taught by Mr. Matthews, the first co-teacher. Mrs. Stanton shared that she would rather do most of the preparation, teaching, disciplining, and grading; she did not seem to want to relinquish control. When asked about co-teaching or co-planning between the two inclusion teachers, she commented, “Mr. Matthews can teach a class if he wants to.” The two teachers did not discuss their shared teaching responsibilities. Mr. Matthews said that he did not want to “invade her space” and felt stifled in the co-teaching arrangement, which in reality was not co-teaching. When Mrs. Grant started working in the class, she took on the role of being an assistant or a tutor. Both teachers seemed to accept the clear distinction of roles.

Role of the Special Education Teacher

The researcher had observed the special education teacher, Mr. Matthews, for the first three weeks of data collection before he was moved to teach in a different class. Mr.
Matthews was a dynamic and creative teacher who enjoyed teaching language arts.

I originally chose this class for the study because I had observed Mr. Matthews co-teach (with a different English teacher) in an inclusion class during the year prior to the study. During this time I observed some positive effects of inclusion for the teachers and the students such as active student engagement and coordinated co-teaching. However, at the time of this study, Mr. Matthews took a “back seat” as co-teacher, except when he taught the “readers’ theatre” lesson. Mr. Matthews said that he would have liked to teach more if Mrs. Stanton would have been more open to it. Mr. Matthews frequently took the special education students to the resource room and closely monitored their progress.

Since Mrs. Grant, the second special education teacher, was new to the class and started three weeks into the semester, she assumed a quiet and passive role. Her role was similar to that of an aide or tutor helping students who were off-task or offering assistance with the work. At times, she took some of the special education students to the resource room to work on assignments away from the general class. Mrs. Grant did not discipline the students or teach in whole class format, only in small groups and one-to-one teaching situations. The role and interactions of Mrs. Grant will be described in this excerpt of her first day’s experience:

Mrs. Stanton introduced Mrs. Grant to the class and then explained that Mrs. Grant will be taking attendance and giving the class their vocabulary words for the day “so that Mrs. Grant will get to know you.” The class was very rude and disrespectful; the students were shouting out and were very distracting. For example, as Mrs. Grant was taking attendance and called out the name of a boy who was present; she called his name twice before the student answered. A few students responded with a sarcastic and disrespectful tone. Mrs. Grant then presented the vocabulary words in the context of sentences and the students were asked to write the words and their meaning.
Mrs. Grant said, “The vocabulary word is ‘vacillated’. She wrote the sentence on
the board.

“Tyler vacillated about buying the new car.” The students wrote this word and
its meaning and then the teacher moved to the next word.

The next word is ‘zeal.’ “The boys began building the doghouse with zeal.”

Mrs. Grant spoke very slowly and repeated over and over. She said, “Can I
please have your attention,” while the students continued to talk. Mrs. Stanton
reinforced Mrs. Grant reprimands by saying, “The class is getting too noisy”. However,
she also was not effective in maintaining class discipline. Three of the special education
students were very inattentive during this part of the lesson and made inappropriate
comments and gestures. One special education student, Marvin, started making gestures
to others across the room. The students were supposed to be finding the meaning of the
words ‘vacillated’ and ‘zeal’ by using context clues in the sentences. Only about half of
the students were actually engaged.

As a teacher new to teaching, new to Hawai‘i, and new to special education, Mrs.
Grant was not able to adequately provide the support to team teach or be a resource to
Mrs. Stanton, and her role became more of an assistant. It is also important to remember
that Mrs. Grant came into the class when the semester had already started and was
expected to co-teach an undisciplined and poorly managed class with a teacher who was
not open to sharing the teaching responsibility.

The Individualized Educational Program

All students eligible for special education had an Individualized Education
Program (IEP) outlining their present levels of performance, academic and behavior goals
and objectives, instructional and related services, and planned assessment to check
progress. Each year an annual meeting was held to review the IEP.

In reviewing the IEPs of the students in this class, the researcher found that the
goals and objectives were commonly worded and only slightly modified from year to
year and from student to student. Furthermore, the care coordinator, who was usually the special education teacher who wrote the IEP, was frequently not a teacher who taught the student. For this reason, I found that many of the IEPs were generically derived from typical student characteristics based on their disability category, rather than the individualized needs of the students. It also appeared that the goals and objectives written in the student’s IEPs underestimated the students’ abilities and present levels of performance. Furthermore, most of the special education students showed good progress or mastery of the IEP objectives, yet they struggled to get passing grades in the general class.

Here are some sample objectives taken from the Individualized Educational Programs of the special education students in this inclusion class:

- Given a list of spelling words that follow specific rules and patterns, the student will be able to spell the words with at least 70% accuracy.
- Given a list of vocabulary words, the student will be able to write the definition and use the word in a sentence with 70% accuracy.
- Given a reading passage, the student will be able to answer comprehension questions with at least 80% accuracy.
- Given a reading assignment, the student will be able to read the assignment independently and then summarize orally or in writing, the reading on 4 out of 5 occasions.
- Given an assignment, the student will remain focused and work on that assignment until it is 70% complete on 2 of 3 occasions.
- Given a writing assignment, the student will proofread his paper and make corrections before turning it in on 8 of 10 occasions.
Another concern was that there appeared to be little correlation between the IEP goals and classroom instruction, or monitoring of student progress. A sample IEP for a student in this class who had a learning disability is provided in Appendix D. The IEP includes the student’s levels of performance, standards, learning goals and opportunities, instructional and related services, accommodations, and post-secondary transition plans.

Meetings to review a student’s IEP occurred at least once a year, or more often if a parent or teacher requested a review or revision. The special education department provided the classroom teachers with copies of their student’s IEP including instructional and curriculum accommodations needed. A general teacher was required to be at IEP, and eligibility, and student support team meetings. However, during the first semester at the time of the study, Mrs. Stanton had not been invited to any of these meetings. Mrs. Stanton stated that she would be willing to go to the IEP meetings when she is invited. It is important to keep in mind that only one general teacher was required to be at these team meetings. The students may have had five or six general education classes throughout the day taught by different teachers.

When asked if she was aware of the needs of the students and whether the IEP was shared with her, Mrs. Stanton said that she did get a list of accommodations, but when asked whether she implemented the accommodations and modifications outlined in the student’s IEPs, she responded, “Not really, not in such a large class. How can I be expected to adapt for individual students when the class is so big?” Mrs. Stanton did not seem to understand what inclusion and special education entailed. This reiterates the need for assistance from a licensed special education teacher.
Supports for Teachers

Collaboration Meetings

At the initial stages of inclusion implementation at this school, the general and special education teachers and administrators met as a team to orient the teachers to inclusion, provide professional development, and to work out problems with the system. At the time of this study, which was the fourth year of implementation, inclusion was a mandatory school-wide effort with ongoing meetings to help the co-teachers plan teaching strategies, curriculum units, and address student needs. In reality, Mr. Matthews met with Mrs. Stanton only once at the beginning of the year for three hours to collaborate about the class.

When the second special education teacher, Mrs. Grant, came on board, Mr. Matthews met with her after school a few times to prepare her for the class and shadowed her for a day. As the semester progressed, co-teacher planning time was very minimal. The researcher did not observe any planned collaboration meetings other than the common monthly department meetings, which usually covered general department issues. One factor for the lack of planning time was that Mrs. Grant moved on to teach in other classes with other teachers during the school day, and didn’t have much opportunity throughout the day to interact with Mrs. Stanton. Furthermore, Mrs. Stanton, as the lead teacher in charge of teaching and learning, did not find it important to meet to plan with the co-teacher since the co-teacher did not teach or create lessons. Any collaboration between the co-teachers occurred during class through informal conversations about student grades and other areas of concern. Neither teacher viewed collaboration meetings as an essential component of inclusion. Mrs. Stanton did say that she would let the
special education teacher teach if she requested it. Mrs. Grant never asked and Mrs.
Stanton never encouraged her to plan or present lessons.

Administrator Support

The administrators of Sherman High School included one principal, Mr. Stone,
and two vice-principals. One of the vice-principals, Mrs. McGivens, oversaw the Special
Education Department. Two co-chairpersons, Mr. Matthews and Miss Miller,
coordinated the Special Education Department. The administration was credited as being
a strong curriculum leader and the driving force in implementing inclusion and playing a
crucial role in its success. The administrator’s role according to the original inclusion
plan, was to facilitate communication between the team teachers, set guidelines for
inclusion, promote parental involvement, and assist the special education department in
coordinating with other departments to allow for changes such as in teachers schedules.

The administrator had successfully imparted an awareness of inclusion and
launched its implementation; however, the tools for its success were not explicit. Other
key players in the implementation of inclusion at Sherman High School included teachers
and resource staff who were committed to make inclusion work, but they had many other
teaching and school-wide responsibilities that took most of their time and energy.

Additionally, there was minimal support from district and state resource teachers or
administrators specifically related to inclusion, other than offering a teacher workshop on
differentiation. Inclusion at this school became a mandatory responsibility for general
and special education teachers in which adequate guidance and support was not provided
according to the school inclusion plan. Furthermore, many teachers viewed the mandate
to teach in an inclusion class as a “top-down” decision, and did not feel adequately
prepared to co-teach or to teach students with special learning needs. Additionally, many of the teachers who were team with each other were new teachers with little experience and professional background in special education or inclusion practices.

**Teacher Support through Professional Development**

Professional development was a key element in the success of the inclusion program at Sherman High School according to the inclusion plan. There seemed to be a greater need for professional development at this school because so many of the teachers were either not certified in their teaching area or were new in the field. State certification alone was not a clear requisite for effective teaching as some certified special education teachers were not prepared to co-teach in an inclusion class.

School-initiated professional development at Sherman High School, during the year of this study, included articulation time for teachers to meet to align their curriculum with the state standards, and a workshop on elements of effective teaching. The workshop on teaching was based on recommendations by Onosko and Jorganson (1998) and covered lesson and unit planning in inclusion classes. Ideas included structuring a unit of study around an issue or question to provide direction and cohesion to the learning experience and ways to differentiate instruction. Teachers were taught how to address their students’ varied learning styles through cooperative and small group projects, and how to use multiple assessments to check for progress. Varied modes of students’ expression were emphasized, such as how students can show new understandings through written projects, demonstrations, and oral presentations. While the classroom teacher said that she learned much through this workshop, actual classroom implementation of the ideas presented was not evident, and there was no follow-up after these workshops.
The district also sponsored a “Language Arts Consortium” in which teachers created and shared lessons and assessments based on the state standards. Four teachers from the school attended, including the general teacher, Mrs. Stanton. Professional development was also provided through school department meetings related to special education guidelines and aligning curriculum with the performance standards.

Teacher Attitudes and Reflections

*General Education Teacher Reflections on Inclusion*

When asked whether inclusion was helping the students in her class to learn, Mrs. Stanton said that she could not tell because she didn’t know how they would progress if they were in a separate resource class. Students with mildly handicapping conditions such as specific learning disability and emotional problems, were not in fully self-contained classes or in separate resource classes for most of the school day, so there was no comparison base. However, Mrs. Stanton did find that these students, needed extra assistance in completion of academic tasks when compared to the general students and that they tended to display greater behavior problems.

Each inclusion teacher said that the main priority in improving inclusion at the school would be to create smaller classes. When asked for a “wish list”, teachers responded that the ideal program would involve smaller classes and more in-service, especially on how to adapt instruction. Mrs. Stanton felt that she was unprepared to teach special education students and that she had limited knowledge about student disabilities and interventions to help them to learn. Her ideas for improving inclusion illustrated the discrepancy between the ideal planned inclusion program and the realities of actual practice.
When asked the question: How do you change or adapt instruction to meet students’ needs? Mrs. Stanton answered, “How can you make adaptations or accommodations in such a large class?” She shared that sometimes she changes grades if she knows that the student worked very hard. For example, a special education student, Ivan, had an F and she moved it to a D-. Mrs. Stanton said that if the special education students met the standards, then they should pass the class. It should be noted that one of the special education students who was not passing was given more intensive support through the school’s academic motivation program, an alternative class to help students with academic and social skills to motivate them to stay in school.

Mrs. Stanton and other teachers felt that professional development was needed, and that the administration should provide more time for workshops and teaming meetings. One teacher said, “There is no time for professional development or for collaborative meetings. The co-teachers needed to meet to discuss students and to articulate the curriculum and instruction. There is just no time.”

During an after school conversation, Mrs. Stanton shared that she really cares about the students and that her main goal was to teach English. She wanted to help her students improve in reading and writing. Mrs. Stanton said that her philosophy was that she wants students to show respect and to know that, “When you believe in yourself, anything is possible.” She did not feel that discipline was her strong point and that she has had behavior problems throughout her teaching career. Mrs. Stanton felt that there were too many special education students in the class, which added to the discipline and behavior problems she encountered. Inclusion in a large class created greater challenges for a teacher in managing the class.
When inclusion started four years ago the classes included a small number of special education students. The special and general education teachers said that if there were only one or two special education students in the class, inclusion would be more effective. The incentive for general teachers to teach an inclusion class was that they would have the support of another teacher. Currently, the inclusion classes averaged five to eight special education students. Mrs. Stanton said, "Right now there are too many students who are distracting to others; they try to get individual attention and it takes time away from the other students."

Special Education Teacher Reflections on Inclusion

The special education co-teacher was so new, and lacked experience and training in special education, that she did not have much to say about the inclusion class. She felt that the students definitely needed much assistance and that the best way to help them was by providing one-to-one help in a setting other than the general education class. Mrs. Grant felt that the general class was so large and loud, that she preferred to take students out to work in another room on a one-to-one or small group basis, and that the students accomplished more in this setting. She also said that she felt that she needed more support, such as in-service training, to help her meet the needs of students with learning and other disabilities. Mrs. Grant said that she would be starting a state sponsored teacher certification program in special education and hoped to build her knowledge and experience.

Overall teacher reflections. There appeared to be a lack of understanding of the philosophy and pedagogical methods involved with inclusion by both regular and special education teachers. Teachers said that they felt the roles and responsibilities of general
and special education teachers were not clearly defined, and that administrative support was superficial and removed from the realities of the classroom. Generally, the teacher competencies needed to do successful inclusion were unknown to teachers and school personnel; the participant teachers expressed these concerns to the researcher. There was a lack of resource support, professional development, and time for co-planning that would have fostered effective team building.

While teacher collaboration and co-teaching could have produced lessons using differentiated strategies but there was much hesitation among the inclusion teachers regarding teaming. Although there was communication through ongoing dialogue between the regular and the special education teachers relating to students learning needs, there was a lack of shared ownership and mutual responsibility by all stakeholders. A disadvantage was that there was a lack of coordinated teaching and the use of differentiated strategies provided by both teachers. They did not view or see each other as resources for one another. Other concerns expressed by the teachers were a lack of shared responsibilities and roles, time for team meetings, adequate curriculum resources, professional development for administration and teachers, and a problem-solving process.

Some perceptions of the positive effects of inclusion were increased awareness and focus on teaching to meet diverse student needs. There was a genuine sense of concern by the classroom teacher for all of the students in the class. The teachers also felt that there had been increased positive social interaction and a greater acceptance of all students, even though student interactions were negative at times. According to the special education teacher, some special education students seemed to change their previous negative attitudes towards school and increase self-confidence, as they realized
that they could pass a general class. For many students, merely passing a class taken with their peers was perceived as success. Teachers and staff noticed that a few special education students (not in the participant class) had become more motivated and were becoming exemplary students.

Students' Attitudes

Generally, the students did not seem to be involved as a community of learners. The students with greater learning needs struggled to pass the class while the higher-level general education students were bored and able to complete the class requirements easily. In addition, many students seemed disinterested or bored and did not demonstrate a 'buy-in' to complete the class tasks. Some of the comments shared by the students were:

"The students are rude and act up too much."

"The teacher talks too slow."

"I’m tired of reading the same book."

"The teacher has no control."

"This class is too boring."

"The teacher gets on my case too much. She d."

"Everything takes too long. It’s too late in the year."

"The class is too big."

"The other students are distracting. They think I want to get extra credit."

"I help the teacher. I like to get extra credit."

"It’s easy to get good grades in this class."

"I like learning new vocabulary."
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When asked how this class is different from previous classes, one special education student commented, "I used to go to special classes in the portables but the school messed up my placement." Another student shared, "I like to get rewarded. They gave me lots of points (referring to the previous year when the student had special education resource pullout)." One girl said, "I was in special education classes before because I was a behavior problem but the classes were too easy."

Administrator Perceptions of Inclusion

Mr. Stone, the principal, shared a philosophical and humanistic view that inclusion was the most effective way to meet students’ needs. He was proud of the progress that has been made thus far, and discussed the supports that were in place and the model of inclusion that he believed was in place. Mr. Stone talked about the rationale and goals of the resource room as a supplemental support for all students who needed extra assistance. He also felt that the common study period at the end of the day helped all students receive extra assistance in academic core areas. However, Mr. Stone was also aware that there were still areas that needed improvement.

Mr. Stone said that inclusion has helped the students with special learning needs to access the general curriculum, which has led to higher academic progress and improved self-esteem when the stigma of being in special education classes is removed. (It is interesting to note that it was obvious which students were given extra help in and out of the class by the special education co-teacher and that the stigma may still exist.)

Mr. Stone said that he asked all of the teachers to teach inclusion classes so that all can experience the positive outcomes of inclusion, and to build the teacher’s professional capacity in meeting the needs of diverse learners. However, not all teachers
shared the same responsibility. Mr. Stone was also proud of the fact that some special education teachers were teaching general education classes. His perception of the biggest accomplishment in inclusion was:

"We no longer meet the strong resistance in providing inclusive classrooms; rather we have teachers clamoring for professional development in differentiated instruction. We struggle with providing time for the many meetings that must be scheduled during the school day. We still have problems but basically we embrace new challenges that inclusion has presented."

Furthermore, the administrator felt that inclusion could be improved with more support from the district and state in providing financial and other resources, such as on-site resource assistance for teachers and additional staff, including educational assistants to lower student-teacher ratios. Mr. Stone also felt that inclusion would be more effective when all teachers had positive attitudes and could collaborate more effectively on the delivery of instruction. In reflecting on the question, "What has been the biggest barrier to overcome?" the administrator said that he felt that teacher attitudes and their willingness to do inclusion were the main issues. He was also concerned that the teachers who were being trained for special education certification through the DOE’s alternative certification program were not prepared well to meet the needs of the students.

Mr. Stone’s vision was that all teachers would be involved with inclusion so that they can experience the advantages when students can participate in a more equitable general curriculum with their peers. He also envisioned all special education students taking the same standardized tests that the general education students take and scoring just as well. The administrators and teachers also felt that resources were needed in personnel such as having a full-time psychologist and a full-time teacher to administer the resource classroom. The administrator also commented that time and energy were
important factors as the school struggled to provide time for the many meetings that must be scheduled.

District Reflections on Inclusion

District resource teachers shared that they would like to see more open discussion of the issues facing the school in providing appropriate services for all students. One district teacher said, "We need to create detailed plans to improve supports for general education teachers to encourage the inclusion of special education students with their general education peers." The district plans to offer workshops on differentiated instructional strategies and interventions, assessment, classroom management, and on the needs of students with autism, traumatic brain-injury, and mental retardation. A recommendation is for the district resource teachers to have a checklist to monitor the supports that teachers must be given to implement inclusion.

Summary

In this chapter a portrayal of an inclusion classroom was revealed through classroom observations and conversations with the participant teachers and school personnel. I focused on the learning experiences of the special education students in the class and the teachers of the inclusion class. In general, the special education students received instruction in language arts in a very large English class comprised mostly of boys, with a large percentage of students with special learning and emotional needs. At times, the curriculum and instructional components seemed to be "low level instruction." However, there were some incidents of high-level thinking (but not enough) and reflection during class discussion.
An unprepared and unlicensed special education teacher was responsible for implementing the language arts objectives stated on the IEPs of the special education students in the class and monitoring their progress. She spent the majority of her time assisting the students with their class work so that they could keep up with their peers and gain passing grades. Her role was more that of an aide or tutor rather than a special education teacher who was a resource to the classroom teacher. Very few accommodations, adaptations, or individualized instruction were provided for the special education students in the class, other than occasional one-to-one and small group assistance in the resource class to help the students to complete the class assignments.

The special education students seemed to respond well to class discussions and reading aloud, but had great difficulty in completing written requirements. The general students had higher grades (grades of A, B or C) but seemed bored and disinterested in the lessons. Generally, very few students seemed to have a “buy-in” or sense of purpose in completing the written activities. Discipline and classroom management were a challenge and most likely had a negative effect on student academic progress.

In general, Sherman High School had a workable model for inclusion and the provision of resources for student support. Teacher collaboration was actually minimal. Positive collaboration may have been hindered by the general education teacher’s attitude toward teaming and her desire to be in control of teaching and learning in the class. Also, the classroom teacher was asked to team with an unlicensed, untrained teacher, instead of with a special education teacher with expertise as promised. This type of support is essential in meeting the diverse learning needs of the students. The special education teacher was new, inexperienced, and was expected to co-teach in a difficult class.
Additionally, teachers were expected to attend many meetings after school and may not have had the time or energy to focus on inclusion or teaming concerns.

Although administrative support was a key factor in initiating inclusion at Sherman High School, explicit guidelines for practical classroom application were not clear, and follow-up support was minimal. Professional development provided by the school, district, or state did not address how to teach special education students in general classes, co-teaching issues, or ways to meet the instructional and emotional needs of students with learning problems.

The following chapter describes the second inclusion classroom at a rural intermediate and high school. In Chapter 6, Discussion of the Findings, the researcher will address the findings in terms of the research questions of this study and its significance. I will discuss how the findings of the two classes compare to each other, and ways they can be generalized to other secondary inclusion programs. Finally, I will discuss recommendations for successful inclusion and implications for future research.
CHAPTER 5
INCLUSION AT A RURAL SECONDARY SCHOOL

The second case study explored an inclusion class at Kulanui Intermediate and High School. This class was chosen to be included in this research study because the school had implemented a unique model in which the inclusion program was structured. In this chapter, I will describe the school and its inclusion program for special education students, the participant inclusion class, and its reflection of the research questions explored in this study.

A summary of the data sources, timeline, and research questions is presented in Figure 6. The researcher visited the school and conducted observations on a daily basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>September 1, 2000 – November 30, 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 observations of each class (case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 – 70 minutes each day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 weeks time span</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Teachers and students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators and other Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Study</th>
<th>Individual Educational Programs (IEPs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School and district reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student progress reports and grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>7th Grade English class – 33 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education teachers and assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 Students (5 Special education students)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>What was the model and process of inclusion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are elements of effective inclusion present?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the curriculum and instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can inclusion be improved?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Data Sources for Case Study of Kulanui Intermediate and High School
The School Context

In this section I will describe the setting of this case study. Kulanui Intermediate and High School is a large school in a rural area in Hawai‘i serving students from grades 7–12. During the 2001 school year, 1906 students were enrolled at Kulanui Intermediate and High School, of which 809 or 43%, were eligible for free or reduced-cost lunch. (This figure may actually be higher because secondary students who are eligible for the reduced lunch program tend not to apply for this service in comparison with elementary students in the feeder schools.) One hundred ninety-eight, or 10.4% of the students were eligible for special education services, and 77 or 4% of students had limited English proficiency. The school had a culturally diverse student population of predominantly Polynesian ancestry. Approximately 75% of the students were of South Pacific Islander ancestry including Hawaiian, Samoan, Tongan, Maori, Fijian, Micronesian, and other (Laotian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese). Ethnic characteristics of the students included: 37% Hawaiian, 21% Caucasian, 13% Samoan, 5% Filipino, 1% Portuguese, 1% Hispanic, 2.4% Japanese, and 20% other ethnicities. The community surrounding the school consisted of a population of 17,877 with 15% of families headed by single parents, and 10% of families receiving public assistance income (Hawai‘i DOE, 2001a). It was estimated that approximately 16% of families with children lived in poverty.

In 1988-89 Kulanui Intermediate and High School was recognized as a “School of Excellence” by the United States Department of Education for its community involvement and its strong effective school practices. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges accredited the school in 1998 for a full six years. The school was proud of honors such as winning state championships for History Day, “We the People”,
Speech and Debate, and various sports including wrestling, football, basketball, and water polo. It also had an outstanding marching band that performed in the Macy's Day Parade in New York City and the Rose Parade in Los Angeles.

At Kulanui Intermediate and High School High School there were 70 general education teachers, 19 special education teachers, and 21 support staff providing supplemental instruction in 2001. The Special Education Department was the largest department in the school. Sixty-nine percent (69%) of the teachers were certified in the field in which they teach. In the year of the study 95% of seniors graduated with high school diplomas.

Sacred Stories of Kulanui Intermediate and High School

As previously mentioned, Clandinin and Connelly (1996) describe sacred stories as the visions, the policies, and improvement plans that describe an ideal learning environment on the professional knowledge landscape. Kulanui Intermediate and High School’s sacred story included the school vision that was “Learning today for lifelong success!” The school’s plan to achieve this vision was through the following mission statement:

- Kulanui Intermediate and High School’s ohana (family) recognizes that each individual has inherent worth and talent to become a dedicated lifelong learner.
- The school will be a safe, supportive environment where a caring, stimulating, and knowledgeable staff has adequate resources to meet the needs of all students.
- Kulanui Intermediate and High School students will engage in a relevant and challenging curriculum that provides worthwhile learning experiences.
- Kulanui Intermediate and High School graduates will be empowered with the academic, career, citizenship, and social skills necessary to meet the challenges of the 21st century.
- Kulanui Intermediate and High School will be an ohana of meaningful involvement and will remain a source of pride for all.
The school identified General Learner Outcomes (GLO’s) which were consistent with those of the Department of Education (DOE) that Kulanui Intermediate and High School students will be responsible for one’s own learning, to work together, to be involved in complex thinking and problem solving, and to recognize and produce quality performance. However, these goals were vague, nonspecific, and not easily measured. New initiatives during the time of the study were transition activities for incoming seventh graders, post-secondary transition programs for upper level students, and the use of career portfolios and problem-based learning programs to promote a positive school climate. A major need area was to improve the skills for students performing below average in reading and math. Supplemental reading and study skills classes were recently established to help students to improve their literacy skills.

The Inclusion Model

Kulanui Intermediate and High School’s plan for inclusion was part of the school’s ideal or the “sacred story.” A team of teachers worked on planning and implementing the inclusion program, which was initiated in 1996. The first phase of inclusion took place in seventh grade classes. At that time, students took classes in teams called “pods”. This type of teaming is similar to a middle school and the “school within a school” concept, where students move with their team to classes throughout the day taught by a common core of teachers. The first inclusion classes included one team of teachers who agreed to take special needs students into their classes with in-class resource support provided by the special education teachers. The school eventually implemented inclusion in one grade level each year, reaching its current high school level implementation.
In the structure for inclusion at Kulanui Intermediate and High School, a general education teacher was the lead teacher who delivered instruction, planned lessons, and assessed student progress. The special education teacher’s role was to be a resource to the classroom teacher by adapting curriculum and using teaching strategies to meet the special learning needs of the students included in the class. I had observed the classroom teacher of the participant class and a special education teacher working together in an English class the previous semester, and observed this model for inclusion in action. I chose this teacher’s seventh grade English class to be part of the study because I felt that it represented a unique model for inclusion in a secondary school in Hawai‘i.

The role of the special education teacher, according to the school’s inclusion plan, was to be the resource person who had experience and the knowledge about students’ disabilities and learning needs. The special education teacher would stay in the class throughout the class period, take notes, circulate among the students to offer assistance, and adapt curriculum to make accommodations for the students with special learning needs. For example, when the teacher gave a test, the special education resource teacher would adapt it, resulting in the student being given a test with fewer items or differently worded items. The special education teacher was also most of the students’ care coordinator for their Individualized Education Program (IEP), and therefore had knowledge of the students’ present levels of performance and their learning needs. The role of the care coordinator was to oversee and manage the student’s IEP including related and extended school year services, annual reviews, and the evaluation processes.

The special education students were also provided supplemental study skills help through a resource class, taught by a special education teacher and an educational
assistant. The school’s inclusion plan outlined that the special resource teachers and the general education teachers should meet on a regular basis to collaborate and plan instruction. A framework of the school’s model for inclusion is presented in Figure 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Teacher</th>
<th>Special Education Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Teacher</td>
<td>Resource in meeting special learning needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Class teaching format</td>
<td>Provide individual and small-group assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivers all Instruction</td>
<td>Works with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individually within class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small-group and one-to-one pullout as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans Curriculum Instruction</td>
<td>Adapts curriculum, instruction and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final grading for all students</td>
<td>Determines student progress on IEP goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General education elective classes</th>
<th>Special education study skills class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Optional supplemental classes in reading writing, and computer.</td>
<td>• Separate class for additional assistance for one other class period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After-School assistance provided by all teachers

*Figure 7.* The Ideal Model for Inclusion at Kulanui Intermediate and High School

**Rationale in Choosing the School to Participate in this Study**

As mentioned earlier I had observed this inclusion model in action at Kulanui Intermediate and High School during the year prior to the actual study. On six occasions I visited and observed the class of the participant teacher of the general class in my role as a state resource teacher for teacher training. I was familiar with the positive dynamics of the class and impressed with the students’ progress and the instructional supports that were in place for all students. I found that the inclusion model was unique and different
than other secondary schools and believed that an in-depth study could add greater understanding of inclusion in secondary schools in Hawai‘i. I also had a positive rapport with the classroom teacher and felt comfortable visiting her class. Additionally, the classroom teacher was welcoming and open-minded about the researcher spending a large amount of time in her class on a daily basis.

With the increasing numbers of certified students, it was essential that the school utilize its staff and resources to provide adequate support to meet the needs of the students and maintain this inclusion model. The numbers of students eligible for specialized instruction in the school had increased by almost 50% within the past three years. When the school initiated a new trimester system in 2001, the integrity of the structure of inclusion at Kulanui Intermediate and High School was compromised, which will be described in the following section. Scheduling and personnel changes made it difficult to adhere to the original plan for inclusion. Since this is a naturalistic study to explore a phenomenon in its natural setting, the reality of inclusion in actual practice will be the portrait portrayed in this case study. My pre-study assumption was that there was a very unique and workable model for inclusion in place at Kulanui Intermediate and High School. In reality, changes occurred, which were not unusual in a large school in a statewide Department of Education system that resulted in less than ideal conditions.

Actual Classroom Practice

I had observed this inclusion model in practice during six visits to the general teacher’s classroom during the previous school year. At that time, the special education teacher served as a resource to the general education teacher in the classroom. The special education teacher partnered with the general teacher by collaborating on lesson
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planning, communicating the special education students’ individual needs and learning styles, and planning instructional modifications. However, at the time of the actual study I found that the classroom teacher was not only the lead teacher but also was, in reality, the only teacher. The special education teacher was, in actuality, a long-term substitute, who had no teaching experience and no training in special education teaching. This was a similar situation that had occurred at Sherman High School, in which actual classroom practice did not meet a level of effective inclusion.

Unfortunately, the restructuring of the school from a semester to a trimester schedule precluded the allocation of a special education teacher to the inclusion class. To help fill the need for resource assistance and collaboration, the special education teacher of a study skills class monitored the progress of the special education students. A substitute teacher was hired to assist the general education teacher in the classroom. The model of actual practice of inclusion during the year of the study is described in Figure 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead General Education Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains total responsibility for teaching class, planning, curriculum, and grading of students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Substitute Teacher as Educational Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Fulfills duties similar to an educational assistant, such as collecting papers, helping to keep track, offering one-to-one assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• C: Collects and stores students responsible for implementing their plans and monitoring progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• T: Teaches supplemental additional instruction and projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M: Monitors education class and takes students out for extra activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8. Inclusion in Actual Classroom Practice at Kulanui Intermediate & High School*
The Teachers

The participant teacher was Mrs. Mari Thomas, a licensed secondary English teacher. This was the same teacher whom the researcher had observed the previous year. She had taught for nine years at Kulanui Intermediate and High School and has a reputation for being an effective teacher who was patient, supportive, and who had high expectations for student academic achievement in language arts. Mrs. Thomas was involved in the initial planning and implementation of inclusive education at Kulanui Intermediate and High School. She was also the first teacher to volunteer to include special education students in her English classes during the first phase of implementation and each year thereafter. Mrs. Thomas was originally from Tahiti and is of part-Polynesian ancestry (a similar ethnicity as that of the students). Mrs. Thomas enjoyed teaching and being with the students and had an active life outside of the class, raising seven children, and pursuing music and poetry in her leisure time.

As described earlier, the inclusion plan called for a special education teacher to be assigned to work with this inclusion class. However, this type of support was not offered during the year of the study and a long-term substitute teacher, Mrs. Pat Martinez, was hired to provide in-class assistance. Mrs. Martinez had experience in substitute teaching across all grade levels during the past two years. However, she had no teaching training or experience in general or special education and little knowledge of teaching special education students. For the purposes of reporting the findings of this study, she will be referred to as the special education substitute teacher or assistant in the inclusion class. The limitations of her experience and lack of teaching certification will be discussed in the following sections of this chapter.
The original plan, at the beginning of the year, was that Mrs. Martinez would take some of the students who needed extra assistance or tutoring to work in a separate classroom during the class period when it was needed. A teacher of the class next door offered to let Ms. Martinez use her room for the pullout sessions as needed during her preparation period since no other rooms were available on campus. However, this was not utilized, except for purposes of individual counseling, when a student’s disruptive behavior resulted in taking him to another room to ensure the learning or safety of the other students.

The special education teacher who was the care coordinator for many of the seventh grade special education students was Mrs. Tiana Bolton. She was a young woman who was expecting her first child during the time of the study. Mrs. Bolton planned to go on maternity leave before the winter vacation in December. She had been teaching for three years and was a certified special education teacher. She received her certification through the DOE’s alternate teacher certification program. Mrs. Bolton planned the IEPs for the special education students, monitored the students in the general education classes, collaborated with the general education teachers, and taught a study skills resource class which offered additional assistance to the special education students in the core subjects.

The Class

The participant class was a seventh grade general English class of 33 students. The class was held during the last period of the day for a period of sixty-five minutes. As mentioned earlier, the general classroom teacher assumed sole responsibility in curriculum planning and delivery. She received in-class support from the substitute
teacher (Mrs. Martinez), and resource support from the special education teacher. The special education teacher, Mrs. Bolton, taught a study skills class for a small group of special education students. The students were scheduled to go to this resource class for one period during the school day.

This general classroom was a portable room at the furthest end of the campus. The portable classroom appeared to be in need of renovations such as painting and window and lighting repair. The bulletin boards contained posters of the state learning standards for language arts, levels of thinking for comprehension skills, motivational posters (e.g., “Reach for your dreams.” “Everyone is a winner.”), and some student work. The teacher’s desk was in the front of the classroom and the students’ desks were in traditional rows.

The students in this class included 14 girls and 19 boys, which was considered a very large class. A large proportion of the students in the class had special and diverse learning needs. Five students were certified to receive special education services through IDEA; two students were eligible for accommodations under 504 plans; three students received English as a Second Language (ESL) services; and two male students were eighth graders who were repeating the class for the third time. Both displayed motivational and behavior problems in class. More boys than girls were identified as needing more intensive levels of instruction and assistance in their learning. Most of the students in the class were of Polynesian ancestry including Hawaiian, Tongan, Micronesian and Samoan. A breakdown of students with diverse learning needs is shown in Table 6.
Table 6. Students with Diverse Learning Needs in the Inclusion Class

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Special Education students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 “504” students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade students repeating 7th Grade English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ESL students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three students received additional supports through the school’s English as a Second Language (ESL) program; they were Darrell, Thomas, and a female student, Kaylen. Kaylen’s skills appeared to be average. Darrell’s literacy skills were estimated to be approximately two to three years behind his peers in Writing and Reading. Thomas struggled with writing and reading and frequently displayed inappropriate behavior and lack of motivation.

Two other students were classified as needing “504” modifications. Students who are in need of “504” accommodations qualify for a Modification Plan based on their needs under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Chapter 504, (P.L 93-112). This included one girl, Luana, who received mental health services due to severe emotional distress which affected her grades, and one boy, Thomas, who needed accommodations for health needs (severe asthma), which resulted in inconsistent attendance in school.

Students who were in need of learning supports through IDEA, Chapter 504, English as a Second Language (ESL) and the two students who were repeating the class composed 27.5% of the class or 12 students.
Special Education Students

There were five special education students in this class as shown in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keaka</td>
<td>ED Emotionally Disturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>SLD Specific Learning Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>ED Emotionally Disturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>SLD Specific Learning Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa</td>
<td>SLD Specific Learning Disability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Special Education Students

A short description of special education student characteristics and learning needs are described below:

1. Keaka was a student who struggled academically and also displayed emotional and social needs. His mother was an advocate for special education parent rights. Keaka struggled in math and writing.

2. Nelson had a positive attitude toward learning and was polite and attentive in his classes. He was responsible in completing assignments in and out of his classes and had good attendance. His strength was computational math but he struggled with word problems. His main difficulty was in reading and spelling.

3. Jonathan was a student who had had a very difficult family life. His mother passed away when he was five years old from a drug overdose and his father was an active substance abuser. He was currently living with his father and his father’s girlfriend who was also abusing drugs. At times he lived in a foster care home with his aunt. Jonathan had severe emotional issues that were interfering with his ability to be successful in school. He also was very volatile and frequently exhibited very distracting...
successful in school. He also was very volatile and frequently exhibited very distracting and disruptive school behaviors. Jonathan struggled academically in writing, reading and math.

4. Kevin was a student with a specific learning disability who had a friendly demeanor but became frustrated easily because the work was difficult. Kevin had problems in organization and consistency in completing and turning in homework and written assignments.

5. Elissa had difficulty in reading and writing and also had emotional and behavioral needs. She received related services of mental health counseling through the Department of Health as a contracted service. Elissa read at approximately third grade level, became easily frustrated, and struggled in most academic tasks.

All of the special education students also had IEP goals for organizational and coping skills.

The Curriculum, a Representation

The curriculum was composed of language arts components including vocabulary study, reading and literature, writing, and oral expression. While the general teacher, Mrs. Thomas attempted to integrate curriculum through interesting thematic units, there was also a heavy emphasis on grades and points for skills practice activities that took a large percentage of class time. The majority of instructional time was spent on large-group discussion and lecture with skills practice through student worksheets. Student to student interaction was minimal; no cooperative learning was observed. The breadth and depth of content area curriculum covered tended to be mundane, rote, and skills-based. The teacher’s underlying curriculum philosophy seemed to overemphasize the “work” and series of tasks that needed to be done rather than what was “taught and learned”.
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These main curriculum components will be described in this section through excerpts from typical lessons derived from the observational data.

**Vocabulary and Spelling**

Vocabulary study and application of new words in conversation were a major part of this class. Spelling and sentence writing were an ongoing weekly activity to reinforce vocabulary. Each week the students were given a list of ten spelling and vocabulary words. The students would receive a handout of the vocabulary words and definitions on Monday to start the routine for the week. Each day, there would be an assignment related to the words for that week. Students had the entire week to complete the assignment, which included writing the words five times each, writing the definition, and using it in a sentence. On Friday the class would have a quiz consisting of some sentence completions and multiple-choice items. Grades would be given in the form of points.

Formal vocabulary lessons integrated spelling and writing through class discussion that drew on student’s language and experience. The teacher frequently presented the words in a sentence containing rich context and drew on the student’s language and experience. For example, in explaining the word *acquitted*, she used the example of O.J. Simpson being acquitted.

At times, the teacher would give mini-lessons such as a short lesson on the use of homonyms.

TEACHER: We need to practice some mechanics, especially words that are confusing. Some words have the same sound but different meaning such as:

- *their*  *they’re*  *there*
- *you’re*  *your*
- *its*  *it’s*
TEACHER: If you use the computer check, the computer will not find these errors because they are spelled right but may have been used wrong. Who can tell me how to use their? (She shows the example on the board.)

The students were asked to write the seven homonyms from the board and describe their use by taking notes in their class notebooks. The teacher asked the students to give her an example using the word in a sentence to check for understanding. The teacher explained each homonym using the student’s input as examples and then gave a “pop quiz” to see who was paying attention. The students were given five sentence completion tasks using the homonyms. They self-corrected their work; most students got three or four correct.

Another type of mini-lesson for word study was called “Spelling Dictation.” In this procedure the teacher would dictate a sentence and students would volunteer to write the sentence on the board. For example,

*The spooky story was about a ghost in a cemetery.*

TEACHER: I am going to drill you on spelling dictation. This is a check of vocabulary, spelling and sentence writing.

Two students with special learning needs, Kevin and Jonathan, volunteered. Then the teacher led a class discussion to check spelling, wording and sentences structure. The students checked their own work and Mrs. Thomas included the students in the practice and discussion. For example, she gave a clue for the word, ‘cemetery’ that it has ‘all e’s. The teacher repeated the process to teach another vocabulary word in a dictated sentence.

Some of the words included in this lesson were:

*cafeteria  calendar  callous  cemetery*
TEACHER: Look and learn from your errors. Write your paragraph carefully. Look over your errors. Use your best handwriting and do you work carefully. Think of it as getting more practice.

The class was then asked to use the spelling/vocabulary words in a paragraph on their own. Many students did not finish or include all of the words in their paragraph.

Reading and Literature Study

Reading centered on short stories based on thematic units. During the observation period the thematic units were on spooky tales and myths and legends. Key components of reading involved read aloud, sustained silent reading, and independent home reading. During read aloud the teacher read and the students followed along in their books. The class read a literature anthology consisting of stories, plays and poems. However, there were not enough books for every student so some students had to share books.

During one unit, the students read myths and legends and then wrote and shared their own stories. To introduce the unit, the class read a story about a “peculiar” chicken from the class literature anthology text. Students were asked to write a summary of the story in their reading log. This story had a local setting and characters and the students identified with it. This became a springboard to introduce the spooky tales unit. The class also read a variety of Hawaiian legends and Greek myths.

Another unit, the “spooky tales” unit, was presented around the time of Halloween. The teacher usually tapped on the students’ language and experience to help them make connections and arouse interest in the stories. For example, Mrs. Thomas brought in an article about spooky tales of Hawai’i from the newspaper and emphasized the idea that the students had stories that were also very intriguing.
As a culminating activity for the unit on spooky tales and legends, the teacher showed a special video by Glen Grant, a famous storyteller in Hawai‘i called Chicken Skin. Mrs. Thomas explained, “We’ve been telling our stories and now it is time to listen to others tell their stories. There are many myths in Hawai‘i and spirits are part of the daily routine of many people here.” On the video, local people (from Hawai‘i) shared their experiences with the supernatural. The class was very attentive during the video. The teacher explained that she wanted the students to watch the video mainly to listen and enjoy it rather than taking notes.

The teacher frequently used film as a reward and to reinforce key concepts of the lessons. For example, during a unit on myths and legends, the class saw the film The Medusa. The teacher would put excerpts of the movie on during the last fifteen minutes of class. At times, the students would be asked to take notes. For example, during the movie, The Medusa, the student’s task was to write notes on heroic characters, such as Pegasus, the Medusa, and Peruses. Students were actively involved and attentive and did take notes. The teacher was always visible, accessible to the students, and would provide cues of upcoming events during the movie.

Sustained Silent Reading (SSR). Twice a week at the beginning of each period the teacher provided time for sustained silent reading called SSR. Here the students were asked to read silently and independently and to write a summary response of what they read in their reading log. During SSR, student engagement was high (about 90%). Students usually read quietly, although some students had difficulty getting started, or would be pretending to read. The students needed more explicit assistance in choosing
material at their reading level and interest. Some students read surfing magazines or the newspaper (usually the sports section) but actually were looking at the pictures.

Writing

A key component of writing was the creative writing related to the spooky tales, myths and legends unit. Earlier in the year the students had written an autobiography to culminate a “Biography” unit. The culminating project for the unit on spooky tales involved the students writing a creative spooky story that they either experienced or created. The students found ideas for this writing project very easily as there was much class discussion about scary experiences since it was Halloween time. The students also enjoyed listening to one another’s stories. Throughout each lesson, the teacher focused on the content and the quality of the students’ writing and emphasized basic writing skills.

Some of the teacher’s comments were:

“Make your paper as perfect as possible.”

“We can all learn from our mistakes.”

“Next time you’ll know how to make it better.”

“Don’t forget to use your writing skills. Use the capitalization skills. This is fine-tuning your writing. Remember the mechanics skills and you will be writing better and better each time you write.”

One day, a student named Jonathan asked, “Why is it that we don’t write better and better?” The teachers answered, “Well, look at you Jonathan. You did a great job on your story. I am proud of you. You’ve been turning in fine work.”

During periods called “Sustained Silent Writing,” students were given time to catch up on missed assignments. The students would be busy writing for various assignments; the class usually wrote quietly and for twenty minutes and was focused.
During one lesson, some students were studying for the spelling test they were taking later during the period. Other students were writing their summary for the response in the reading log. The teacher encouraged students to keep up with the tasks, “See it doesn’t take you long to do it.”

*Student Oral Presentations*

As part of a culminating literature and writing activity, the students volunteered to read their creative stories aloud. Students would receive extra credit and practice in speaking and oral presentation skills. At first students were reluctant to volunteer to go up to the front of the room to share their stories. However, as students started to give their presentations, more students were happy and anxious to share their stories. Students were very attentive during each other’s stories. The class was given a chance to ask the speaker questions about their story. Most students read their stories well with expression. Mrs. Thomas explained how storytellers communicate a mood. She modeled this by changing her voice to give examples (e.g., using a scary ‘old lady voice). The teacher lowered the lights and shut the windows.

The teacher responded to the students’ stories by providing very positive and specific feedback and set clear expectations. For example, she explained

> “You will learn specific skills in storytelling. There are speech techniques that you can learn such as volume, using gestures, speaking slowly, giving eye contact, and using facial expression. It’s intriguing and fascinating. Some of you will get chicken skin.”

One girl started the oral presentations by sharing a story about her brother videotaping a ghost. Another boy told a story about a photograph of his grandfather in a room, moving and talking. Once the first two students gave their oral presentations,
others students were excited to go next. Another student told a story about being chased up the mountain by a creature while hiking with her brother and his friends.

Twelve students presented their stories during this class period. The students were very attentive during each other's presentations. Sometimes the class got overly excited and everyone wanted to talk at once. The teacher redirected the class to the story at hand, expanded their ideas, and gave positive feedback. For example,

"See there was a logical explanation for that mystery".
"I thought we got good tales. Some were told with mystery and suspense and some were funny. What good expression!"
"There are so many stories about the night marchers in the fields."
"Everyone knows that Cabin 32 at Camp Erdman is haunted."

A student said something inappropriate. "Teacher, did you see a shadow around Thomas?" The teacher and the students played along while the teacher laughed with the class. The teacher concluded the lesson by sharing an article in the newspaper about haunted buildings downtown. The entire class participated and the students seemed to be empowered and excited as they and others shared their stories.

A Typical Lesson

In this section I will describe a lesson in Mrs. Thomas's class that was typical of the lessons that I observed. I chose one that integrated reading and writing because these were major components throughout many of the lessons. These lesson excerpts will give the reader an idea about the type of curriculum content and instructional strategies that the teacher used and a sample of student and teacher interactions. Additionally, there is a complete lesson on vocabulary study provided in Appendix F.
Sample Lesson

The teacher planned a unit on scary stories with Hawaiian local settings and characters. The students read a story, *The Cemetery Path* by Leonard Q. Ross, in their literature anthology to set the tone of this lesson. During the reading of the story, the class was very attentive. The teacher read with expression and changed her voice several times during the reading to create the mood. After the read-aloud, the teacher related the story to the student’s language and experience.

"In our islands, everyone has a story to tell and there are many spooky stories. You have stories too. It’s like ‘chicken skin’. In our last unit we talked about how myths were fiction, but there could be some truth in it. Stories can be strange or can be funny or scary."

During the read-aloud, the class fidgeted but the students were attentive to the story. To set the stage for the story and have students relate the ideas to their own language and experience, Mrs. Thomas talked about an airfield used during World War II which the students were familiar with. (Hands go up and questions or discussion takes place). A student shared a story about Morgan’s Corner, a well-known place involving ghosts and scary tales. The class discussed some common spooky stories about the area near where students live or on other parts of the island, such as the airfield and the stories about Morgan’s corner. The class was getting excited while the teacher explained:

"This is just one story. There are many interesting tales. Some of your stories can be like this one. There may be a logical explanation. For example, the cigarette that looked like it was in the air could have been hanging from a spider’s web in the story of Morgan’s corner."

The teacher then asked the class to share what words in the story of “The Cemetery Path,” they thought made the story scary. The students volunteered words and
the teacher listed them on the board. These included:

    howl  senseless  omen  sword  darkness  terrible

Several times throughout this lesson, the teacher needed to redirect and discipline a student named Thomas (who was receiving ESL services). Teacher gives quick reprimands and redirection: “I don’t want to hear your voice again, Thomas.” The lesson continued as the teacher built upon the student’s language. She said,

    “All of the words we choose are reflective of our language. When you tell your story I want you to use your language to make it effective. Try to keep the reader in suspense. (The teacher gains the students’ attention.) Let me see your eyes. Your eyes are the windows of your soul. When you write a story, you use descriptive words and give examples

There was much discussion during this lesson using the student’s language, experience, and thinking. The teacher acknowledged all of the student’s input, comments, and stories. The teacher referred to a picture on the bulletin board from a student’s story from last semester. The teacher explained that each student would write his or her own spooky tale as part of the next writing project. The students were told that they could make up the story or share a story that they had already heard. One student asked if they had to give an oral presentation the stories that they wrote. The teacher responded, “Good question! If you present your story, you will get twenty extra points. This is an exercise in speaking. You can have your own notes to read from. You must have heard the story from somewhere else or created your own story.”

The classroom teacher gave the students a chance to summarize their stories on their reading calendar for the week to help them to start to organize their ideas. Mrs. Martinez, the assistant, and Mrs. Thomas walked around the room to help the students.
The Teaching

Overall, there seemed to be very few differentiated teaching strategies, curriculum adaptations or modifications in teaching to meet student's varied learning needs. However, there were elements of effective teaching such as explicit modeling, cueing, teaching in thematic units and building on the student's language and experience.

Whole Class Teaching Mode

The class was conducted in whole class teaching format. The classroom teacher, Mrs. Thomas, usually taught at the front of the room and the students sat at their desks that were in traditional rows. Students listened, responded verbally, followed along in their books or worksheets, or completed independent work. The emphasis was on getting the work done to get points for grades. Much instruction time was spent in explaining directions and points for assignments and motivating or redirecting the students to complete their work.

When asked about cooperative learning strategies, Mrs. Thomas said that the class was too large to do cooperative or collaborative learning activities with 33 students in a small, portable classroom. Furthermore, she said that there was no room in the class to move desks to form a circle and she also felt that the students did not have the social skills in which to cooperate successfully in a group. The teacher's comment regarding cooperative learning was, "This class is too big and too many students need help that they would be fooling around too much." However, the skills for collaboration and cooperation need to be explicitly taught in any classroom.
Modeling and Cueing

The classroom teacher, Mrs. Thomas, usually provided very explicit modeling and often shared her own experiences. She used phrases over and over again to reinforce skills and strategies such as “fine-tuning your writing,” “doing your best work,” and “your desk is your office space.” Some of these teaching strategies seemed to help the struggling students. For example, she would frequently show and demonstrate student assignments by showing exemplary student work. Mrs. Thomas would repeat steps to the assignments over and over to help the students understand what was expected. The teacher also set up various routines that the students knew and followed such as the reading log and response, vocabulary and spelling weekly tasks, and final writing projects.

Class Interactions

The classroom teacher usually seemed calm, respectful of the students, and encouraging. Mrs. Thomas spoke in a very soft voice, displayed a positive attitude, and communicated high expectations. Basically, the rapport between the teacher and the students was very positive. Mrs. Thomas acknowledged student input and included all of the students in discussion and activities. The teacher provided much positive reinforcement, which usually was very specific and descriptive. Apparently, she interpreted special education students’ needs (and probably most of her students) as requiring much encouragement and motivation. Examples are

“I thought your stories were very original.”

“Some of the stories were very creative. I enjoyed reading them.”

“Wow, what a lot of important ideas. This was fabulous.”
Generally most of the students participated actively. It was apparent that the students freely participated in class and it was apparent that the classroom was a comfortable place to express one's ideas. The students with special learning needs seemed to be more actively involved and participatory in class discussions than the general students. During each discussion, three particular students always raised their hands to offer input into discussions or answer the teacher's questions. During teacher lectures or explanations, student engagement averaged 60% (based on an intermittent tally method which was described earlier) but would jump to 80% when the teacher would read aloud. These students seemed to enjoy participation that did not involve independent writing.

The Individualized Education Program

The Individualized Education Program (IEP) identified a student's present levels of performance and the goals and learning opportunities that were planned to meet the student's unique learning needs. The IEP also included a list of accommodations, a post-secondary transition plan, and a statement about how students will learn in the least restrictive environment. All of the special education students in the class had the following statement on their IEP for "least restrictive environment":

Student will learn in regular education classes except for Study Skills classes.

A sample IEP for one of the students in the class, Nelson, is provided in the Appendix E.

It is important to note that there seemed to be little connection between the student's IEP and teaching and learning in the classroom. One factor was that the general classroom teacher was not involved in the planning of the student's IEP and did not refer
to it in planning class instruction. Additionally, the goals, objectives and the instructional accommodations listed on many of the students' IEPs were very similarly worded which makes one wonder if they really were a reflection of specific individual students' strengths and weaknesses. Another interesting pattern is that most students showed proficiency indicated by “mastery” or “satisfactory” on all of their IEP objectives. A sample portion of an IEP for a student named Kevin is presented illustrating his learning needs and literacy objectives.

Individualized Educational Program

Present Levels of Performance. Kevin is very personable and well-liked by peers. Kevin’s reading scores are at grade level. His strength is in expressing ideas and story construction. In spelling he uses a strong phonetic approach but is spelling at approximately 5th grade level.

Needs areas include difficulty in organization and consistency in completing and turning in homework. He rushes through his work, which is frequently sloppy and difficult to read. Kevin’s writing has many errors in punctuation, spelling and grammar.

Impact statement: Kevin’s problems with organizational and writing skill affect his ability to be independently successful in 9th grade.

Sample IEP Goals and Objectives

Writing: Standard: Apply knowledge and understanding of the conventions of language and research when writing.

Measurable Annual Goal: Kevin will improve spelling punctuation and grammar by one grade level.

Benchmarks or Short-Term Objectives

1. Given a sentence without descriptive words Kevin will rewrite the sentence adding five or more descriptive words
2. Given a specific topic the student will create a paragraph, supplying answers to who, what
where, when, how and why, and where.

3. Given a paragraph of Kevin's own writing, he will be able to go through and make corrections,
with appropriate capitalization, spelling, usage and appropriate punctuation independently or get
help 100% of the time.

Accommodations:

Allow extra time to complete assignments. Do not penalize for late work.

Post-Secondary Transition Goal: Kevin would like to attend college after high school graduation.

Figure 10: Excerpts from a Student's Individualized Education Program

These portions of the sample IEP provided in Figure 10 were typical of the plan
for specialized instruction for the students in this class. Many of the special education
students’ IEPs were worded in similar ways and some seemed generic.

Class Procedures, Management and Grading

Although the class was very large, the students generally knew the routines,
systems, and behavior expectations. However, there were incidents of inappropriate
behavior. It was a large class consisting of many boys and students with diverse learning
needs. This class period was the last class of the day and the students frequently seemed
tired but very active. Most of the students come from their physical education class in
the gym, which was on the opposite side of the campus. The students usually entered the
classroom very noisily. Some students were frequently late and there would be much
movement. However, the students settled down once the teacher started the lesson. The
classroom teacher frequently used a distinct signal to alert students to the routine
preceding the desired behavior such as counting down. At the beginning of the trimester,
the students chose their own seats, but midway through the trimester, the teacher changed
the students' seats to newly assigned seats. The class was very noisy and chaotic as the
students moved. However, alternating students' seats did help with classroom
management.

If a special education student disrupted the class, the teacher would send a
message to the special education study skills teacher who would take the student to
another room to provide counseling. Such disruptions and subsequent removal for
counseling was limited to the male students. Since two special education teachers shared
the study skills class, one of them could leave the class to attend to immediate needs
when severe behavioral problems arose. If the special education teacher, Mrs. Bolton,
was not available, Mrs. Martinez, the aide, would escort the student to the office to see a
school counselor. This practice of removing students who behaved inappropriately
minimized distractions. Generally, Mrs. Thomas tended to ignore or downplay
misbehavior, but would take further steps when a student became too disruptive.

Classroom Routines and Procedures

The class routines and procedures were followed throughout the trimester. At the
beginning of each class, the teacher reviewed the agenda for the day, which was written
on the board. Mrs. Thomas explained why each assignment and activity was important in
learning English and how the skills would be applied in real life situations. Every class
and homework assignment was collected, counted, and recorded for points or grades.
Feedback was provided in a timely manner so that the students knew exactly how they
were doing. Much of the feedback was provided in the form of points and the teacher's
verbal comments to the whole class. The teacher also spent much time during each class period to review the procedures and class requirements. For example, the teacher said:

"How many pages do you read each night?"
"What do you write for your reader response?"
"It doesn't take much time to write a response."

The teacher would model starter phrases for writing assignments and cue responses on the board. For example to help students write a reader response for the reading log, she wrote:

"I think that ....."
"The best part of the story was....."
"I wondered what would happen if ....."

The teacher set the tone for a supportive, encouraging mood in the class and provided specific praise as appropriate.

All of the papers that were used throughout each lesson were available to the students in a bin in front of the teacher's desk. This minimized student questions and unnecessary movement about the materials. The teacher was clear and specific about the class routines and the procedures.

*Trimester System and Course Requirements*

The school year at Kulanui Intermediate and High School consisted of three trimesters in which students received credit to meet graduation requirements. The students were required to pass each trimester in order to receive one full English credit. Students who did not pass had to attend summer school or repeat the class again in eighth grade if necessary.
The scheduling involved in the new trimester system required the shifting of teachers, educational assistants and resources. As a result, the teachers and students experienced changes related to the move to a new system. For example, the teachers had to become accustomed to changing classes in November and had to plan content coverage and grading in a shorter time span. Another challenge was that the teacher would have some students who were in the class during the first trimester again in the second trimester, along with students who would be new to her class. Thus, the students needed time to adjust to the new make-up of the class. More importantly, the teacher did not have necessary supports such as having a certified special education teacher work with the inclusion class because of personnel shifts.

Teacher Feedback to Students on Grades

As mentioned earlier, there was a great emphasis on grade and points. Mrs. Thomas frequently addressed the whole class or approached students individually to discuss grades. The students always knew what their current grades were and what they had to do to improve their grades or points to meet class requirements. This allowed the students to mentally keep track of their progress and provided an incentive for goal setting. The teacher’s encouragement and coaching seemed to have increased the student’s motivation to do well. For example,

"The mid-trimester grades are coming up. These grades will not go on the report card. You can change an A to a B or an A to a D or a D to a C or higher. If you get an A now, that doesn’t mean that you should relax."

In reference to the reading logs, the teacher explained, “If you are behind four calendars of your reading then you have to read 150 pages to catch up. That means 10 pages a night. This is not the time to socialize.”
“You are not getting an end of the year grade anymore. Now you only have two trimesters for English so this grade for this class is very important for graduation.”

The teacher usually provided grade checks so that students knew how their grades affecting the mid-trimester grade. For example:

“Itua, this is your mid-trimester grade. It’s not the best but it is passing. It means you can get a higher grade next time.”

“Thomas, you’re doing great. Keep it up and by the end of the trimester you should have an A.”

“You are progressing very well. Six or seven of you have not been turning in much work. Those who aren’t turning in their work will get a stamp in the red agenda book.” (The ‘red book’ was an organizer that was provided by the school to help students keep tracks of assignments and a communication tool for the parents.)

The prevalence of immediate feedback and encouragement appeared to be contributing factors in creating a positive learning environment and motivating the students to do better.

Opportunities for Students Improve Grades

Mrs. Thomas frequently provided opportunities for the students to improve their grades through extra credit, make-up assignments, or by retaking tests. In essence, she taught to “mastery,” which was very helpful for students who struggled and had difficulty keeping up with their peers. For example, students who volunteered to read their myths to the class would receive extra points to boost their grades. Some of the teachers’ comments were:

“If you need to make up a test, if you were absent or if you want to get a higher score towards your grades, then you can come in during my preparation period. I am always here in my room after school too. About 20% have already come in to see me and their grades are now higher.”
“Two students came in after school and retook the myth exam and passed it with a much higher score. You always have that option. It shows that you are willing to work harder and try again. You can never say that you didn’t have a chance to pass.”

The teacher’s encouragement eventually helped many of the students to get passing grades. During one grade check, two weeks before the end of the trimester, ten students turned in late work that was due for the reading logs. The teacher also contacted parents through notes in the students’ red agenda book or through telephone calls. She said that these contacts did help some students to show better progress.

Many times during the last fifteen minutes of the class period, Mrs. Thomas, would give make-up work and additional time for the students to complete their missed work. This appeared to increase student engagement in the task. She also kept paper worksheets accessible in a box on her desk for students to work on when they were between activities or finished their work early. The students seemed to enjoy this and would receive extra credit to boost up their grades.

As mentioned earlier, students were able to come in after school to retake a test and the teachers also offered instruction at times other than the school day such as a Saturday or a holiday in order for students to get extra assistance in completing their academic work. The teacher wanted all students to achieve mastery and provided many opportunities to improve grades. However, grades were based heavily on points related to class and homework assignments and this is where many students did not follow-through, which was the primary factor of why the students were not able to achieve higher grades.
Homework

Throughout the observation period ongoing homework was completing a reading log, vocabulary and spelling weekly assignments, or completion of a larger writing project such as writing a creative myth or a spooky tale. There was adequate time provided in the class for the writing assignments so many students did not have to work on this at home. If homework was not completed on time, the teacher would write a comment in the red plan book and put a reminder stamp on the date. However, this did not seem to be effective with the special education students because they frequently lost their plan book, or did not consistently record their homework and reminder assignments, or show it to their parents. Furthermore, too much time was spent in class to record, stamp, and make comments in the students' red agenda books.

A key part of homework and class assignments involved the reading log. The students were required to keep a reading log to record what was read at home for four of the five days of the week. A reading log consisted of the title of a book read, a personal response, and a parent's signature. This was a major part of the student’s grade (25%) and resulted in many students getting lower final grades for the class. The researcher wondered why this assignment was weighted so heavily for grades since it did not accommodate the learning style of some of the special education and other struggling students. These students had a difficult time reading independently at home and completing a log on a daily basis. The researcher wondered why the teacher did not adjust the assignment to better meet the needs and learning styles of the students.
Student Grades

The grades of the special education students for the final trimester are presented in Figure 7.

Table 7. Special Education Students' Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Final Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>250 out of 415</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnathan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>156 out of 415</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keaka</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>343 out of 415</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>246 out of 415</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>394 out of 415</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A breakdown of the grades of the 33 students in the class included:

Grades - Number of Students

A - 5  
B - 9  
C - 7  
D - 6  
F - 6

With the exception of Nelson and Keaka, the grades of the special education students were in the lower range averaging Cs or Ds. Generally, these students did poorly because they did not turn in the class or homework assignments. They could not pass on the basis of classroom performance and assessments. Many of these students also had attention and motivational problems. Students who turned in most of their work had better overall grades, even if their test score grades were low. The teacher gave the students ample opportunity to bring up their grades to passing but some students just did
not have the ‘buy-in’ to complete the requirements. It is important to note that the
student’s lack of motivation could have been the result of symptoms of depression or
attention deficit disorder.

The weight of the curriculum components in determining grades was:

- 20% Tests (mostly vocabulary)
- 50% Homework (mostly vocabulary worksheets and reading log)
- 20% Culminating projects (mostly writing)
- 10% Participation

It is interesting to note that the breakdown of time for curriculum and instruction
during the class time was approximately:

- 25% to complete Homework
- 50% Reading, Discussion
- 25% Class written work (writing or skill worksheets)

This did not correlate with the weight of points given for grades. For example, the
students actually did a wonderful job on their oral presentations of their spooky stories
but only received a small amount of extra credit for sharing.

**Student Academic Needs.**

Mrs. Thomas said that she thought too many of her students, approximately half
of the class, were in the “needy” or “at-risk” category and had low final grades. This
included students with limited English proficiency and the two students who were
repeating the class. Of the 12 students in the class who received final grades of D and F,
two were ESL students, one was an 8th grade repeater, two were students with special
needs, and one was a student with a ‘504’ Modification Plan for intensive counseling.

Mrs. Thomas felt that the writing skills of her students were their biggest need area
for academic improvement and that the students come to seventh grade from the
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not have the ‘buy-in’ to complete the requirements. It is important to note that the student’s lack of motivation could have been the result of symptoms of depression or attention deficit disorder.

The weight of the curriculum components in determining grades was:

- 20% Tests (mostly vocabulary)
- 50% Homework (mostly vocabulary worksheets and reading log)
- 20% Culminating projects (mostly writing)
- 10% Participation

It is interesting to note that the breakdown of time for curriculum and instruction during the class time was approximately:

- 25% Complete Homework
- 50% Reading, Discussion
- 25% Class written work (writing or skill worksheets)

This did not correlate with the weight of points given for grades. For example, the students actually did a wonderful job on their oral presentations of their spooky stories but only received a small amount of extra credit for sharing.

**Student Academic Needs.**

Mrs. Thomas said that she thought too many of her students, approximately half of the class, were in the “needy” or “at-risk” category and had low final grades. This included students with limited English proficiency and the two students who were repeating the class. Of the 12 students in the class who received final grades of D and F, two were ESL students, one was an 8th grade repeater, two were students with special needs, and one was a student with a “504” Modification Plan for intensive counseling.

Mrs. Thomas felt that the writing skills of her students were their biggest need area for academic improvement and that the students come to seventh grade from the
elementary school unprepared for writing and lack some of the basic study skills. She said that her goal is to help the students improve their writing ability by giving them interesting things to write about and providing class practice in vocabulary, grammar, and spelling. Mrs. Thomas said that she was apprehensive about the students leaving her class and then getting a new group of students for the new trimester. Some of the current students would stay in the next class and some will move to other classes. She felt that this shift would involve much planning to meet the needs of the new students coming in, and the students who will continue with her English class for the next trimester.

Collaboration between Special and General Education Teachers

Support from the Special Education Teaching Assistant

Instead of a certified special education teacher being assigned to give support to the teacher and the students with special learning needs, the extra help was given by a substitute, Mrs. Martinez, who performed the role of being a teacher's aide or educational assistant. She gave out student papers, collected books, took attendance, wrote on the board, recorded grades, escorted students to the office, and assisted students with assignments. Mrs. Martinez walked around the classroom throughout the period to redirect students who were off task or who needed help. The students usually responded to her in appropriate ways but did not seek out her assistance. They did not seem to view her as their teacher.

Support from the Special Education Care Coordinator

The special education teacher, Mrs. Bolton, was the care coordinator who monitored the IEPs of many seventh grade students and she was also the teacher of the Study Skills resource class. According to the original inclusion plan, she was the
resource to the general education teacher in meeting the needs of the special education students in the inclusion class. Mrs. Bolton served dual roles of being the study skills teacher and monitoring the students in their general classes. However, most of her support was provided in the separate resource class. Mrs. Thomas felt that Mrs. Bolton did not come into the class to monitor the special education students consistently and review the class lessons in order to make accommodations. Throughout the observation period of twelve weeks, I only observed the special education teacher go to the inclusion class twice. On these occasions, Mrs. Bolton’s purpose was to check on recordkeeping issues rather than to observe or work with the students in the class.

I observed the study skills resource classes on six occasions and also observed collaboration meetings between the general and special education teachers. Both teachers were extremely busy in their main roles and there was little time allotted for collaboration. Mrs. Thomas’s main responsibility was to teach a large class of general students with diverse learning needs. Mrs. Bolton main responsibility was to teach the Study Skills class and to plan and monitor the students’ IEPs. The only time the teachers met formally was during weekly department meetings and neither teacher wanted to use their preparation period for collaboration time. Teaming and collaboration among the teachers involved with the inclusion students was minimal.

Teacher Collaboration

Collaboration between the special and general education teachers was a key component of the original plan. However, during the observation period of the study, it seemed that the teachers were still navigating the new trimester system, which provided less time to plan and less resources to the classroom. True collaboration seemed to be
minimal or nonexistent. The only set time for the inclusion teachers to meet to collaborate for inclusion planning was during a monthly time slot. During these monthly meetings, the main discussion topic was how to help the special education students pass the class rather than on adapting curriculum or using differentiated teaching strategies.

Furthermore, there were disagreements among the inclusion teachers on major components of the class such as student grading. For example, the general teacher gave the special education teacher the student grades. The special education teachers wanted the classroom teachers to change the grades or to lower their standards and expectations to better meet the needs of the students. It was evident that the grading practices were in conflict with appropriate ways to meet the needs of students with learning difficulties or emotional needs that affected their academic progress. Additionally, many of the classroom accommodations that were listed on the students’ IEPs were not implemented. One special education teacher commented: “There is a need to look at a student’s ability and balance it with the need for the general teacher to cover a great amount of content in one trimester. Also, since trimester grades are not averaged out for the year, as it was in the past, students who fail one trimester do not have a chance to pull their grades up to improve.”

Support through the Study Skills Resource Class

To support inclusion efforts, every special education student in the seventh grade attended a special study skills class as part of their specialized education program, which was co-taught by two special education teachers. If one teacher needed to go to a class to observe, to take notes, or to counsel a special education student, the other teacher would stay in the class. There were four study skills classes throughout the day for 7th grade
students. These classes are smaller and averaged ten students each class. The classroom was the size of half of a regular classroom, which was partitioned off with the other side used for the eighth grader resource class. The small seventh grade resource class was frequently divided into two smaller groups each taught by one of the teachers.

The special education teachers taught the study skills classes in the morning. The time in the afternoon periods were allotted for paperwork, conferring with the regular education teachers, and planning. The teachers seemed dedicated and committed and put in much time, energy and overtime to help the students to pass. For example, the teacher offered a special half-day class for students who needed to catch up on Election Day. Ten special education students showed up and completed much work such as book reports that were due for social studies. Four of these students were from Mrs. Thomas’s inclusion class.

The study skills class seemed friendly, well organized, and comfortable. There was even a couch where students could sit and read. Everything that the students needed was right at hand such as paper, pencils, and even a bin of news articles for current events. There was much record keeping involved as the teachers checked out books for the student to borrow to do other class assignments or for independent reading. The teachers seemed warm and supportive and positive student-to-student and student-to-teacher interactions were observed. For example during one period, two students worked on a social studies project on the couch while two others worked on current events. Student behavior seemed better than in the larger general classroom because students were allowed to verbally participate spontaneously through the class period, to
work with their peers, and to move around the classroom more frequently. It was also a smaller class where they received more individual attention.

The teachers set an agenda for each class, which was written on the board and discussed the schedule for the week, which was written in a large calendar on the board. Each day the students did 'sustained silent reading (SSR)', which was a school-wide policy for all classes. During SSR most of the students were engaged and seemed to know the routine. However, there was little follow-up to what the students read. During the remainder of the class period, the students worked on 'current events' for their social studies, their reading log for the English class, or other work that needed to be caught up. The teachers had a positive rapport with the students and provided much positive reinforcement.

The teacher said that there was very little time to teach specific study skills, (which were a need area for all of the students) since most of the time was spent helping the students to catch up with the class-work of the core subjects. Again, the grading system dominated the curriculum.

Other Supplemental Supports

The school offered a study hall after school for all students who needed extra assistance. The teachers encouraged the students to attend since there were only two weeks left before the end of the trimester. A computer lab was open before, during, and after school where students could come in to work on assignments. However, many special education students did not take advantage of it.

Extracurricular involvement was another form of support for students in developing social skills. A full-time Student Activities Coordinator planned interesting
team activities for the intermediate students. For example, a Turkey Trot was held before Thanksgiving in which most of the students participated and dances were held throughout the year. In different school contexts, the special education students performed very well in areas such as sports and the school-wide annual song festival.

A special education motivational class was offered for students needing more intense assistance. There was one student in the inclusion class who was not making adequate academic gains and had severe behavior problems. Midway through the trimester, the student’s schedule was changed to include this special motivation class for students who had intense academic and emotional needs (usually boys).

Teacher Attitudes and Reflections

*General Education Teacher Reflections on Inclusion*

The general education teacher, Mrs. Thomas, said that she felt that the inclusion program during this school year had broken down because there was not a certified special education teacher to provide the instructional supports and modifications that were needed. Another major setback was that the teachers didn’t have planned, regular meeting time in order to share and articulate concerns. The classroom teacher worried about the trimester system, curriculum planning, and its impact on students. She felt frustrated in not being able to help all of the students in her class and felt that the class was too large, especially with the large percentage of students needing extra assistance to meet the academic expectations. Furthermore, Mrs. Thomas, who was part of the team that originally initiated inclusion, felt that the plan, and the gains that she had worked on and experienced during the past few years were breaking down.
Special Education Teacher Reflections on Inclusion

Most of the special education teachers, as part of the special education team at Kulanui Intermediate and High School, were disillusioned with the present school system. When asked what their "wish list" would be to improve inclusion, they said that they would like to have the study skills resource class taught by a teacher other than the inclusion teachers. This would enable the special education teacher to go into the classes to help the students as originally planned. In the past, the team would be able to take students from their study skills classes to bring them to a resource room. Since the special education teachers were scheduled to teach the study skills classes, they had minimal time to visit the general education classes (unless the two teachers switched off).

Administrator's Reflections on Inclusion

The principal was a young woman, Mrs. Leslie Denton, who worked her way up quickly in the DOE system. She said that she was a strong advocate for inclusion who believed that the students do much better academically and socially in inclusion classes. Mrs. Denton said that the resources for the special education students have increased as there were more educational assistants working with the students than ever before. Her ideas on improving the inclusion program were to have more educational assistants and certified special education teachers at the school. Adequate personnel could provide more direct in-class support, assistance, and tutoring to help the students learn. It seemed that the principal perceived the inclusion program to be working more effectively than it actually was. She was not aware of the challenges that teachers faced and coped with on a daily basis.
Reflections of the Special Education Department Head

The special education chairperson, Mrs. Pam Hines, was a certified special education teacher, who was responsible for checking that the students' IEPs and evaluations were completed in a timely manner. She coordinated the needs of the department (e.g., checking on placement and services for students, facilitating department meetings) and "stayed on top of things." She did not have teaching duties in order to fulfill department responsibilities. Mrs. Hines said that the demands of running a large department seemed beyond the capabilities of one person. She said, "The job gets so overwhelming. People are demanding things constantly. I want to quit the DOE."

Mrs. Hines said that there was much confusion and cautiousness in the certification process and provision of specialized educational services at Kulanui Intermediate and High School, as in most other schools in the state of Hawai'i because of the large federal lawsuit resulting in the Felix-Waihee Consent Decree (DOH, 2001). This has placed many sanctions on the schools under the threat of further legal complications. Mrs. Hines said that she felt pressure from the district and the state to certify more students because the lawsuit resulted from issues relating to students not receiving adequate special education services. An additional challenge was that there were new and uncertified special education teachers at the school who needed help in writing IEPs. Mrs. Hines said that she has already spent too much time completing IEPs that were other teachers' students so it was not her responsibility. Her department responsibilities were overextended because of the increased number of students, new teachers, and various tasks related to internal reviews and the necessary paperwork to comply with state directives.
Mrs. Hines was one of the original teachers who planned and initiated inclusion at the school. However, she said that the school now lacked adequate resources and supports in order for inclusion to work and to be successful such as having certified and special education teachers, and enough educational assistants. Furthermore, she said that the school had not worked out the scheduling problems (due to the new trimester system) in order to follow the original model of inclusion. Mrs. Hines said that it took a team of teachers four years to work on improving the model since its inception in order to come up with the inclusion model that should be in effect. It seemed that she was frustrated because the team had invested so much time in implementing inclusion according to this plan (which showed promise) and felt that the school was “backsliding” away from inclusion.

Reflections of the Special Education Counselor

Mrs. Betty Norton was the counselor for the special education students, who assisted the department head, and was responsible for counseling the special education students. Mrs. Norton had been teaching for eight years and was currently being trained as a reading specialist. Mrs. Norton was one of the original teachers who worked on initial planning and implementation stages of inclusion at Kulanui Intermediate and High School. During the previous school year she was the special education teacher and spent her entire day in the inclusion class.

Mrs. Norton said that the greatest need, in order for the inclusion program to be effective, was for the school to follow the original plan. During the first three years of implementation, she went into the general class to take notes, assist struggling students, adapt the curriculum, modify assignments and check that accommodations were being
made for the special education students. She believes that the inclusion model was very effective when it was implemented according to the original plan.

Reflections on the Process of Implementing Inclusion

Two of the original teachers on the planning team described the process of the school moving toward inclusion at Kulanui Intermediate & High School. Mrs. Hines said that the administrator first brought up the idea of inclusion and that she and Mrs. Norton were asked to be the first inclusion teachers. Mrs. Norton had learned about inclusion through a graduate course and was excited about implementing it at the school. Ms. Hines shared that she felt inadequate in undertaking such a large task because she had very little knowledge or guidelines about inclusion. It was also her first year teaching. She said, “We were the ‘experiment.’ We were the first teachers who had to figure out how it works.”

As these two teachers started to explore the options for inclusion, they began to get more and more excited about it. The initial rationale for inclusion was to offer a program other than the traditional, pullout, resource services for the students. Also, so many more students were becoming eligible for special education that the school did not have the personnel or the resources to accommodate separate special education programs. In preliminary planning Mrs. Hines and Mrs. Norton started to visit classes and analyze what was needed in the general education classes to help the students with special learning needs.

During the first year of implementation, Mrs. Norton and Mrs. Hines became a resource to the general education teacher about students’ needs and disabilities. The special education teachers would plan modifications and adaptations of curriculum. For
example, they would modify the tests and put a red dot on the top of the students’ paper and next to the students’ name in the grade book to indicate the accommodation. The teachers looked for ways to solve any problems that they observed in teaching and learning in the classroom. Both teachers shared that they felt very positive and had a tremendous sense of satisfaction in doing this. These teachers also assisted other general students in the class who needed extra support.

Mrs. Norton said that in the previous years there was more team teaching going on because the special education teacher was perceived as a resource in the role of being the “expert” in meeting the needs of the students with specific learning problems. They shared resources and ideas in areas such as specific reading techniques and students’ processing disorders. Both teachers said that the special education students showed good progress because many students had good grades and most graduated from high school.

Mrs. Norton shared the following ideas:

*Inclusion is the best innovation that ever happened in education. This has really turned students’ lives around. You have the curriculum richness of the standards and the expectations are the same as the general education students. You have the support, modifications, and accommodations to help the special education students to do well. The curriculum in inclusion is so much richer. With inclusion, you have the special education teachers as the experts with the knowledge; they know about the student’s processing disorders or memory problems and other disability areas.*

Another teacher described what she thought was a key component for inclusion, “You need to have small classes and the time to meet as a team. In the earlier days there was less pressure, less students were identified for special education, and there were less restrictions. Inclusion has made education for many students more equitable.”
Changes during the 2001 School Year

A significant change during the year of this study was that the new trimester system resulted in the teacher teams being dismantled. In the past a team of teachers teaching seventh grade students would have the same preparation periods, which allowed for ongoing collaboration meetings. Additionally, the inclusion teachers were given an extra preparation period to help plan and prepare. However, the present schedule was not able to accommodate this as the teachers had different preparation periods throughout the day. I was not able to find a valid reason for these changes other than the new schedule of the trimester system and wondered why the administration did not have greater supports in place to sustain the inclusion program. It is also important to note that the current principal was not the same administrator who had initiated the inclusion program. Some of the teacher comments were

"Now the teachers are not willing to give up their own time that is needed for special education."

"Now teachers can only meet once a month on Wednesdays and only when no other meetings are scheduled. For that reason, most general education teachers do not go to IEP meeting; they just don't have the time."

"In the past we were always right on top of things; we had time to know the curriculum and to make adaptations. We would put chapters of textbooks on tape for the students to listen. We would modify the tests and assignments."

The teachers were dedicated and committed to trying to work out things out to solve these problems, but it was at their own time and expense. For example, the teachers bought rewards and incentives such as coupons for McDonald’s and gave up a Saturday or a holiday in order to provide additional assistance for struggling students.
It is important to note that in one year the numbers of special education students at the school jumped from 139 students to 200, which was approximately 11% of the school’s population (Hawai‘i DOE, 2001a). There was still much pressure from the state and district offices of the Hawai‘i Department of Education to certify more students because federal statistics showed that Hawai‘i was still behind the average national percentage of 11.6%. There was also the thrust to certify more students based on the Felix Consent Decree to be in greater compliance with IDEA guidelines. One teacher stated, “Now with so many more students being certified, teachers were beginning to question: Was there enough fact-finding when decisions were being made?”

Inclusion in the Upper Grades

An important question to ask is: What was the follow-up for these current seventh graders when they went on to higher grades in high school? In the eighth grade, two educational assistants were hired to work with the students in the general core classes. They went into the English, Social Studies, Science and Math classes to provide instruction to any student who needed help. The special education students were also scheduled to take a study skills resource class taught by the special education teachers.

The question was asked about whether there was a set curriculum for the study skills class in eighth grade. Basically, these teachers also spent most of their time helping students catch up with the work from other classes in the core academic subject area and there was little time to teach study skills.

The model of inclusion required structural changes at the high school level. High school students tended not to want the special education teacher to help them in their content area classes. The high school special education inclusion teacher said that she
looked for ways to solve problems. Each day this teacher went to each of the content area classes for 10-15 minutes where she learned about the curriculum, the students' needs, and the expectations regarding assignments and tests. Students were also taken out to work in small groups or individually as needed in a resource room. Additionally, the students were scheduled into a study skills class with the inclusion teacher during the first period of the day where they received extra assistance, mentoring, and tutoring.

*Increasing Numbers of Special Education Students*

An interesting question to explore, which was revealed through the findings of this case study is: Why are the numbers of special education students growing so rapidly and was the school "over-certifying?" It seemed that the more students were being tested; therefore, more students became certified for IDEA services, and the numbers were growing at a tremendous pace. Many referrals for eligibility testing were due to behavioral and academic concerns and most of the referrals were for boys.

Furthermore, more students were identified as eligible for special education under the category of Emotional Disturbance than ever before. These students received counseling from the special education counselor and or a mental health therapist (for those with those intense needs).

During the year of the study, over 200 students were identified as eligible for special education services and the numbers were changing week by week. During the 1999-2000 school year, the number increased from 139 to 200. Twenty-six out of 35 students eligible to receive specialized education in the seventh grade were identified in the categories of specific learning disability and emotional disturbance (Hawaii DOE, 2001a).
The special education department head and other teachers said that they felt that things were moving too fast and that they were being pushed in too many different directions. One teacher stated, “There is a need to slow down and analyze the situation. Is all this certification really helping the students?” Furthermore, teachers were being asked to be more accountable especially in light of changes with procedures, paperwork, assessments, documentation, and a new computer data base system. One special education teacher had a different view about the current system that, “Things were more lax in the past so now teachers and staff feel more confident that they are in compliance with the IDEA law.”

Summary and Concluding Remarks

Generally, the perceptions of the level of success of the inclusion program at Kulanui Intermediate and High School were dependent on the special education students’ final grades. If the students passed the class then the teachers felt that they had achieved their goal. During the year of the study most of the special education students did pass their classes. It should also be noted that the special education students were contributing members of the general class. However, there was little collaboration between the general and special education teachers in meeting the goals and objectives on the student’s IEPs. This was perceived to be the job of the special education teacher. Another factor, related to teaming concerns, was that most general education teachers did not attend the IEP meetings and were not involved in planning the students’ IEPs (and unfortunately, they did not consciously implement them in the classroom).

The inclusion teachers felt that the program lacked the basics of collaborative teaming, adequate staffing, and smaller class sizes. Although this was, in part, due to
scheduling difficulties, it is also important to note that the special education teachers, who were skilled and experienced in inclusion, had moved on to other positions in the school. Therefore, there may not have been the same level of attention and energy devoted to providing the resource support in the general classroom or to sustain the program.

In many ways the inclusion program still functioned largely because the general education teacher, Mrs. Thomas, was experienced in working with students of diverse needs and backgrounds and had taught inclusion classes since the beginning of the program. Some aspects of her teaching style and instructional methods were conducive to student learning. For example, she gave clear directions, provided opportunities for students to improve grades and thus taught toward mastery, provided good modeling and cueing of academic tasks, linked reading and writing thematically, and provided much encouragement and extra assistance for students. Mrs. Thomas also drew upon the students’ language and experience in building new concepts and motivation for the writing activities. However, in some ways the curriculum can also be considered ‘low-level,’ emphasizing a series of work tasks, points for grading, and simple skill-based worksheets assignments and routines, in which the learning processes were not clear.

The students did receive specialized instruction from the study skill special education teacher and from the assistant (substitute teacher) in the class. However, this assistance was predominantly in the form of helping the students to catch up with the work from their academic classes. It also appeared that some of the students were receiving so much assistance that they experienced “learned helplessness.” Many of the
students did not perform independently and would not have passed the class without the teachers checking, monitoring, and providing extra instructional assistance.

One teacher shared this analogy to describe the role of an inclusion teacher with that of a "push-me, pull-me" character in Dr. Seuss books who has two heads. She said, "The 'push-me' is that the teacher is pushing, encouraging, and motivating the students to feel that they can do it and to keep going, and the 'pull-me' is that you have to pull them along with the curriculum of the general classes." If the essential components of inclusion such as collaboration, adequate staffing, and smaller classes were present at Kulanui Intermediate and High School, not only the students, but also the teachers, would be better supported.
CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, I will discuss the themes that emerged through the case studies and how the findings relate to my original research questions. Some conclusions about how inclusion impacted the teachers and the students of the two classrooms will be shared. I will also discuss some of the major research questions and general recommendations for the improvement of special education services that extend beyond this study.

Chapters 4 and 5 conveyed the stories of two inclusion classes at two secondary schools in Hawai‘i. These chapters portrayed the inclusion program, the school, the classroom, students, the curriculum, and instruction in the two classes. This final chapter will present an overview of the significance and implications of the findings and how they extend ideas described in the literature review. In addition, comments will include the limitations of the study, its applicability to other schools, recommendations to improve inclusion, and the major themes revealed through the findings. Finally, an epilogue will present some key events that have occurred since the study and pose remaining questions and recommendations. This discussion will present implications for other secondary schools working on inclusion and recommendations for future research.

In revisiting the literature, there were varied definitions and meanings of inclusion. Fuchs and Fuchs (1994, p. 226.) said, “Inclusion means different things to people who wish different things from it.” Multiple and varied perspectives on inclusion were shared by teachers, staff, and administrators. The findings depicted how experiences, definitions, and models vary as our perceptions impact thinking and action. Inclusion results from politics, philosophy, and knowledge. All three must come together to
provide more effective inclusion programs. The findings of these case studies show that the philosophy and vision may have initially prevailed; yet the lack of practical knowledge (and possibly elements of political power) has hindered its effectiveness. This is one variable that affected the outcomes of this study, as inclusion was not valued as a priority by the school, district, or state. Another variable, which shortchanged the program, was that the teachers lacked adequate support and resources to fully implement inclusion effectively.

_inclusion: The Model vs. the Reality_

Qualitative data from observations, informal interviews, and a review of documents from the Hawai‘i Department of Education described the model for inclusion at each school and how it was implemented. Both schools had a well-developed plan for inclusion and took the initial important step of implementing it, but in both case studies the model had broken down. While there was a model and a plan at the school, district, and state levels, the plan alone was not enough. Similarly, Patton (1997, pp.147-175) discussed the idea that program goals are often not met, and that goal statements are not usually useful in evaluating educational programs. He believes that the staff at all levels need to be continually informed, provided with the appropriate support, and made accountable for fulfilling the requirements that are necessary in providing optimal educational opportunities. It is interesting to reflect on these ideas in relation to the findings of this study.

While reasonable plans and adequate personnel were in place and in practice at both schools during the previous year, this fell apart during the year of the study. The fact that this may be typical of many school programs is cause for alarm. In effect, both
schools made “promises” to the general education teachers about adequate support when opening their classrooms to inclusion students. These promises included having a certified special education teacher as a co-teacher, and providing time for teaming and planning. These promises were not met at either school. In light of the disconnect between the findings and actual practice, specific recommendations for improvement are suggested, such as having planned meeting time for teacher collaboration, and ensuring that a trained and licensed special education teacher is assigned to every inclusion class.

It was anticipated that teacher collaboration and teaming between the special education and general education teachers would occur, but this is not what happened. Instead, the classroom teachers crafted their own methods to make inclusion work within the context of their own knowledge, experience, and teaching situation. In many ways, the type of model used for inclusion may be less important than the quality of instruction in the classroom, which will be discussed in the next section.

In discussing the outcomes of this study, we need to review the literature to determine what constitutes inclusion in contrast to mainstreaming. Mainstreaming places special education students in the regular class and expects them to keep up with the curriculum and adjust on their own (Lipsky & Gartner, 1987). Inclusion is providing specialized instructional supports in the general classroom to help the special education students succeed (Giangreco & Putnam, 1991; Wilson, 1999; Mac Donald, Vandercook, Wolff & Tork, 1989; and others). Both schools had an inclusion model that specifically called for the supports and resources in the general classroom. However, in reality, both general education teachers were predominantly working in isolation without the support of a special education teacher, and they carried the sole responsibility to teach a large
class of students. There needed to be a greater sense of importance and effort on the part of all key stakeholders in providing what was needed to sustain inclusion efforts. Long-term outcomes and successes in inclusion programs are usually progressive through time, and involve total school support not limited to the efforts of a few overworked teachers.

At both schools, the resources in personnel, time, and professional development allocated by the administration were minimal. A barrier that both inclusion classes encountered was that neither was supported by a trained, certified special education teacher. The move to the trimester system at Kulanui Intermediate and High School was a major change that precluded the provision of essential resources, which had been available during the previous year to implement inclusion according to the planned model. Inclusion seemed to be a low priority since the resources to sustain it were not continued when new demands were placed on the schools, such as scheduling changes due to a new trimester system at Kulanui Intermediate and High School and the creation of a new class at Sherman High School.

At Sherman High School, classroom teachers were mandated to co-teach in inclusion classes often with inexperienced and untrained teachers. Other areas where the model faltered at both schools were the lack of scheduled meeting time for collaboration or planning, and little or non-existent professional development offered specifically on inclusion issues for the classroom teacher. This was contrary to the fact that both of the classrooms studied had been selected as "optimal" cases because the elements of inclusion did appear to be in place during the semester prior to this study.

An additional barrier to inclusion was presented when the key staff members at Kulanui Intermediate and High School (administrators and teachers), who originally
planned and implemented the inclusion model, had moved on to other resource positions in the school or district. Those who were left to carry on the plan may not have had the professional capacity or the emotional investment in the process that the original teachers did.

**Elements of Effective Inclusion**

The second major research question asked: Were the factors that were considered key elements of inclusion visible in the classes studied? Factors that were identified in the literature review included the following key components (Mastriopieri & Scruggs, 2000; Giangreco & Doyle, 2000; McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998; Gravois, Rosenfield and Vail, 1999; and others):

1. Collaboration and teaming between special and general teachers to maximize instructional support.
2. Commitment and support of administrative and school resource staff.
3. Quality of teacher and student classroom interactions including classroom management.
4. Adaptive teaching strategies and accommodations to meet behavioral, social, and academic goals in classes of a reasonable size.
5. Professional development to build teacher knowledge and skills.
6. High expectations for student progress and ongoing formative assessment of student’s needs and strengths.

Other indicators of instructional practices conducive to inclusion discussed in the literature were cooperative learning strategies, effective classroom management, high levels of student engagement, and smaller class size (Hunt & Goetz, 1997; Slavin, 1990; Council for Exceptional Children, 1995). Unlike the ideal inclusion environment called for in the literature, the classrooms in this study lacked two of the key areas of effective inclusion, which were adequate collaboration among staff and “specialized” instructional
support for the special education students (e.g., curriculum and instructional modifications).

In comparing both of the inclusion classes in this study, there appeared to be greater commonalities than differences. Thus, discussion of many of the conclusions drawn from the findings applies to both schools. Table 8 compares effective inclusion practices (described above) and common themes as observed at the two inclusion classes.

*Table 8. Comparison of Components of Inclusion Classes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Inclusion</th>
<th>Sherman High School</th>
<th>Kulanui Intermediate &amp; High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>Non-certified assistant</td>
<td>Non-certified assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Inclusion</td>
<td>Mandated</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Academic Needs (e.g., ‘504’, ESL, special needs)</td>
<td>Approx. 25%</td>
<td>Approx. 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development on Inclusion</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration Meetings</td>
<td>Once per quarter</td>
<td>Once per Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format of Teaching</td>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>Whole Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Learning</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Student Support</td>
<td>Separate Resource Room</td>
<td>Separate Resource Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Room Curriculum</td>
<td>Catch-up on Class and Homework</td>
<td>Catch-up on Class and Homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Differentiation/Adaptation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Grades</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress on IEP</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>Very large</td>
<td>Very large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both case studies, the participant teachers lacked the basic supports for inclusion. These include limitations in time, resources, or training in order to make the necessary adaptations, accommodations, and modifications for the special education
students. As described earlier, there was minimal professional development offered which would have helped the teachers understand students with special needs and the type of collaboration needed between special and general education. Materials and resources were the responsibility of the teacher to create on their own. Additionally, both inclusion classes in this study were very large, with students of diverse learning needs and cultural backgrounds. Each class contained over 30 students, with one class having over one-third of its students in other needs categories (e.g., ESL, “504”).

Collaboration and teaming. Since the special education (care coordinators) and general education teachers shared the same students, there was a greater need for collaboration and teaming. As described in the literature, collaboration improves communication among general and special education teachers to better understand the individual needs of students and to plan appropriate teaching and learning strategies (Thousand & Villa, 1992; McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998; Wood & Wood, 1998). Two teachers with expertise in their fields can enrich educational experiences through their support of each other as professionals. For example, general education teachers can be a resource to the special education teacher in understanding general learning expectations and course content. Special education teachers can be a critical resource to the classroom teacher in understanding and teaching students with learning disabilities. This type of collaboration was not evident on a consistent level at either of the two schools. One reason for the lack of teaming was that no time was made available for regularly scheduled meetings for collaboration. The teachers did not have a common preparation period or planned meeting time that was part of their schedules. Moreover, temporary substitute teachers, who were not trained or experienced in teaching students with special
learning needs, provided the in-class special education support. They did not have (nor were they perceived to have) expertise in special education. Even so, more collaboration might have improved instruction for special education students.

The teachers in this study seemed to be working in a vacuum rather than participating in a learning community that was working to expand and share their expertise as educators. The participant teachers did not have structured time away from their direct classroom responsibilities for peer collaboration, reflective teaching, sharing experiences and expertise, or for professional development. For example, at Sherman High School the inclusion teachers met only once a month as a department (which focused on department issues), and once at the beginning of the semester to focus specifically on inclusion. At Kulanui Intermediate and High School, the inclusion teachers met only once a month for 45 minutes as a team with other teachers. Therefore, collaboration occurred informally, “in passing” as side conversations that centered on whether or not the students were caught up with their work. Although the teachers sought ways on their own to accommodate the broad range of student needs, there were few opportunities to routinely discuss teaching and learning.

Adaptations and accommodations. While common indicators of successful inclusion, such as collaborative teaming and planning, in-service training, and smaller class size were not evident, there were aspects of an enabling environment. There were examples of inclusive practices and some adjustments and supports to meet diverse student needs observed in both classrooms. For example, there was in-class and individual assistance by the aide to help the students who struggled with the academic content. Each teacher provided clarity and repetition of directions for academic tasks,
simplification of steps, and good modeling and cueing. Each teacher also frequently accessed and built on students’ prior knowledge and experience, and provided much encouragement and positive reinforcement.

Some of the strategies that helped students to learn are reflective of the findings of Mastriopieri & Scruggs (1996) who identified some instructional components for successful inclusion. These include enthusiasm of the teacher, redundancy to emphasize concepts, clarity, structure and rate of presentation, and maximizing student engagement with instruction. The general education teachers at both schools often gave simple, step-by-step directions, frequently checked for student understanding, gave feedback in a timely manner, were redundant and provided visual cues that helped to clarify instruction throughout the daily lessons. While the use of some of these strategies may not have been consciously “inclusion” practices, they were teaching practices that helped struggling students to learn (or pass the class) and were effective in meeting the learning needs of all of the students in the class.

On the other hand, there was very little individualized or specialized instruction occurring in either class. The interviews with the general teachers revealed that they did not consciously plan to teach any differently to meet the needs of the special education students. Both teachers shared that they did not have the time or the practical knowledge to adapt learning materials or strategies to help the students to learn.

Furthermore, the teachers were very rigid in adhering to standard whole class course requirements and grading criteria. It is important to note that while the teachers did receive a list of accommodations for each special education student, they were not involved with planning their students’ IEPs and did not monitor student progress toward
meeting their IEP objectives. This was the responsibility of the special education teacher (not the substitute teacher) or care coordinator. Grading processes will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

Teacher knowledge and skills. Professional development is a key ingredient in helping teachers to acquire the knowledge and skills to build professional capacity, and can provide team training for teachers on collaboration issues (Giangreco & Doyle, 2000). Additionally, professional development helps to improve teacher attitudes toward inclusion through the support of others. The findings of this study indicated that there was no teacher professional development specifically focused on inclusion issues offered, with the exception of the workshop on unit planning at Sherman High School.

The inclusion teachers in this study needed more explicit means to address the practicalities and realities of the classroom, and needed to build on one another’s strengths and weaknesses to maximize student learning. There were no opportunities, whether formal or informal, to increase the general classroom teachers’ knowledge about learning disabilities, methods of remediation, or other issues related to teaching special education students. Most professional development offerings by the state or district were on curriculum standards, internal IDEA compliance reviews, and test preparation for the statewide assessment, which did not address essential components in teaching inclusion classes or students with specific learning needs.

Adaptations in student assessment and grading. In both inclusion classes of this study, there was inflexibility in student grading, as there was no differentiation in grading practices to meet the diverse abilities of the students. Grading centered on “work tasks”, tests or quizzes, and points. The breakdown of how class content was “weighted” for
final grades focused solely on homework, vocabulary worksheets and quizzes, and independent writing assignments. The emphasis on assessment in both classes seemed to be on grades as an end product, rather than as an avenue to help students to learn and the teachers to reach them. Furthermore, there were no alternative methods of formative assessment that may have matched the students varied learning styles, such as group projects, portfolios, peer presentations, independent inquiry, and other meaningful and authentic demonstrations of learning.

Students with special learning needs can demonstrate learning in varied and alternate ways to match their strengths and their needs. For example, one student was able to answer vocabulary completion questions with 100% accuracy when given the test questions orally. However, this student attempted the written test and was not able to negotiate the text well enough to gain meaning and to pass. Students can demonstrate and apply what they've learned in various ways. Single measures of grading for common expectations were used throughout the semester in both classes. Ongoing formative and qualitative assessment, based on performance criteria, could provide opportunities to demonstrate what they have learned. Assessment to monitor students' progress based on their developmental academic abilities, such as the use of a reading inventory, would help track individual student growth, and also help the teachers to adjust their teaching to help all students to succeed.

Additionally, the teachers of both classes took a great deal of time to explain the rigid grading criteria and points to the students, and the special education teachers spent most of their time helping the students to "catch up" to pass the class. The researcher wondered about the usefulness of instructional time. These findings confirm the research
of Goodlad (1984) who found that only 75% of the time is spent on actual instruction in high school, with the other time spent on routines and procedures.

While most of the special education students passed the classes, these students passed with lower grades of ‘C’ or ‘D’. The classroom teachers seemed too willing to give a student a ‘D’ or and ‘F’ (which were not reflective of mastery) rather than find the means to help the student achieve mastery of the learning objectives. Teachers needed to adjust their teaching when they were not reaching the students. Furthermore, better collaboration through the joint efforts of special and general teachers could have accommodated students’ learning and emotional difficulties through adaptations in assessment and grading.

The responsibility in helping the students to pass their classes was placed on the special education teachers through separate, one-on-one, or small group assistance. It is important to remember that there were double demands for the special education students to meet their special learning needs and to learn content material at a level with their peers. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that all students showed progress on the goals and objectives stated in their IEPs (noted as “Mastery”), but may have gotten Cs, Ds, or Fs in meeting the general class expectations. As mentioned earlier, many of the IEP objectives that are based on individual student needs did not reflect the course curriculum objectives. Therefore, there was an overt but subtle conflict between the intent of the IEP and the learning standards and the entrenched grading system.

Class size of inclusion classes and management issues. As mentioned earlier, both classes were too large at over thirty students. Not only were the classes large but there was also a large percentage of students who needed extra attention, including the
special education students. The inclusion class at Kulanui Intermediate and High School consisted of over one-third of students in need of academic supports. An important question to ask is: Can one expect successful inclusion and individualization in classes as large as those in this study? How does the classroom teacher teach to a wider range of students with diverse needs? This study aimed to gain insight into this process by studying how this support is provided for all of the students in the class. However, the large class size hindered successful inclusion practices.

The results of this study are consistent with other studies that show that inclusion is most effective in classes of a reasonable size, and probably least effective in very large classes. Studies have shown that academic performance in general improves with smaller class size (Finn & Achilles, 1990). Researchers have suggested that special education students comprise no more than 10% of the students in the class, and suggest a maximum class size of 25 students (McLeskey, Henry & Axelrod, 1999).

It becomes more difficult for a teacher to recognize individual learning needs in a large class. The schools in this study solved this dilemma by providing an assistant, but the aide was not trained in special education or in teaching. However, the general classroom teacher still had to manage a large group of students and supervise the assistant in the classroom. In both classes there were many distractions such as loud, irrelevant talking, wasted time in transitioning between routines, and behavioral problems, especially when the students were not motivated or engaged in the academic tasks. It is critical for a teacher to have all students’ attention in order to teach.

Lower student achievement may have been the result of poor classroom management. The general students in both classes, as well as special education students,
presented challenging behaviors and had trouble keeping up with the curriculum. The teachers of both inclusion classes expressed concerns with classroom management and discipline. Both teachers seemed to let students “get away with” inappropriate and improper behavior. Even though the general classroom teacher at Sherman High School had a management plan, there were no consequences for problem behavior, except when the behavior was so severe that it disrupted the class and the student had to be removed for separate counseling. However, both general teachers of the inclusion classes had established routines and procedures that made it easier for the students to follow class activities, and neither teacher ever stopped teaching or raised their voices. They also provided much praise and positive reinforcement throughout each lesson.

Involvement of support personnel. The teacher assistant was a critical component and support to the inclusion process. Teacher aides, whether they were an educational assistant or a temporary long-term substitute teacher, were used, valued, and relied upon to help the students in their learning in the two classrooms of this study. Although the general education teachers of these classes were appreciative of the teacher assistant’s help in the class, there seemed to be an underlying feeling that “this was the way it is” (in relation to not having a licensed special education teacher), and not to ask or expect anything more than helping students to complete the assignments, assisting with paperwork, and removing disruptive students from the classroom.

Administrative support. The administrators at both schools generally had a skewed perception of inclusion, indicating that everything was working very well and that their schools had made great gains in being one of the first to implement inclusion in their district. The administrators of both schools in this study seemed to take a “back-
seat” approach and were not involved in the day-to-day operations and concerns of the inclusion classes. District and state support could help school administrators better understand the inclusion model, to build a “vision” as to what would be the ideal at their school, and to have the tools to assure practical implementation. State and district administrators would need to require some basic guidelines which must be in place, such as class size limitations, student-teacher rations, professional development, and collaboration meeting time.

The principals at the two schools in this study provided vision and direction, but did not lead through their knowledge and skills of effective instructional practice and learning. Ideally, principals and state and district level educational officers should be curriculum and instructional leaders, and fulfill a decisive role in making inclusion work at their schools. In general, there was little support from the school or district related specifically to inclusion at schools. Often, inclusion issues tend to be addressed only when a case might be going to a due process legal hearing or when it becomes a federal or state directive.

An interesting component of administrative support is dependent on whether inclusion was mandated or if the teachers initiated it. At Sherman High School the teachers were not only mandated to implement inclusion, but also were assigned the co-teachers, which created discontent and disconnect from the inclusion process. On the other hand, the classroom teacher at Kulanui Intermediate and High School volunteered to teach the inclusion class and had worked on initiating inclusion at the school. During the four years of implementation, this teacher had expanded her skills and experience in
teaching students of diverse abilities and seemed better able to manage the class and its learning challenges.

Mandating inclusion as a directive in a top-down manner, without providing adequate resources, can make inclusion susceptible to negative attitudes and failure. Additionally, forced inclusion of special education students into classrooms where teachers do not welcome them, can be a great injustice both to the student and to the teacher. These findings reflect those of a study conducted by Hargreaves (1997), who described attributes of teacher collaboration as being spontaneous, voluntary, pervasive across time and space, and unpredictable. These attributes of teacher collaboration are contrasted with attributes of “contrived collaboration”, which are administratively controlled, fixed in time and space, and predictable. Some of the teachers in this study experienced contrived collaboration.

Curriculum and Instruction in Inclusion Classes

Teaching and learning, in both inclusion classes, were very traditional, frequently mediocre, and often seemed like “low level” instruction. There was little flexibility in adjusting the curriculum and instruction to meet diverse and individual student needs. Instruction in both classes in this study was solely teacher-directed and prescriptive, emphasizing content rather than empowering students to think and socially construct knowledge through peer interaction (e.g., cooperative learning, peer review, and group projects). Both teachers commented that they could not use cooperative learning strategies because the classes were too large, although neither teacher had attempted to do so. Research has shown that students with special learning needs may achieve more in inclusive settings when strategies such as cooperative teaching and peer tutoring are in
place (Wade & Zone, 2000). These types of social interactions that can facilitate student learning were not observed in the participant classrooms.

At both schools, there was maintenance of normalization in terms of curriculum and instruction. The main change evident in practice was that the special education students were in a general class, and this did involve greater collaboration between the general teachers, the special education teachers, and the assistants. Both inclusion classrooms generally appeared to be like any other general classroom. While these classes were heterogeneous, it is important to note that many of the general students were low achievers, and, in many ways, the special education students did not stand out in behavior or performance. The rhythm and routines of each lesson were the same for all students.

In actual practice, inclusion creates avenues for subtle, spontaneous, and hidden student supports through the provision of accommodations, modifications, and adaptations in teaching practices and curriculum. This is the type of assistance that may not easily be seen. Unfortunately, such “sparks” of exchange were not observed or discussed. There were no “behind the scenes” adaptations to assist the struggling students or accommodations in teaching strategies such as providing more time or differentiated learning practices.

Mastering the academic content of each English class was the focus of the inclusion experience on the part of the teachers and students. The emphasis was on “covering” the content and the students’ “work”. Once the grades were given, it was time to move on to the next topic regardless of how the students performed. Some teachers were willing to put forth greater effort to help students pass and to eventually
graduate from high school, and seemed to care about their students. However, in many ways, the curriculum appeared to be “low level” in offering easy, simplified tasks through structured lessons, whole class reading, and skill-based vocabulary practice. Additionally, the students were not provided adequate explicit instruction in building higher-level skills, such as those involved in the writing process and collaborative learning activities.

Student engagement and learning may have been greater if the teachers used a variety of instructional strategies to accommodate the students’ individual learning styles. For example, in both classes the emphasis on student writing was on the number of words per page. A differentiated strategy to meet the varied ability and learning styles of the students would be to allow the students to write at their own pace on topics of their own interest and choice. Students would be more likely to care about their writing and to know that their writing has a voice that communicates ideas, if they were given the opportunity to share their final stories with their peers. Many of the students were at a lower ability level than what was mandated for the common core of standards for the language arts curriculum. Students with special learning needs require meaningful learning experiences and developmentally appropriate curriculum (Applebaum & Applebaum, 1998).

The general teachers used whole class teaching methods and delivered information verbally as the main mode of instruction, with questions and answers built into the lectures. Most of the students in the study, not only the special education students, seemed bored and disengaged during many of the class lessons, with the exception of the students’ oral presentations. There was little motivation to be engaged
in the learning tasks. At Sherman High School, the class read a novel that was at a lower interest and reading level for the tenth grade English class, and the students became disinterested as the class read the same novel throughout the entire semester. Students should be involved in rich and meaningful discussion about appropriate texts.

Another example of student non-engagement and disinterest occurred when students were asked to complete daily reading logs at Kulanui Intermediate and High School. These reading logs were a major part of the students’ grade. However, independent home reading and response were difficult for many students. Rather than the teacher merely checking the assignment off and giving points, students could be engaged in ways to share or discuss what they read. The students also needed direction in choosing interesting reading material, which would be meaningful to them. Students needed more challenging and meaningful literacy activities to engage them, generate their interest, and help them to make connections to the world around them. For example, extension activities in media other than writing (e.g., drama, art, speaking), would help the students to relate vocabulary and literature study to the real world. Generally, the students were passive receivers rather than active participants in their learning, and did not display a “buy-in” to most of the lessons (with the exception of the student oral presentations in both classes).

Both schools in the study had difficulty adapting standard programs and traditional curriculum to meet individual needs. Curriculum performance expectations were the same for all students in the inclusion classes, but there was little understanding of how to ensure student proficiency, especially for students with special learning needs.
Furthermore, educators may not understand what the individual student needs are, as the special education students' present levels of performance on their IEPs are based on standardized test scores. The researcher observed few examples of modified curriculum or assessments in teaching and learning.

The successes that did occur seemed to be the result of some effective teaching strategies, student integration, and the support of additional tutoring in the resource classes. As mentioned earlier, the model of inclusion that was originally set up was not evident in practice, as the classroom supports such as accommodations and differentiated strategies were not observed. In many ways, the model of inclusion, its implementation, or its setting may not be as important as the quality of curriculum and instruction in the classroom. If greater instructional supports were provided to the students in the general class (which is the intent of inclusion), there may not have been as great a need for the segregated help in the resource or study skills classes, and perhaps the special education teachers would have had more time to assist in other ways to be a resource to the classroom teacher.

*The Individual Educational Program.* In reviewing the IEPs of the students in the study, there appeared to be a lack of meaningfulness and mindfulness in planning the students’ goals and objectives for individualized instruction. I found that the individual goals and objectives were very generic and impersonal, even to the extent of students having the same or similarly worded language arts objectives. Many of the students’ goals and objectives on their IEPs were defined in simple, vague, and broad terms, which could be applicable to any student. Some seemed more like lesson plan objectives rather than plans to meet individual student’s strengths and weaknesses based on a learning
disability. These findings support various studies that have described a lack of meaningful IEP objectives (Hunt & Farron-Davis, 1992). Additionally, these objectives appeared to underestimate the students’ true performance and abilities.

For example, contrast this objective taken from one student’s IEP, “Student will be able to comprehend four out of five comprehension questions with 100% accuracy,” to a more meaningful objective embedded with a reading strategy: “Student will use a graphic organizer to monitor their comprehension before, during, and after reading material at or above their reading level.” Differentiated strategies and learning opportunities to meet the student’s needs should be embellished in these goals.

The special education teachers may have been able to write more meaningful goals and objectives if they had more information about the students’ strengths and learning needs. One recommendation is to use formal and informal assessment data to drive the development of the students’ IEPs. The teachers often planned goals and objectives based on sparse knowledge of the student provided predominantly from standardized test scores. Another reason for the poorly written goals and objectives is that special education teachers often write IEPs for students whom they don’t know or don’t teach. This was the case for some of the students in this study. Furthermore, “timeline” concerns (to complete evaluations and IEPs within 60 days) could have impacted quick meetings without all of the team members present, or result in quickly and simply written IEPs. As mentioned earlier, there was a greater focus on getting the paperwork done correctly than on best practices and student needs, which points toward the need for an attitude shift from the “process” of special education to the student’s actual education.
In general, observations, interviews, and document review in this study indicated that educators’ understanding of student needs, least restrictive environment, accommodations, modifications, and standards were limited. Furthermore, there seemed to be little correlation between the goals on the IEP and the class learning expectations. Unfortunately, despite the vast resources and funding for special education, there seemed to be a lack of instructional accountability for student learning outcomes. Since this study, some districts in Hawai‘i have started a peer review process for teachers to review one another’s IEPs, which may result in more relevant and meaningful IEPs.

*Students with Specific Learning Disabilities and Emotional Disturbances*

It is a challenge to teach students with needs in mildly handicapping categories because there is a great deal of imprecision and generalization about what constitutes a learning disability. This study confirmed the findings of previous research studies that these students can display overlapping characteristics and varied learning needs (Ysseldyke & Algozzine, 1987). These students may lack the basic skills, cognitive ability, or have underlying neurological processing disorders that appear in reading and writing which was characteristic of many of the students in this study (Hallahan, 1992; Kaufman, Lloyd, Baker & Riedd, 1995). Some students may be slow learners, exhibit different learning styles, or display behavioral or attention problems.

The special education students in this study struggled to keep up with the curriculum expectations and appeared to be well behind their peers in reading and writing. They were given so much assistance in completing class and homework assignments that some exemplified “learned helplessness”. For example, some students would not complete any schoolwork unless the special education teacher sat right next to them to constantly
redirect, explain, and guide them through each step of an activity. On the other hand, more engaging and meaningful curriculum can be a key factor in building students’ motivation to succeed. All students should be held responsible to put forth more effort, and to be at the center of their own learning.

The students in this study needed a good deal of teacher assistance and other supports in order to keep up with the general curriculum. The findings appear to substantiate Kaufman and Hallahan’s (1995) claim that there is a myth about “mildness” (related to learning problems), and that these students are not so different in their educational needs and not so difficult to teach. The findings of this study suggest that this is an assumption. The students who have a learning disability or severe emotional problems that interfere with their learning do need intensive and explicit support in order to show academic progress at the level of their peers.

One reason that the students had difficulty in keeping up with the general class expectations may be that some of the students were previously taught in segregated small class settings where they received more teacher attention and immediate support. These students may have been protected from struggling with new or difficult concepts in certain content areas, and may not have been accustomed to learning independently. There should be a plan in place to transition students to the general classroom environment. The more effective tangible methods used in traditional separate resource classes to build student motivation and self-responsibility could easily be utilized in the general classes such as self-monitoring charts and concrete, visual learning activities.
The General Classroom Teacher

The teachers in this study said that they would be more willing to teach inclusion if the resources and support were available, and if they could rely on these supports in the future. Teachers have been stretched to do more with teaching in light of the emphasis on standards and high expectations for all students and the emphasis on the school making annual yearly progress (AYP) to comply with NCLB (No Child Left Behind Act, U.S. Congress, 2001) mandates. Aside from teaching, most teachers “wear many hats” as they fulfill the roles of being curriculum developers, social workers, evaluators, data managers, and counselors. Current DOE statistics show that about 50% of Hawai‘i’s students in public schools are considered to be disadvantaged, including students in poverty, in special education, ESL, and other multiple disadvantages. More students have a broader range of diverse learning needs and there are limits on what we can expect from general classroom teachers.

The greatest needs expressed by the general classroom teachers were for smaller class sizes and the support of a certified special education teacher. Concerns of general teachers included too much paperwork, lack of materials, inadequate preparation time, high student-teacher ratios, and minimal consultation with the special education teacher.

The Special Education Teacher

The findings of this study suggest that the special education teacher’s role in an inclusion class can become vague and unclear. The special education teacher who may have been trained and experienced in teaching in small, structured class settings is asked to go into another teacher’s general, larger, content class and co-teach. It is often easy for these teachers to fall into the role of being an aide or a tutor, especially if there is little
administrative, professional development support, or if there is a poor match with the
general co-teacher. The special education teacher (who was uncertified) at Sherman
High School said that she felt very uncomfortable in her role in the general class. Other
key concerns of the special education teachers were the amount of time, paperwork, and
meetings involved in doing IEPs and the lack of time to visit other classes to observe the
students and to be a resource to the classroom teacher.

**Strengths of Inclusion Revealed through the Study**

It is important to look at some of the successes of inclusion illustrated through the
findings. Although the key elements of inclusion were not evident in practice, most of
the special education students did pass the general class, which can be an indication of
some success. Another indicator of success could be that some students with special
learning needs showed improved self-determination, which was observed in behaviors
such as seeking extra assistance before and after classes. Although it was not a focus of
this study, the students also seemed to show self-confidence that was demonstrated
through active participation in the general class discussions. Additionally, the students
were presented with higher expectations than they would have had if they were in
separate, fully self-contained resource classes. Other school-wide student successes
could include the high rates of attendance, graduation, honors and awards in academic,
social, and athletic areas, which were not the result of inclusion but definitely promoted a
positive school climate.

There was a clear commitment and dedication on the part of the teachers to help
the students learn in an inclusion setting. Inclusion did have a meaning for the
participants, especially a stakeholder such as the teacher at Kulanui Intermediate and
High School, who had originally planned and implemented inclusion at the school three years earlier. Some parents shared that they were comforted knowing that their students were keeping up in the general curriculum and also receiving extra assistance in academic content areas.

Suggestions for More Effective Inclusion

The most problematic issue in inclusion occurs when general education teachers are moved into teaching situations to meet the individualized, special needs of students without adequate support and resources. During the study, the participants recommended explicitly or implicitly what changes could improve inclusion, from their perspectives as stakeholders. In reflecting on my experience and what I have learned through this study, there are many obvious ways that inclusion can better work in Hawai‘i, and possibly in other states as well.

To summarize this discussion, the key barriers to inclusion were:

- Lack of meaningful collaboration and teaming, which involves time, choices, resources, and training.
- A need for more effective teaching to meet diverse student needs rather than transmitting facts and covering curriculum content. Skills in teaching can include collaborative learning, the provision of modifications, differentiated learning strategies, and peer support.
- The class size of both classrooms in this study was too large.

Areas that could be addressed immediately to facilitate inclusion are adequate collaboration and planning time, professional development focusing on inclusion issues, smaller class size, and the use of differentiated learning strategies, cooperative learning, higher-level thinking activities, and a more challenging curriculum.
A learning center model may hold some promise. In this model, a central learning center is established where students can come throughout the day to study for tests, take notes, and receive accommodations and general support. A learning center can provide support built into the student's day, on an "as needed" basis, as the student moves through his or her academic classes. This has been implemented in some elementary schools in Hawaiʻi with much success, but not yet at the secondary level. This model is different from the resource or study skills classes that were described in this study, because the students are not scheduled to go to a learning center but the learning center is usually available for all students as needed.

Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study was somewhat limited by time constraints, which limited my fieldwork to one semester. However, I felt that there was sufficient time to observe the daily operation of the classes, and that the data gathered were adequate for the purposes of this study, which was to create a portrait of the two inclusion classes.

Qualitative data relied mainly on classroom observations and informal discussions with the teachers and the students. One limitation of this study is that I did not use all the avenues planned for data collection, such as more in-depth student and parent interviews. However, there was a trust and comfort level as teachers offered their feelings and shared their views freely and honestly. Data from only a few parent interviews were not sufficient in representing a parent "voice" for this study. There was also a lack of an explicit student voice. No separate formal interviews were conducted with the students because it would have involved taking them out of the class, and time away from their class work. However, the students did share their perceptions with the researcher at
various appropriate times during and after the class period. Students' voices were also revealed through observations of their participation.

*Limitations in interpretation of the data.* I had started the study with key questions relative to effective inclusion practices that can be viewed as elements of an "ideal" program. In reality, the findings revealed that inclusion was implemented at incremental and less than ideal levels. As the primary data collector, I asked myself, in looking for the ideal, was I missing the subtleties and new ideas happening in the classes? Was my focus too narrow? In focusing on the ideal, did I over-focus on the lack of inclusion? Although I was disappointed that I did not see inclusion the way I expected it, I did see a glimpse of inclusion at a set period of time at the particular schools.

At one point I even questioned whether to select other schools for this study that exhibited more apparent components of inclusion. However, I chose to continue at the original participant schools because I had reserved a specific time for this study during my sabbatical leave, and I wanted to study inclusion at typical schools in Hawai‘i. Sudden changes in personnel and procedures were very common. Any study of inclusion in other schools would have been subject to the same types of change and instability in implementation. I may have had a more successful inclusion study at another site but there were no guarantees. Moreover, qualitative research explores life in its natural context and the two case studies did provide contrasts. The narrative of the two classrooms is not entirely that of failure. It is important to discuss why events occurred as they did and to reveal possible explanations for inclusion in practice, as well as to demonstrate a need for improvement in inclusion at all levels in the future.
Applicability of Findings to Other School Contexts

A key question is whether or not the reader can infer and apply generalizations to other settings. The reader can explore issues related to inclusion by reviewing the many interactive factors that are revealed by a narrow focus such as this study. The reader brings his own experience to the findings and will draw his own conclusions. Applicability of findings to other contexts can be discussed in terms of the trustworthiness of data and transferability. Through the selection of typical schools and classes, thick description may promote applicability of findings to other schools and districts in Hawai‘i and elsewhere. Applicability of the findings to other contexts depends on the experiences of the reader and the connections that they make to their own experience.

Are State Directives Hindering Inclusion Efforts?

It is important to note that Hawai‘i has a unique educational system as the only state in the country with a single unified statewide school system. A state board consisting of eight members approves all major educational decisions. A common criticism of the current system is that there is very little autonomy at the school level and that the Department of Education (DOE) can be entrenched in top-down bureaucracy. Commonly, due to the organizational structure of the DOE, individual schools are afforded very little autonomy. Therefore, it is easy to see why only a few secondary schools chose to implement inclusion. Perhaps, because so few secondary schools chose to implement inclusion, the DOE has not communicated a clear vision of special education instructional practices and inclusion. On the other hand, inclusion could
flourish more effectively if there were clear state directives, focus, energy and commitment.

The purpose of this study was not to explore the pitfalls of the educational system; however, in some ways the system itself may have become a barrier to positive systematic inclusion efforts. Some of the barriers imposed by the system were the overemphasis on procedural compliance, and the lack of accountability for student outcomes. It should also be noted that barriers such as the *Felix-Consent Decree* were imposed on the department of education system. Excessive amounts of time, money, and the energy of state and district administrators and resource personnel in special education were spent in due process hearings to avoid litigation, mandated meetings, and compliance procedures. As a result, very little time was spent in supporting schools and teachers on teaching and learning issues.

Other barriers are that there has been insufficient documentation of the actual progress that students with special learning needs have achieved. Additionally, frequent changes in procedures and paperwork have caused confusion in the field. As a result of the dominant top-down educational structure in Hawai‘i, the manner in which educators coordinate systems frequently appears to create standards of “work processes”. However, this standardization may be only on paper. The findings of this study indicate that there was a large gap between DOE specifications for inclusion and instruction in the least restrictive environment and actual classroom practice.

An important question to ask is: Does the paperwork trail show that educators are “doing the right things” compared to “doing things right?” Was there efficiency at the expense of effectiveness? These issues have been a national concern as well. The
President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education (2002) stated, “IDEA will only fulfill its intended purpose if it raises its expectations for students and becomes results-oriented – not driven by process, litigation and regulation. The system must be judged by the opportunities it provides and the outcomes achieved by each child” (p. 8). Discussion and reports on “least restrictive environment,” “all students can learn,” and inclusion ideals may seem like “window dressing,” when there is little focused action in the field. One reason for this may be that so few teachers have experienced inclusion that there are few practical classroom models to follow. This study intended to highlight the classroom version of inclusion.

The key people who can build the knowledge base about inclusion are the teachers who are the experts on teaching and learning in the classroom. In this study, it was the teachers who implemented inclusion at the school and classroom levels. Unfortunately, their voices are usually not heard when DOE directives are passed down to schools or when new programs and initiatives are discussed. Furthermore, there seemed to be complacency on the part of many teachers toward the current state of inclusion, and that it was not worthwhile to advocate for more.

Epilogue

The end of this dissertation does not reflect the end of the study. Students went on to graduate from the schools in the study; more teachers became certified, more schools have implemented inclusion, and more in-service trainings were provided in differentiated teaching strategies. In addition, each school district now completes annual internal reviews, and pre-referral intervention is now part of each school’s student support system. The state Department of Education is moving beyond the sanctions of
the *Felix-Consent Decree* as every school and district has met compliance criteria. In many ways the *Felix-Consent Decree* created the impetus toward greater sustainability, accountability, interagency collaboration, the provision of improved behavioral health services for students, and other positive results.

Inclusion has been implemented in every grade up to 12th grade at Kulanui Intermediate and High School. However, there is still little time for collaboration and teaming. The classroom teacher at Kulanui Intermediate and High School continues to teach inclusion classes, as do many other teachers at the school. During the year after this study, the general teacher at Sherman High School shared that she was very pleased that she was no longer teaching an inclusion class. However, teachers at this school continue to be assigned to co-teach inclusion classes in all content areas.

*New Federal, State, and District Initiatives*

Significant external factors have impinged on the Hawai‘i Department of Education, such as the status of the court-ordered *Felix-Consent Decree* (2003), *Reauthorization of IDEA, 2003*, and the *No Child Left Behind Act* (US Congress, 2002). The law entitled *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) outlined educational requirements for every child to succeed. States were asked to develop measures to assess student achievement based on standards to meet strict and rigid guidelines on what constitutes a school making annual yearly progress (AYP). A requirement of NCLB is that 95% of students with disabilities will participate state assessments with appropriate accommodations. However, most students with special learning needs have not been able to master common grade level curriculum standards or to pass these state assessments. Thus, this mandate may be unrealistic.
The new reauthorization of IDEA (2003) has presented three broad themes that include: focusing on results (not on processes), embracing a model of prevention (not a model of failure), and the policy that all children who require special education are general education students first. A federal report stated that these themes are not apparent, as educators and policymakers still perceive the two systems as separate. In the present system, students in need of special education are not treated as general students whose needs can be met in the regular classroom. This report stated, “This creates incentives for misidentification and academic isolation preventing the pooling of all available resources to aide learning (President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002, p. 3).”

The state Department of Education recognizes areas as needing improvement related to special education as part of the “sacred story” (the ideal). These include

- Providing specialized instruction within a continuum of programs, services, and supports in the least restrictive environment. Students who are special education students are first general education students.
- The Hawai‘i Department of Education’s (DOE) goal is for special education students to score as well as students who are economically disadvantaged or who are second language learners. In the year 2000, special education students scored in the 6th percentile on the state assessment test, while ESL students scored in 12th percentile, and economically disadvantaged students scored at the 27th percentile in Reading.
- The goal for improved post school outcomes is that 80% of special education students will graduate on time, that parent satisfaction will be at 80%, and that there will be a lower number of due process hearings.
- A Sustainability Plan indicates that 90% of teachers who are teaching special education will be certified in teaching special education, and 100% of Educational Assistants will be highly qualified.

(from Hawai‘i Special Education Performance Goals and Indicators, Improvement of Programs and Services for Special Education, DOE, 2001).
These goals reflect years of discussion about the state and district offering more focused professional development on instruction and teaching. It was evident in the case studies of both classes that differentiated and individualized strategies were not used. Workshops in differentiated instruction are now being offered to some teachers, but this has not reached all schools. There has been some discussion at state and district levels moving from “Are we doing things right?” to “How are we teaching and are the students learning?” A recommendation is to offer these professional development sessions to all teachers rather than restricting it to special education teachers, which frequently is the case, since the funding sources specifically target special education teachers.

The federal, state, and district mandates described in this section presume ideal situations, which may be unrealistic in addressing the realities of the classroom and the school system. More valuable time could be devoted to what the law intends, which is helping students with special learning needs to learn. Many stakeholders view compliance with the law as an end to itself. The inclusion class with its own limited resources was not as effective as it could be if there was greater state and district support.

General Reflections on Inclusion

General questions about inclusion emerged through the data. A question that I constantly reflected upon was: Where was the special education? The purpose of special education is to help close the gap between performance and expectations, and to build on students’ strengths in order to meet their special learning needs. Specialized instruction is provided through individualized, focused, planned and specific intervention, which is the intent of IDEA law. The goal of special education is to bring the students up to the level of their peers to make adequate progress through specialized instructional supports.
and services. In inclusion classes these supports are brought to the students. The findings showed that there was not a real change in methods or instruction in the inclusion classes that were studied.

Most of the “specialized” instructional supports at both schools were provided through the separate resource classes. Without this extra assistance, it was dubious as to whether these students would have passed the class. The special education teachers of these classes worked beyond their duties to help the students to pass the classes. In fact, one high school inclusion teacher said, “They’ll graduate if it kills me.” The findings of this study indicated that very little actual content instruction was presented to the students in the segregated resource classes at both schools because the main focus of instruction was on the students completing their work from other content general classes. Study skills instruction would have helped these students to develop much needed strategies to be better learners.

The expectation is that students with learning disabilities can improve through special education intervention. These students show average or higher intelligence in order to qualify as having a learning disability. However, academic success is becoming less possible, as many students are not achieving at a level commensurate with their potential. A question that the researcher continually asked was: What constitutes academic improvement or indications that the students are learning? Does inclusion help achieve this goal? Very few students, and none of the students in this study, ever effectively move out of special education as general students. Furthermore, if students can only be given the supports to pass through a segregated resource class, does this defeat the mission of inclusion?
There is the fear on the part of teachers and parents that the students with special learning needs will be “lost” without special education services such as individual attention in smaller class settings. There is security in knowing that a student will be in a special education program and that they will get the extra help that they need. Some educators feel that separate, pullout resource programs should continue for these students until safeguards and supports are in place in the general classroom.

In this study, special education and general education were still perceived as separate entities. There seemed to be two different paradigms present as the general education teacher worked within the closed setting of the classroom. A dichotomy existed between the IEPs that needed to be implemented by the special education teachers, and general class instruction to meet the academic needs of all students. The school administrators and teachers were not able to maintain the integrity of an individualized system of special education in the inclusion classroom.

Documentation may show that a school is complying with the law as IEPs are written and students are taught in the least restrictive environment, but in actuality we don’t know if special education is really making a difference in the lives of students with mild learning problems. Stake (2004) suggests that there is rarely, if ever, a real world example of an ideal program. He states that there are a lack of working models of what an ideal program is and that an ideal program never exists, which make comparisons and evaluations difficult. He describes a solution to this dilemma, “We can use the implicit standards people have in their heads. We can measure and describe. We rely on standards but most of the standards have been built up in the minds of people by all the experiences they bring to the tasks” (Stake 2004, p. 14). This supports a qualitative
approach to seeing what the perceptions of different stakeholders may be from the policy-makers to the teachers, students, and parents. It is a way to demythologize the “standards” as having a weak empirical base, being difficult to measure (and implement) and to continually think about what the standards ought to be. This study discussed the “sacred story” about the ideal program and the “secret story” about actual practice.

A comparison of constructs about inclusion and actual practice revealed through the findings related to the teachers and the students are reflected in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. A Comparison of Beliefs about Inclusion and Actual Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, the curriculum in the classroom was not always challenging, meaningful, or interesting to the students. The quality of the general curriculum is not often addressed in inclusion studies, but it should be.

Researcher’s Reflections on Inclusion

As described in Chapter 3, Methodology, the researcher was the main instrument of data collection and cannot be separated from the study. As a Department of Education employee, there have been self-imposed conflicts of interest as far as sharing the secret stories of the schools and sharing the sacred or ideal stories. My feelings and ideas about inclusion have changed during my journey with this study and while writing the dissertation. I have had to question whether I am an advocate for inclusion in Hawai‘i if the practice does not reflect effective models where specialized, instructional supports are provided in the general class to help the students to learn. It is also difficult to be an advocate if you are part of the system. However, the voices of the practitioners in the field should be heard since they are the closest to classroom practices and are the most experiential and knowledgeable sources.

Through the course of this study, I reflected on whether inclusion could lead to exclusion. When specialized instructional services are not effectively brought into the classroom, inclusion can easily exclude students with specific learning needs from specialized instructional services that are part of students’ rights. As mentioned earlier, the findings showed that there was little understanding or implementation of accommodations and modifications by both classroom teachers that impacted student learning. There was minimal direct, specialized instruction for the students who were low achievers in reading and writing and who obviously needed much help. If the only
type of assistance the students receive consists solely of helping them with their class and homework, then how are schools and teachers meeting their individual learning needs?

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Frequently, it is easier to critique current practice than to discuss solutions and new ways to teach and learn. We must move from the "complaint and paperwork department" to the "service station" and assure that our instructional programs are equipped with the tools and means to truly address each student's learning needs. I hope through this research that I have offered ways to expand effective inclusion ideas and efforts. Further research on inclusion in secondary schools, especially of a qualitative nature, is needed. One recommendation is for school districts to compile case studies of schools with inclusion histories to share with others in the field nationally and locally. Exemplary models of inclusion can be templates for administrators and teachers to study and apply as appropriate.

Researchers and educators know what components foster effective inclusion programs. However, the processes in implementing inclusion in actual practice are often blurred, unclear, and inconsistent. Merely placing students and teachers in inclusion classes does not guarantee that inclusive practices will be evident. It is important for schools to share and learn what others schools have experienced in regard to the barriers and the challenges that inclusion presents. School histories can include how teachers have met instructional needs through curriculum adaptations, modifications, differentiated strategies, peer interactions, collaboration, and team building efforts. Educators can learn about the vast issues related to inclusion through discussion of the many interactive factors that are revealed by a narrow focus such as this study.
Further inquiry is needed for studying students with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, attention-deficit disorder, emotional problems, and cultural-related differences in learning and behavior. More problems in society and families affect student learning such as substance abuse, unemployment, separated families, and other risk factors. Many children have neurological and psychological problems due to prenatal exposure to drugs and alcohol, and are in need of intensive behavior therapy and therapeutic intervention. Many Hawai‘i schools have a full-time School-Based Behavior Therapist to address students’ intensive counseling needs. Unfortunately, we will continue to see significant increases in the numbers of children in need of special education. There is a current epidemic in Hawai‘i (and other areas of the country) of the substance abuse involving “ice” (crystal methamphetamine) that has already had severe consequence for our youth and their education.

Additional recommendations include exploration of why certain ethnic groups of students are over-represented among students who qualify for special education programs, such as part-Hawaiian students. Hawaiian students account for 23% of the school population, but over 33% are identified with learning disabilities, emotional or speech/hearing impairments, and many more are estimated to be in the gap group of students who have academic learning needs but do not qualify for special education services (Kamehameha Schools, 1999). Furthermore, the findings revealed that many of the teaching practices were not congruent with cultural learning styles. For example, research has shown that Hawaiian children learn best through hands-on, experiential learning, and peer interactions. There was an overemphasis on independent written work and minimal student involvement in sharing finished written work in the classes studied.
Finally, it is recommended that all schools offer supplemental programs (other than the general English class) in explicit instruction and practice in building reading skills for students who struggle with literacy. These could be tutoring programs, learning centers, reading classes, or after-school programs. Most of the special education students in this study showed reading difficulties, which affected their progress in all academic areas including mathematics. However, the main mode of reading instruction was whole-class read aloud. Strategy instruction should be built into each reading lesson. National statistics indicate that up to 40% of students become certified to receive special education services because of reading problems (President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002). There are many recurrent concerns about special education that should be addressed, such as the quality of instruction in all class settings, appropriate methods of evaluations and eligibility, and the use of going formative assessments that show what the students are learning.

*Where Do We Go From Here?*

The state of special education and inclusion in Hawai‘i (and probably other states also) is still in the early development of inclusion to help create more effective special education programs. Small steps, as the schools in this study have taken, can lead toward larger goals if schools and teachers do not lose focus when another initiative or directive is introduced. Inclusion is a gradual, intentional, focused, and mindful process, which involves innovative organizational structures, curriculum, policies, and quality instructional practices. Until there is discussion, direction, interest, and enthusiasm backed up by professional development, resources, and adequate staffing, I believe that “true” inclusion will not exist without the necessary support and resources to ensure its
effectiveness. There is concern about the viability of the inclusion movement in Hawai‘i, if it is not endorsed by the state, district, and school administration and the teachers, in a unified effort to merge two separate systems into one coordinated system. The findings of this study support the idea that change should be initiated “bottom-up” and supported “top-down” (Ouchi, 2003). A balance is needed between directives for school improvement and reform and the provision of the professional and instruction support needed to be successful.

Inclusion often takes place one class and one school at a time, pioneered by those who are willing to try new models of inclusion, such as the schools portrayed in this study. Schools need to plan for sustained growth and improvement of their inclusion programs from year to year, and to place a higher priority on an accepted level of implementation. Teachers and school staff need to have an active voice in the implementation of inclusion and that resources are in place to assure it sustainability rather than maintain a “wait and see” attitude. The participants of this study believed they were implementing inclusion and doing the best they could. Generally, the practices of inclusion are not explicit enough and most educators have not experienced it, so the message, delivered through federal, state, district, and university directives can be vague or muddled. All schools may not be ready for inclusion, and inclusion may not be appropriate for every special education student, but there still needs to be a statewide focus, vision, and plan to assure that special education students are taught in the least restrictive environment with appropriate instructional resources and supports.

Schools continue to strive to create caring communities where students are welcomed, accepted, and have the opportunities to achieve at higher levels. This vision
can be achieved through building teachers’ professional capacity, redefining the roles and responsibilities of all teachers, and providing the financial support to sustain the vision of inclusion. There is an urgency to expand inclusion efforts and other programs to support students, such as the students in this study, as the population of disadvantaged students in Hawai‘i approaches 50%, and the population of students eligible for special education services rises. In 2000 statewide statistics showed that the numbers of eligible students with specific learning needs rose from 10,000 in 1990 to 20,000 in 2000, and these numbers continue to grow (Hawai‘i DOE, 2002b). Expansion of alternative learning environments, such as inclusion, which address special learning needs, must prevail among Department of Education initiatives to maximize classroom learning to benefit all students.

There is a need to critically question practices and perceptions of “special education” and “inclusion”. Findings and synthesis of research in the field show that a shift in thinking is needed regarding special education from evaluation and placement options toward effective teaching and learning strategies in an appropriate and relevant curriculum. There is still a tension between traditional skills-based, behavior modification type strategies in teaching students with special need in contrast to more learning process-oriented approaches. Educators must look at instructional services in general in teaching all students. Many concerns related to special education are actually manifestations about teaching and learning in general.

As this study has shown, there is a wide variation in practice as each school plans how to use their own resources to create inclusion. There may never be a clear blueprint for implementing inclusion because every school needs to find their own unique way of
matching capabilities and resources to student’s learning characteristics; yet, the components for its effectiveness are evident. Teachers can be transformation agents not only in the classroom, but also at institutional levels as they actively apply inclusion practices. All educators can take on an advocacy role in assuring that the knowledge and experiential base of inclusion is expanded. Inclusion is a powerful idea and can change the landscape of special education, as more and more schools move to include, welcome, support and acknowledge all students in general curriculum.

We have the tools and the knowledge to create inclusive classes that can successfully meet the needs of all of the students, but we must support and expand the experiences of inclusion in the field. In conclusion, we can reflect on the words of Edmonds (1979, p. 29) who said:

"We can, whenever and wherever we choose, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest to us. We already know more than we need to know in order to do this. Whether we do it must finally depend on how we feel about the fact that we haven’t done it so far."
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APPENDIX A

COMMON CORE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Teachers

• What is your understanding of inclusion? Tell me about inclusion at this school? How is this different from mainstreaming?

• What helps you to meet the needs of all of the students in your class?

• What adaptations/accommodations do you make for students with learning disabilities in your class?

• What methods or learning activities have the students responded positively to?

• What school practices foster or undermine successful inclusion and student academic and social achievement?

• What are your needs as a teacher in order to successfully implement inclusion?

• What are your goals for long-term inclusion? What are your opinions?

• What do you say that may help another school in implementing inclusion?

• Describe any professional development or resource support provided to help you as an inclusion classroom teacher.

Administrators

• What is the purpose of inclusion at your school?

• What is your understanding of inclusion? Tell me about inclusion at this school?

• What do you think fosters or hinders successful inclusion and academic and social gains of the special education students at your school?

• What are your needs as a principal in order to successfully implement inclusion?
Other School Personnel and Educational Assistants

- Describe the preparation, professional support, and in-service training you received. How do you help meet the needs of your students with special learning needs?

Other general questions:

- How do you feel about the inclusion?

- How did inclusion come about in their school? Who were the key people involved?

- What changes occurred since inclusion was implemented? How did inclusion affect teaching and learning at this school?

Parents.

- What were your previous school experiences (e.g., elementary, intermediate)?

- What types of programs and supports helped you (or your child) to learn?

- What is your child’s diagnosed disability? What are the learning strengths and weaknesses of their child?

Students

- How do you feel about school?

- What do you do well? What worries you?

- Do you feel that this class helps you to learn? Why or why not?

- How is this class different from your other classes? How is this class different from previous year’s classes or schools?
APPENDIX B

NARRATIVE FORM – CLASSROOM ETHNOGRAPHY

Page ___ of ____

Date _____________  Teacher Code ____________  Aides Present ____________

Beginning time ______  Observer Code ____________  Others Present ____________

Ending Time ____________  # of Students Present ____________

1. __________________________________________

2. __________________________________________

3. __________________________________________

4. __________________________________________

5. __________________________________________

6. __________________________________________

7. __________________________________________

8. __________________________________________

9. __________________________________________

10. __________________________________________

11. __________________________________________

12. __________________________________________

13. __________________________________________

14. __________________________________________

15. __________________________________________

16. __________________________________________

17. __________________________________________

18. __________________________________________

19. __________________________________________

20. __________________________________________

21. __________________________________________
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# APPENDIX C

## LIST OF CATEGORIES AND CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Collaboration</td>
<td>Instructional delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grading tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration meeting time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School department meetings and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>Time on task during reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time on task during writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time on task during lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations and Adaptations</td>
<td>Testing accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seating accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Instruction</td>
<td>Whole group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guided Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-to-one assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>In-services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District or state resource assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>Scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District resource assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-class assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Curriculum</td>
<td>Reading novels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading short stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole class reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poetry study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language arts standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Attitudes</td>
<td>General class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special education class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pullout classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attitudes</td>
<td>Impact on special education teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on regular education teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student interactions</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Praise and encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to student interactions</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology</td>
<td>Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Educational Program</td>
<td>Goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present Levels of Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability needs</td>
<td>Learning disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotionally disturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentally retarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech language needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process in Implementing Inclusion</td>
<td>How things were done in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stages of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current phase of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future phases of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What needs to be implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Student Support</td>
<td>Resource study skills class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other programs of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-to-one tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE goals</td>
<td>State Content and Performance Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felix Consent Decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State mandates/support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision of a high school graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student characteristics</td>
<td>Special education students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular education students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male/female and ethnic characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Background</td>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher training and certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Knowledge</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and School Support</td>
<td>DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic progress</td>
<td>Grades, Report cards, Achievement tests, Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>Cooperative learning, Webbing, Peer Review, Partner and group projects, Teacher Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on students</td>
<td>Grades, Student attitude, Academic achievement, Social affects, Class size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish List</td>
<td>Students, Teachers, Administration, Biggest hurdles to overcome, Future expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Felix Consent Decree</td>
<td>Compliance issues, Classroom, teachers and students, DOE impact, Internal review and quality assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issues</td>
<td>Ethnic, Cultural, Transiency issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successes</td>
<td>Students, Teachers, School, DOE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D

SAMPLE INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Henry: Student at Sherman High School

Present Levels of Performance:

Henry has shown a two-year improvement in reading on the SDRT to a 7.7 grade equivalency level. His area of strength is the ability to decode words and read with fluency. Henry is curious about learning and has good basic skills to build on.

In reading comprehension, he needs to work on literal and inferential comprehension skills to further his understanding. He also needs to work on analyzing and interpreting information. He would benefit from having more opportunities to read a wider range of materials to give him exposure to the range of reading. In writing he needs to work on writing skills to structure details in sentences and to learn the writing process.

In Math he has difficulty with math reasoning skills and to break down word problems into smaller steps to understand and problem solve. He needs to work on building self-confidence and learns best in multi-model learning an opportunities for hands-on experiences. Henry tends to give up when he doesn’t care about something or if it is not important for a grade. He tends to give up, rush through assignments, and gets frustrated.

Impact statement: The student’s cognitive disability requires monitoring and accommodations necessary to progress towards his IEP goals and objectives so he can adequately progress in the general education curriculum.

Writing: Standard. Use writing processes and strategies appropriately and as needed to construct meaning and communicate effectively.

Goal: To improve writing skills by completing at least 4 pieces of writing using the writing process.

Benchmarks or Short-Term Objectives

1. When given a writing assignment, Henry will use strategies such as brainstorming, mapping and reading to generate ideas about the topic 80% of the time.

2. When given a writing assignment, Henry will complete at least three paragraphs using the following steps in the writing process 80% of the time: prepare a draft, revise, and rewrite.

Reading Standard. Use strategies within the reading process to construct meaning.
Goal: Henry will improve reading comprehension by one year.

Benchmarks or Short-Term Objectives

1. When given a passage to read at his instructional level, student will be able to answer questions in the following with 80% accuracy: literal, differentiation, drawing conclusions.
2. Student will use strategies to check comprehension by asking questions, seeking clarification and summarizing in 4 out of five times.
3.

Life Skills

1. Henry will bring supplies for each period including red book, pencil, pen, paper and textbooks 100% of the time.
2. Henry will attend all five periods each day on time, be in his chair before the bell rings, have supplies on desk, start class as outlined by class and have red book ready.
3. Henry will use strategies to deal with anger/frustration by:
   1. Count to 10, breathe and relax and then continue to work;
   2. Self-imposed time out;
   3. Following directions;
   4. Talk with support team such as the Behavior Specialist or a teacher when needed.

Services: Student has 60 minutes of counseling each week.

Accommodations:

- Utilize computer for writing;
- Provide adequate time for assignments (do not penalize for late work);
- Give midterm grade checks since he gives up and gets frustrated when tasks are tough.
- Check for understanding of directions.
- Preferential seating. Hearing loss in left ear. Talk toward his right side.

Post-Secondary Transition Goals. In all regular classes except for study skills and math transition goals include playing football and going to college.
APPENDIX E

SAMPLE INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Nelson: Student at Kulanui Intermediate and High School

Present Levels of Performance:

Nelson had a positive attitude toward learning. He was polite, attentive in his classes, and responsible in completing assignments in and out of classes and has good attendance. Math is his strength especially in computation yet he struggled with word problems. His main difficulty is in reading and spelling.

Nelson scored at a 2.6 reading level based on the SDRT (The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test). However, teacher-made tests placed him at 5.0 grade level in decoding reading. When Nelson confronts a difficult assignment he usually asks for help. Nelson does well in identifying the main idea in comprehension but has difficulty inferring meaning or the author’s purpose and in reading in the content areas. He does well in decoding words in isolation and phonetic analysis. Math is a strength, but he requires extra assistance in word problems due to his limited vocabulary. He usually asks for help in understanding word problems. Nelson learns best in multi-modular learning environments and hands-on experiences. In writing he can express complete thoughts and ideas, especially in expressing feeling he needs help in writing process to edit and rewrite

IEP Goals and Objectives

Writing Standard: Apply knowledge and understanding of the conventions of language and research when writing.

Measurable Annual Goal: Improve his written expression to grade level.

Short term-objectives and benchmarks:

1. When given a written assignment, Nelson will be able to convey meaning, provide important information, make a point and fulfill purpose 90% of the time.

2. When given a written assignment, Nelson will apply the writing process with 100% accuracy in 4 out of 5 responses.

Reading Standard: Use strategies within the reading process to construct meaning.

Measurable Annual Goal: Nelson will improve reading skills to the next grade level.
1. While reading passages at current level, Nelson will recognize breakdown in comprehension and repair breakdowns by re-reading, asking questions, and seeking clarification from the teacher 80% of the time.

2. Student will make connection between prior knowledge and text while reading to construct meaning 80% of the time.

Goal: Nelson will use a balance of word attack and comprehension strategies throughout the reading process.

1. When confronted with an unknown word, Nelson will segment and sound out words using general vowel sound rules 80% of the time.

2. Given an unknown word, Nelson will identify known prefixes, suffixes or root words to help him identify the complete word 80% of the time.

Accommodations:

Nelson will continue to receive accommodations in classes and monitoring to be successful.

Model the use of comprehension fix-up strategies such as oral decoding, rereading, self-questioning, the use of context clues and seeking clarification.

Provide questions and pre-reading activities that aid students in accessing knowledge.

Allow retake of tests for passing grades without penalty.

Midterm progress reports to inclusion teacher.

Nelson will continue to receive accommodations in classes and monitoring to be successful

Allow adequate time to complete assignment. Do not penalize for late work

Nelson was very successful in reading workshop class and it is recommended to continue

Least Restrictive Environment Statement: Nelson will stay in the general education classes for all of his courses except for Study Skills. Although Nelson is in general education classes, he continues to benefit from monitoring and accommodations.

Post-Secondary Transition Goal: Nelson’s goal is to attend an institute of higher leaning and to explore his interests. He wants to attend college and should pursue career goals and create a college portfolio.
APPENDIX F

SAMPLE TYPICAL LESSON AT SHERMAN HIGH SCHOOL

Agenda is posted on the board.

Vocabulary
Characteristics Worksheet
Read aloud in book
Review Homework and Assignment

The student’s first assignment was the ‘bell-work’ in which they are asked to write their vocabulary words and definitions from the board. While the students were working, the teacher took attendance by calling each student’s name aloud. However, this took too long and gave the students too much ‘free time’ and distractions occurred. The students all finished the assignment at different times. Many students lost focus and started doing other things while they waited for the teacher to redirect the class. Furthermore, there was no feedback or monitoring of what was completed. The teacher asked the students to hold on to their work and use it to study for the quiz, which was scheduled for later that week. The class period was shorter, fifty minutes, since it was an Assembly Schedule.

The teacher reminded the class that they would have a quiz on the novel the following day. She also emphasized the importance of knowing the ‘details’ in the novel, “Make sure of your facts.” The planned quiz will cover predominantly literal comprehension questions. The researcher wondered why the teacher would give a test on the ‘details’ of a fictional work?

The teacher started the lesson for the day with daily vocabulary. Her students were given a vocabulary word in sentences rich in context and asked to guess what the
meaning of the new word. These words were not the same words used in the first assignment.

TEACHER: Who can guess what the word ‘indolence’ means in this sentence?

_The boy was fired for indolence._

STUDENT: I think it means that he got fired for stealing.

TEACHER: What the speaker said was not relevant to the discussion

Same student (shouts out): It means that ‘it matters.’

TEACHER: I’m going to ignore you.

Generally, the students seemed very bored. There were constant interruptions, shouting out inappropriate comments, and talking out of turn. One student had his head on the desk. The researcher conducted a ‘time on task’ analysis and found that only approximately one-third of the students were engaged. Ten minutes later, engagement moved to 50%. The teacher attempted to redirect the students by saying, “Are you listening? Pay attention, or you will lose points for vocabulary. Let’s look at this sentence and see if we can guess what the word ‘inevitable’ means?”

_Traffic was inevitable on the long holiday weekend._

After the vocabulary lesson, the teacher directed the students to a “Character Characteristics” sheet for the novel, _The Family Nobody Knows_, by Helen Doss.

Mrs. Stanton said, “Listen carefully. You could correct your sheet and then turn in the corrected worksheet at the end of this period. Listen so that you will know how to improve it.”

The teacher directed the class discussion to characteristics of a little girl in the novel, Rita. Some of the characteristics were:

- roly poly
- red apple cheeks
- pixie eyes
- brown hair
- olive skin
- Hawaiian
- Korean
- Indonesian
The students asked questions such as, "What is 'roly poly'?" and "What is Indonesian?" The teacher explained these terms. There was a chart on the board for each of the main characters with two columns. One column was for physical characteristics and the other for personal characteristics. The students worked on filling in the chart. Then the teacher wrote the answers on the chart written on the board and asked the students to copy it.

The discussion of traits went on until it was almost the end of the period when one student asked, "What do we do with the list?" There actually was nothing that they had to do with the list except to turn it in to get the points.

The researcher observed that the special education students seemed lost and inattentive. Two students did not even take out a paper or pencil and both sit in the back of the room removed from participation. Towards the end of the class period, general student engagement averages about 50%. Generally, most of the students did not seem interested in the novel or the assignment.

Five minutes before the end of the period, the teacher read aloud from the novel yet the students were still very restless. Mrs. Stanton reminded the class that their homework was to write fifty more words for their composition, which was due the following week.

In describing this lesson, it should also be noted that the special education teacher, Mrs. Grant, was not involved in instructional delivery in any way. Her main role was to walk around the room and redirect students who were off-task (as most were). Some of the students may have been responsive to her redirection at first; however, as soon as she went on to help another student, they again became unfocused, and off-task.

(Observation notes and summary, 11/21/2000)
APPENDIX G

SAMPLE TYPICAL LESSON AT KULANUI INTERMEDIATE & HIGH SCHOOL

This lesson involved Vocabulary Study. The agenda for the lesson was written on the board:

Agenda
- Vocabulary words for the Week
- Practice using words in sentences
- Start Homework
- Sentences Dictation

While the students were settling down, the teacher said, “Please take out a piece of paper to write your spelling words for the week. Let’s go over the new words for the week.” The vocabulary words were on a handout for students to refer to.

The teacher discussed the meanings and use of the words and gave strategies for remembering spelling. The students were listening and wrote the words, meanings, and used them in a sentence.

The special education (substitute) teacher wrote the words on the board while Mrs. Thomas taught the lesson. One of the words on the list was achievement, which was misspelled on the board. One student raised her hand to say that the word is spelled wrong. The teacher says, “See how observant you are, you caught that.” The examples for the vocabulary words continued in this manner of interaction between the teacher and the student.
The next word was ‘acquitted.’ The teacher used the example of O.J. Simpson being acquitted. Student engagement during the vocabulary lesson was 80% based on the intermittent tally method.

The third word was absorb. “Your brain absorbs knowledge.”

The next word is absolutely. “I want you to be absolutely quiet“.

Mrs. Thomas acknowledged student responses and comments. Students were participating and engaged in the lesson. The teacher used the student’s language and experience to explain the use and meaning of the word. For example, in discussing the word acquaintance, the teacher described how she has acquaintances at the school but may not “hang out” with them such as eating lunch together or meeting during preparation time. The teacher drew on the student’s language and experience by saying, “Do you have any acquaintances who are not your buddies but people you are acquainted with?”

The lesson continued as the teacher explains that some of the words are considered spelling demons, “We can’t teach you to spell every word in the English language but there are strategies you can use.” Time was given for the students to get started on the homework assignment in class and they are asked to complete at least two sections.

There are five sections to the assignments, which were due by the end of each week. The vocabulary and spelling assignments for the week were:

1. Write the words, definitions,
2. Use the new word in a sentence,
3. Copy each vocabulary words ten times,
4. Complete a practice worksheet choosing the correct word in ‘fill-in-the-blank’ sentences and

5. Take a quiz on Friday.

This vocabulary lesson is a routine that the students are familiar with. The teacher said, “Check you spelling and how you write your letters and your capitals. Check your spelling as you say the word to yourself and it will help make it stick in your mind.”

The general classroom teacher and the special education teacher walked around the room to check on the students as they worked and to offer help or redirection.

During the last fifteen minutes of class, the teacher gave a quick review and added practice is provided in the format of Sentence Dictation. “This is a check on spelling, vocabulary and sentences.” She dictated a sentence and the students copied the sentences. The sentence was: “Your callous friends hurt my feelings.”

The teacher emphasized over and over why the class was working on this. “We are practicing so we can write good sentences with good spelling and correct form which is mechanics. Do you remember some of these things?” After the students wrote their own sentence, the teacher called on different students to come up and write the sentence on the board and then the class discusses whether it is correct or what may need to be added. One student shared his sentence, “Look, it’s the cavalry!” The teacher reviewed the use of an exclamation mark. Another student asked, “Can I put an exclamation mark in my sentence.” The teacher acknowledged that an exclamation mark would be appropriate. The class reviewed three sentences before the final bell rang and the class was dismissed.

(Observation notes and summary, 9/24/2000)
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