

Spring 1994

Staff Development Model for a Special Education Inclusion Program in the Northshore School District

John E. DeForest
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/graduate_projects



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

DeForest, John E., "Staff Development Model for a Special Education Inclusion Program in the Northshore School District" (1994). *All Graduate Projects*. 431.
https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/graduate_projects/431

This Graduate Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Student Projects at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Projects by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

A STAFF DEVELOPMENT MODEL FOR A SPECIAL
EDUCATION INCLUSION PROGRAM IN THE
NORTHSORE SCHOOL DISTRICT

A Project
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education in Administration

by
John E. DeForest
May, 1994

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

COMMITTEE CHAIR
Dr. Jack McPherson

Dr. Glenn Madsen

Dr. Gregory Chan

A STAFF DEVELOPMENT MODEL FOR A SPECIAL
EDUCATION INCLUSION PROGRAM IN THE
NORTHSHORE SCHOOL DISTRICT

by

John E. DeForest

May, 1994

The purpose of this project was to design a staff development model for a special education inclusion program for the Northshore School District, Bothell, Washington. The inclusion model developed was intended for use by regular and special education teachers at the secondary level. To accomplish this purpose, a review of current literature and research regarding the special education inclusion concept was conducted and selected education inclusion models were studied.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express a special thanks to my Central Washington University project committee, Dr. Jack McPherson, Dr. Glenn Madsen, and Dr. Gregory Chan for taking time from their schedules to provide their guidance. I also want to thank Ms. Kathy Boyce (Special Education Department Head Bothell High School), and Mrs. Judy Anderson (Special Education Aide Bothell High School) for their cooperation and effort during the implementation of this project.

My special thanks to my wife, who brings happiness into my life. Her unfailing support has given me the confidence and the tenacity to achieve this goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. Background of the Project _____	1
Introduction _____	1
Purpose Of The Project _____	2
Limitations Of The Project _____	2
Definition of Terms _____	2
2. Review of Literature _____	5
Introduction Of Related Research _____	5
The Inclusion Concept: Background Information _____	5
Evidence Supporting Tthe Use Of TheTeam Approach As An Important Concept In The Inclusion Process _____	7
A Review Of Selected Model Inclusion Programs _____	10
The Principal's Role In Administering Programs For Students With Disabilities _____	16
Summary _____	18
3. Procedures of the Project _____	20
Need For The Project _____	20
Development Of Support For The Project _____	21
Planned Implementation Of The Project _____	21
4. The Project _____	22
Part I: Introduction _____	P-3
Part II: Past Practices at Bothell High School _____	P-5
Part III: Current Inclusion Model, B.H.S. _____	P-8
Part IV: Outcomes _____	P-12

TABLE OF CONTENTS - CONTINUED

Chapter	Page
5. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations _____	23
Summary _____	23
Conclusions _____	23
Recommendations _____	24
References _____	25

CHAPTER 1

Background of the Project

Introduction

As illustrated by Schattman in the statement below, the team approach has been perceived as an important concept in assuring fully inclusive education in the classroom. Thousand and Villa (1990) have contended there is a correlation between teaming of regular and special education teachers and their ability to accommodate wide ranging individual differences typically encountered in heterogeneous classrooms.

When a planning team is working well it can address virtually any issue. There are programs throughout the United States committed to the provision of fully inclusive education, and the one common denominator is they all use teams for planning, problem solving, and program implementation. It is the configuration of a team, with its diverse representation of perspectives and multiple sources of creativity, that allows them to deal with the diversity and complexity of the needs represented in the classes that include all children (Schattman, 1992).

Jenkins, Pious, & Jewell (1990) have also suggested that regular classroom teachers will need additional assistance in developing and implementing specially designed instruction for low achieving students. In a 1982 study Schubert and Landers concluded that regular and special education teachers must be able to work together as teams if students are to be truly educated in the least restrictive environment.

According to Jenkins and Pious (1991), teaming is the key to effectively managing the mainstream classroom's diversity. "A critical element is the team approach, people working together. There is no doubt that teams are the model of choice in many schools." The team model enabled regular classroom teachers and specialists to work together in a problem solving process. The intent was to create a framework in which specialists and classroom teachers

could participate equally in analyzing a student's learning problem, examining the existing instructional environment, and proposing modifications.

Purpose of the Project

Prior to 1990, Bothell High School in the Northshore School District, Bothell, Washington did not have an effective staff and student inclusion model.

The purpose of this project was to design a staff development model for a special education inclusion program for the Northshore School District, Bothell, Washington. The inclusion model developed was intended for use by regular and special education teachers at the secondary level. To accomplish this purpose, a review of current literature and research regarding the special education inclusion concept was conducted and selected education inclusion models were studied.

Limitations of the Project

For purposes of this project it was necessary to set the following limitations:

1. **Scope:** The model program produced as a result of this project was intended for use by regular and special education teachers at the secondary level in the Northshore School District, Bothell, Washington.
2. **Target Population:** The model program which was the subject of this project was designed for the instruction of mildly disabled high school students.
3. **Research:** The preponderance of research and literature reviewed for the purpose of designing this model program has been limited to the past ten years.

Definition of Terms

Significant terms used in the context of this project have been defined as

follows:

1. **At Risk Children:** Children who because of extenuating circumstances, may be at a higher risk for school failure (Gillet, 1993).
2. **Inclusion:** The provision of educational services for students with disabilities in schools where nonhandicapped peers attend, in age appropriate, general educational classrooms with special education support (Thousand and Villa, 1992).
3. **Individual Education Program: (I.E.P.)** A program developed in a meeting with parents, teachers, special education personnel and student which describes the child's present levels of performance, states specific, measurable goals and objectives, and a description of services to be provided. The I.E.P. must be reviewed annually (Vandercook, 1989).
4. **Integrated Program:** A program that places a child full time in an age appropriate program with nonhandicapped peers (Schubert and Landers, 1982).
5. **Learning Disabled: (L.D.)** A term used to describe a disorder in the basic processes involved in understanding or using spoken or written language (Schubert & Landers, 1982).
6. **Least Restrictive Environment: (L.R.E.)** A term used to meet the maximum extent appropriate for handicapped children to be educated with nonhandicapped children (Affleck, 1988).
7. **Mainstreaming:** The practice of providing handicapped children an education with their nonhandicapped peers to the greatest extent possible (Schubert and Landers, 1982).
8. **Public Law 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act**

which ensures a free public education for all children in the least restrictive environment (Stainback and Stainback, 1992).

9. Resource Room: A special education placement option for handicapped students who require specialized instruction in addition to their regular program for relatively short periods of time. The students are based in the regular classroom and "pulled out" for instruction in the resource room (Affleck, 1988).
10. Special Education: Specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parent or the student, to meet the unique needs, abilities, and limitations of a student having a handicapping condition (Jenkins and Pious, 1991).

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Introduction Of Related Research

The review of literature and research summarized on the following pages has been organized to address:

1. The inclusion concept: Background information.
2. Evidence supporting the use of the team approach as an important concept in the inclusion process.
3. A review of selected inclusion model programs.
4. The principal's role in administering programs for students with disabilities.
5. Summary.

Research addressed in Chapter 2 was identified through an Educational Resources Information Centers (ERIC) computer search. A hand search of various other sources was also conducted.

The Inclusion Concept: Background Information

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 Public Law 94-142 was considered to be a civil rights bill for the handicapped and expressed a national commitment to provide a free and appropriate public education for every handicapped person between the ages 3 and 21. This law assured handicapped students the right to develop their potential to the maximum. States and local school systems have been required to provide all identified handicapped students with an education designed to meet their needs and abilities. The Act also stated that placement of students with learning disabilities should be in the least restrictive environment. (Gillet, 1993)

The Learning Disabilities Association of Washington (LDAW) has investigated how decisions regarding educational placement of students with

learning disabilities are made. The LDAW has taken the position that decisions affecting those eligible for special education services must be based on the needs of each individual student and must be the results of a cooperative effort involving the student, the parents and the educators.

The LDAW has endorsed the basic provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which guaranteed the right of all youth with learning disabilities to:

- "receive a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment appropriate for the student's specific needs;
- have a team-approved Individual Education Program that includes current functioning levels, instructional goals and objectives, placement and service decisions, and procedures for evaluation of program effectiveness;
- have the placement decisions made on an individual basis and considered only after the development of an IEP;
- have the options of a continuum of alternative placements and a full range of related services as determined by the IEP team in order to meet the student's specific needs."

However, according to Lipsky and Gartner (1987), even though the recent changes cited above have represented important landmarks in the field of special education, greater efforts need to be made for students labeled as handicapped, as noted in the following statement:

"The failure to include students labeled as handicapped within the scope of educational reform cannot be based on the actual educational outcomes for such students. An increasing number of reports indicate that these outcomes are dismal. This is true across a number of different outcomes metrics: student learning, graduation rates, return to general education, post school education employment, or community living."

Lipsky and Gartner (1987) have taken the position that the fundamental changes necessary to assure quality outcomes for all students, including those now labeled as handicapped, will require a paradigm shift, as follows:

" Rather than focusing on the adult providers of educational services or the balance of responsibility among national, state, and local authorities, the new formulation places the student at the center of educational reform. It recognizes that it is the student who is the producer of the

educational outcome: learning. It is a shift not merely from inputs to outputs, but from means to results. It involves a fundamental reconceptualization of the process of the production of learning.”

The paradigm shift described above will require what researchers have termed a “New School” and “New Roles” for school and adults. As discussed further by Lipsky and Gartner (1987), the present model of segregating learning disabled students from the general student population has failed. Enlightened educators now recognize the moral responsibility to include all students regardless of ability in the regular classroom setting. This movement toward “full inclusion,” though faced with many challenges will enhance the role of teachers. The new characteristics of real professionalism among teachers in a school committed to the inclusion concept will be:

- “Teachers will transcend narrow categorical responsibilities of subject matter to become broad enablers of learning.
- Teachers will have to work more collegially with other teachers across the disciplines and without distinctions.
- Teachers will have the opportunity to engage in a greater variety of interactions with student learning.
- Teachers will have broader involvement with other adults, learning resources and parents.”

Evidence Supporting The Use Of the Team Approach As An Important Concept In The Inclusion Process

According to Patterson, Purkey, and Parker (1986) every school needs many collaborative teams to invent meaningful learning opportunities for an increasingly diverse student population and to explore the problems that traditional school structures, to date, have failed to adequately address.

Villa and Thousand (1992), indicated that the history of collaborative practices within schools has been relatively short, and collaboration among school personnel has not yet become the norm. The authors have suggested that collaborative teams assist adults with their work as well as offer students of all types a model of the type of work structure they can expect to encounter as

citizens of a highly complex community. It was their belief that collaborative teams enhance a teacher's potential for survival and power in educating a diverse student body by creating opportunities for: 1) the regular exchange of needed resources, expertise, and technical assistance; and 2) professional growth through reciprocal peer coaching.

Keith and Girling (1991) have suggested that a school's capacity to adapt to change and to engage in renewal has been shown to be positively related to the degree to which there is active participation on the part of the entire school community. The emphasis in inclusive schools should be on adapting the program to meet individual student needs, ongoing collaborative planning, and student monitoring.

According to Stainback and Stainback (1988), collaboration among team members has been the key to successful inclusion of all students in regular classes. Collaboration should involve a nonhierarchical relationship in which all team members are seen as equal contributors, each adding his or her own expertise or experience to the problem-solving process. A common denominator among successful inclusion programs has been a strong and unwavering commitment by a core group of people in the school to collaboration and teaming.

In a study conducted by Kaskinen-Chapman (1992), the positive impacts of collaboration and teaming were emphasized. The findings of the study were derived from the Saline Area Schools (SAS) in southeastern Michigan. Although SAS had a history of educating the majority of its students with disabilities in their local home schools through resource room and consultation services, SAS began a fully inclusive schooling program in 1987 to create heterogeneous educational experiences that could be successful for children. SAS relied upon the concept and practice of collaboration and encouraged and constructed

collaboration arrangements among teachers for regular and special education students. As a result of teaming, teachers appeared to believe that heterogeneous education arrangements benefited all students, and they perceived themselves as more capable of teaching students with intensive needs.

Schattman (1992) studied the Franklin Northwest Supervisory Union (FNWSU), a collection of five independent school districts in rural northwestern Vermont. The union's evolution from a dual system of segregated special and regular education services to a single full inclusion model was not an isolated change from within special education. Rather, it was a gradual cultural evolution of collaboration. Collaborative teams were formed to facilitate systems change in the FNWSU.

Teachers and administrators realized that the traditional model, where each individual teacher was expected to have all the knowledge needed to meet all of the needs of an increasingly diverse classroom of students, was inadequate to ensure the level of support required by teachers. Recognizing the complexity of teaching a diverse group of students, a collaborative team model was developed. The team consisted of both "core" and "extended" team members. The core members were the people most directly responsible for the design and delivery of a student's educational program and included the parent(s), the class teacher, special education teacher, and any specialist necessary. The team was a necessary configuration that provided classroom teachers with a support network.

The FNWSU staff discovered when teams followed the collaborative teaming process, there were few problems they could not solve. "The teams became essential to student success." The FNWSU has observed improved programming, better distribution of resources and personnel, increased

commitment to the teaming process and inclusive practices, and improved relations among parent and teachers.

A Review Of Selected Model Inclusion Programs

In 1988, the University of Washington and the Issaquah School District in Washington developed a service delivery model for educating mildly handicapped children in integrated classrooms administered jointly by regular and special education personnel. This effort was the ongoing result of a sixteen-year collaboration between the district and the university. The university and the school district had moved toward developing systems that increasingly integrated handicapped students with their nonhandicapped peers. The "Issaquah Model", also termed the Integrated Classroom Model (ICM), was unique in that it shaped regular education to meet the needs of special education students and expanded special education to meet the needs of regular education students. The program began in 1980, when one teacher implemented the idea in a first-grade classroom. During that three-year study, the program expanded to include thirteen classrooms in three buildings at grade levels 1 through 6. Essential features of the Issaquah model included the following:

Setting:

1. ICM was designed to educate mildly handicapped elementary children in the same classrooms with regular education children for the entire school day.
2. Regular school district curriculum and materials were used, and teachers all had successful prior experience either in special education or regular education settings.
3. Integrated classrooms were composed of approximately one third

mildly handicapped students and two thirds average to above average regular education students.

4. All eligible students were assigned to the integrated classroom at the appropriate grade level in the building they would normally attend.

Instructional Staff:

1. The ICM teachers were selected jointly by the building principals and special education administrators.
2. Teachers were either former special education, self-contained and resource teachers, or former regular education teachers who received further personnel preparation to fulfill Washington State requirements for teaching special education.
3. Each integrated classroom was assigned from 1.5 to 3 hours of aide time per day.
4. Attempts were made to assign one aide to each ICM teacher.

Best Practices:

1. Integrated classrooms were highly structured, with clear behavioral and academic expectations.
2. Cooperative learning was often used for practice of skills previously introduced by the teacher.
3. The district-adopted curriculum and materials were used in the integrated classrooms and were modified to meet the needs of the students.
4. The ICM teachers had also identified practices they felt were essential:
 - a) complete inclusion of the special education students into the classroom,

b) and adaptation of material by the teachers for individual instruction.

Interpretation:

1. The results of the study by the university supported the integrated classroom model as a viable alternative service delivery model for students with learning disabilities.
2. The research indicated that the model was at least as effective academically as the resource room in the Issaquah District, and provided services in a less restrictive environment.
3. The results also supported the ICM as an effective program for regular education students.
4. The Issaquah model was considered to be a practical application involving both disciplines, regular and special education, in the education of all children.

In Vermont, several school districts operationalized their commitment to integrated services in home school districts as part of what has been labeled the "Homecoming Model" (Thousand, et al., 1986). Educational services have been redesigned to provide services based on the concept that responsibility for education was shared by regular and special educators. The primary support was provided by planning teams for each individual student with high needs which included consultants with specialized areas of expertise. Members of the planning team were identified based upon individual learner needs and included at least the regular class teacher, a special education teacher who provided mainstreamed support, and an integration specialist if necessary. Essential characteristics of the Vermont model included:

Setting:

1. In each Homecoming Model all students attended their

neighborhood school, and placed in chronologically age appropriate regular classes.

2. Each student was provided with the individually designed supports necessary to help them learn.
3. Each class was staffed with a special education teacher and special education paraprofessional.
4. Classroom based instructional strategies for students with and without disabilities were presented in much the same manner.

Instructional Staff:

1. The Homecoming Model was linked to the University of Vermont's Center for Development Disabilities.
2. The university provided the schools with technical assistance and staff development opportunities.
3. Also provided by the university was a part-time consulting educator and psychologist.
4. Resources from the university helped staff to acquire and apply the technologies needed to meet a broader range of student needs.

Interpretation:

1. The results showed a thoughtfully planned individualized program with effective utilization of all personnel.
2. The research showed a greater level of exposure to a broad range of educational opportunities for all students.
3. The results also showed a higher level of independent functioning among special education students.
4. The Vermont Model provided additional resources and personal growth for all students.

Hillcrest Elementary School is located in the Oak Harbor, Washington

School District. The school was initially designed to house a self-contained special education program and was the location for special education generally. When the school opened, a self-contained special education classroom was placed in the school serving all developmentally disabled students in grades 3-5. The program has gone through a change in its definition of special education. It has changed from being a place to being a service. The new model stressed the delivery of services to all regular and special education students. The change of program was initiated by the self-contained special education instructor, other special resource staff, the school principal and the regular education staff. Beginning with the 1991-92 school year, Hillcrest Elementary initiated the concept of greater inclusion of handicapped special education students in the regular class in its fourth year of operation. The new model stressed the delivery of services to all students. Special education students would be integrated into the regular classroom, and pull-out models would be eliminated. Essential features of the model included:

Setting:

1. The school enrollment was approximately 600 students in grades 1-5.
2. Hillcrest serves all developmentally disabled students in grades 3-5 from throughout the district.
3. Each special education student was enrolled as a member of a regular education class for all activities.

Instructional Staff:

1. This program was staffed by two special education certificated teachers and 3 instructional aides.
2. The special education teacher's role was one of collaboration with regular education teachers.

3. Support was also given by the paraprofessionals working in collaboration with general education teachers.

Interpretation:

1. The majority of mildly handicapped students are served within the regular classroom through an in-class consultation model.
2. The Hillcrest system meets most of the characteristics of an inclusion model.
3. The role of special education has become less location bound and more resource oriented, providing all staff with the materials and assistance required for students to be successful.

Centennial Elementary School was the fifth elementary school to be added to the Mount Vernon School District in the state of Washington. It housed over 500 students from grades K-6. This school operated a full inclusion model for students who have developmental disabilities, as well as milder disabling conditions. This inclusion model began as a joint venture between Centennial Elementary School and the Skagit County provider for pre-school services to developmentally disabled youngsters.

Students served in the Centennial inclusion project include children with autism, severe health disorders, deafness, other severe behavior disorders, and mild mental retardation. The students were placed in regular education classes full time. Essential features of the Mount Vernon model included the following:

Setting:

1. The Centennial inclusion project was designed to educate mildly handicapped elementary children in the same classrooms with regular education children for the entire school day.
2. This program was staffed by a special education certificated teacher consultant and classified assistants.

3. Each special education student was enrolled as a member of a regular education class.

Instructional Staff:

1. The Centennial model was linked as a joint venture with the Skagit County provider for pre-school services.
2. Work was done with individual staff members on the integration of these students.
3. The Centennial model was staffed with a special education certificated teacher and classified instructional assistants.

Interpretation:

1. Centennial Elementary School operates a fully inclusive model of education.
2. Special education for these students has become a resource and is no longer seen as a location.
3. The school has adopted a philosophy statement guiding their behavior toward all students.

The Principal's Role In Administering Programs

For Students With Disabilities

Current research conducted by Kritsonis (1993), has emphasized that principals must improve their knowledge about special education and special education law. The principal sets the tone for staff, students, and parent attitudes toward students with disabilities.

Kritsonis (1993) has explained how the administrator's role as an instructional leader encompasses knowledge of legal mandates governing special education. Principals bear the burden of implementing and addressing these legal mandates at the local school level.

For example, the principal should be committed to implementing Public

Law 94-142 which mandated that children with disabilities be educated in the "least restrictive environment." In essence, this legal requirement mandated placement of disabled students in regular education classes and schools. Additionally, the school principals' responsibilities should include planning, organizing, and supervising programs for students with disabilities.

Kritsonis (1993) emphasized that a principal's responsibilities should include the following:

1. The principal should provide additional sources of information on exceptional children's education.
2. The principal should utilize special educators as support personnel.
3. The principal should allow for special materials for the regular educator.
4. The principal should provide support for the exceptional child.
5. The principal should provide support for the faculty.

Finally, to assure that school principals acquire a basic knowledge of special education, Kritsonis (1993) made the following recommendations:

1. Principals and special education teachers must establish and maintain open lines of communication.
2. The state department of education should mandate that all school administrators complete courses in special education for administrative certification.
3. Universities should provide consultation services in special education to school systems.
4. Current information of special education should be available to principals.
5. Principals should invite special education personnel to talk with the staff.

Lietz and Kaiser (et, al., 1979), have also contended that a building principal has the major responsibility for special education. Those responsibilities include:

1. Coordinating and administering of special education services in the school.
2. Supervising of educational personnel serving handicapped children in the school.
3. Designating and implementing educational programs for handicapped children in the school, in accordance with approved policies, procedures, and guidelines of the State Department of Education.
4. Promoting of attitudes of school personnel and parents that encourage the acceptance of inclusion of handicapped children in regular classes and interaction with regular students.

Lietz and Kaiser (1979) defined an effective principal as the one who is "sensitive to the needs of special education." The principal will serve as manager and leader of the activities involving parents as well as special education personnel. Cooperative efforts, positive attitudes, and knowledge of the law will assure a successful special education program that includes a free appropriate education for all students with disabilities."

Summary

The research and literature summarized in Chapter 2 supported the following themes:

1. The inclusion concept inherent in public law has assured disabled students the right to develop their potential to the maximum.
2. A collaborative approach featuring teams of regular and special

education teachers has been characteristic of successful inclusion programs.

3. Model programs have been successfully implemented to enhance the inclusion of all students.
4. A principal's knowledge of special education and the laws associated with special education has been perceived as an essential cornerstone of successful inclusion programs.

CHAPTER 3

Procedures Of The Project

The purpose of this project was to design a staff development model for a special education inclusion program for the Northshore School District, Bothell, Washington. The inclusion model developed was intended for use by regular and special education teachers at the secondary level. To accomplish this purpose, a review of current literature and research regarding the special education inclusion concept was conducted and selected education inclusion models were studied.

Chapter three contains background information describing:

1. Need for the Project
2. Development of Support for the Project
3. Planned Implementation of the Project

Need For The Project

The writer, John E. DeForest, first became aware of the need for this project during an interview with Ms. Kathy Boyce, special education department head at Bothell High School. The special education department was expressing frustration regarding the inclusion of special education students into regular education classes. The need to include students with learning disabilities into regular classrooms and the lack of skills needed by regular classroom teachers to help those students posed a difficult problem. Further, the writer discovered that regular and special education faculty and staff had never engaged in teaming efforts to assure the successful inclusion of special education students in the regular classroom setting. Finally, the writer saw an opportunity to incorporate the development of a staff development model for a special

education inclusion program into his graduate studies in school administration at Central Washington University.

Development Of Support For The Project

The writer subsequently conferred with Mr. Jim Bagby, principal of Bothell High School, and Gary Hammons the school district supervisor of Secondary Special Education, regarding the need for the project. With their support and encouragement, the determination was made that a pilot program designed to team special education and regular education faculty and staff should be used to implement a special education inclusion program at Bothell High School.

Planned Implementation Of The Project

The model program produced as a result of this project will be presented to all secondary schools in the Northshore School District at faculty and staff inservice training sessions scheduled during the 1994-95 school year. The writer will also share the project with the district director of special education and the administrative staff at each secondary school in the Northshore School District.

CHAPTER 4

The Project

The staff development model for a special education inclusion program, which was the subject of this project, has been presented on the following pages. The five part outline provides specific information descriptive of the evolution of the special education inclusion program at Bothell High School, and specific strategies utilized in implementing that program. Components of the staff development model include:

- Part I: Introduction
- Part II: Past Practices at Bothell High School
- Part III: Current Inclusion Model
- Part IV: Outcomes

A STAFF DEVELOPMENT MODEL FOR A
SPECIAL EDUCATION INCLUSION PROGRAM

NORTHSHORE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Bothell, Washington

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Part I: Introduction _____	P-3
Part II: Past Practices at Bothell High School _____	P-5
A. Historical Description Of Special Education Program	
B. Initial Inclusion Model, B.H.S.	
Part III: Current Inclusion Model _____	P-8
A. Staff Teaming	
B. Roles Of Staff Members	
Part IV: Outcomes _____	P-12
A. Best Practice Indicators	
B. Assessment Of The Model	

PART I

INTRODUCTION

Part I

Introduction

The "inclusion" concept currently impacting special education represents a major paradigm shift involving the movement of students with disabilities out of the special education classroom into a regular education placement as their primary learning environment. In essence, special and general education have begun to redefine grouping practices into a far more heterogeneous system of placements. Research models have suggested that inclusive educational placements represent the theoretical least restrictive environment in that the student is placed in a general education classroom with non-disabled peers and is provided appropriate services to maximize his/her participation.

Inclusive education as a reform movement must successfully incorporate a cohesive and integrated system focused on providing appropriate, quality educational outcomes for all students. According to current research when accommodations for all students are seen as normal, regular and expected, then school systems have achieved equality. When special education is no longer seen as a place, then schools can be seen as exemplifying inclusionary models of education for everyone.

PART II

PAST PRACTICES AT BOTHELL HIGH SCHOOL

Part II

A. Historical Description of Special Education Programming

Bothell High School (BHS) was one of three high schools in the Northshore School District. The school enrollment was approximately 1300 regular education students, grades 10-12, of whom 68 were served by special education. The high school was staffed by 63 regular education staff and 2.5 FTE special education staff. The students served by special education qualified as learning disabled, health impaired, and mildly developmentally disabled.

The formalized inclusion practices in special education began at BHS in 1990. Prior to this time, special education students at BHS had been mainstreamed in a variety of ways. Typically, if it was determined that students could comprehend the information in a particular class, they were placed in that mainstream class even if it was determined that support for reading and written assignments would be necessary. Those students were usually enrolled in a study skills class for one period a day. During this period, the students were assigned to a special education classroom, and the special education teacher and assistant would assist the students with a) assignment completion, b) organization skills (for assignment completion and studying for tests), and c) skills for when and how to approach classroom teachers if additional help was necessary. Students whose disabilities prevented them from being successful with this type of support were usually enrolled in a special education class offering, like "learning center" math or science.

The impetus for the change in the BHS special education program from mainstreaming to inclusion was essentially initiated by a special education instructor and the science, history and math staff. The science department was selected as the program model. With the movement toward greater inclusion, students at BHS who would have been otherwise served in a separate "learning

center" science class began to be enrolled in regular science classes to fulfill their high school requirement. It was determined that most of these students would be able to complete the course with support or would, at least, be able to participate and benefit from the more enriched curriculum in the mainstream program. The additional support needed for these students' success required the special education teacher to learn the curriculum so that he/she could assist students with their assignments both in the science classroom and in the learning center study skills class.

B. Initial Inclusion Model

In order to learn the curriculum and understand the class expectations, the special education teacher met with a science teacher twice a week after school to get an overview of the week's instruction. Additionally, an extensive peer tutoring program (additionally funded) was implemented to provide peer assistance within the science classroom. This method of support was considered effective, but cumbersome. It required considerable after school time from both staff members and an expensive peer tutoring program. After a two years, the peer tutoring program was eliminated due to lack of funding.

PART III

CURRENT INCLUSION MODEL
BOTHELL HIGH SCHOOL

Part III

A. Staff Teaming

In 1990, a new approach was attempted. An instructional assistant was assigned to a biology class and a general science class full-time. The instructional assistant's role was to take the class, learning the curriculum, providing support to any student who needed it, and generally assisting the science teachers in any way appropriate. The assistant also helped students in a special education study skills classroom when they had science assignments. The majority of special education students taking science were assigned to these two science teachers so that keeping track of assignments was simplified.

After fall trimester of 1990, it was determined that the special education teacher would also participate directly in the science program. This teacher "enrolled" in the biology class, leaving the instructional assistant to focus on the general science class. This situation continued through out the school year, and this type of support was considered generally successful. However, several problems were noted, mainly relating to the content level and expectations of the biology curriculum. Since that time, special education teachers, rather than instructional assistants, have continued this inclusion model. The model was established in the general science classes, rather than biology, and later it was expanded to classes in applied math and required history courses.

A critical part of the program was that the majority of the special education students were enrolled as a member of a regular education class in science, history and math. There was a small number of students for whom one or more of the topics were waived or substituted with a vocational program as a more appropriate option. Each topic would have one special education teacher who would become the topic expert for the special education program. The special education certificated staff member also participated in team-teaching

with the regular teacher.

B. Roles of Staff Members

The special education instructor's role was as follows:

1. To provide direct instruction and team teaching.
2. To facilitate communication with teachers.
3. To supervise the instructional assistants.
4. To provide assistance with testing, observation, and evaluation of students.
5. To coordinate the teaming and collaboration on behalf of all students.
6. To provide support for individual students.
7. To assist with curriculum and materials modification.
8. To define the testing and grading options and behavior standards for each student on his/her IEP in conjunction with the regular education teacher.

The role of the regular classroom teacher was defined as follows:

1. To collaborate with the special education teacher.
2. To welcome the student with disabilities as a full member of the classroom.
3. To collaborate with the special education teacher for any necessary program revisions.
4. To facilitate positive social relationships among the students.
5. To provide the special education staff with information on curriculum and classroom expectations.
6. To model proper interaction with the students.
7. To provide grading options for successful completion of the class.
8. To provide input to the IEP goals and objectives.

This model stressed the team approach in the delivery of services to all students. The regular education staff in science, history and math used a core mentor program. Each department had a staff member who volunteered to be the instructor within the inclusion program. The instructor worked in collaboration with the special education staff. The intent was that the regular education teacher would also serve as a mentor instructional leader for any additional staff needed in the expansion of the inclusion program. The collaborating of special education staff and regular education staff was an effective utilization of resources. It afforded special education students a much broader range of educational opportunities (topics and programs), a sense of independent functioning, and additional educational resources for all students. Additionally it expanded the educational skills of all team members.

PART IV

OUTCOMES

Part IV

A. Best Practice Indicators

Bothell High School has demonstrated the following inclusion indicators:

1. The placement is with same-age peers.
2. There is an environment of resources and supports accessible by all students.
3. The classroom is structured to promote interactive time between disabled and non-disabled students.
4. The special education program functions to support and not replace the regular education program.

B. Assessment of the Model

The model for evaluation of the project included both formal (objective) and informal (subjective) data collection. Student progress and the effectiveness of the model were measured using the following criteria: a) number of trimesters students were enrolled in science, b) number of trimesters students successfully completed science, c) number of students who moved on to a higher level of science, d) number of students who elected to receive a "regular" class grade as opposed to a resource grade, and informal teacher (both special education and regular) observations from 1991-1994.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this project was to design a staff development model for a special education inclusion program for the Northshore School District, Bothell, Washington. The inclusion model developed was intended for use by regular and special education teachers at the secondary level. To accomplish this purpose, a review of current literature and research regarding the special education inclusion concept was conducted and selected education inclusion models were studied.

Conclusions

Conclusions reached as a result of the project were:

1. The inclusion concept guarantees disabled students the right to develop their potential to the maximum.
2. Successful inclusion programs have featured teams of regular and special education teachers.
3. Model programs have been successfully implemented to enhance the inclusion of all students.
4. A principal's knowledge of special education and the laws associated with special education were the cornerstone of successful inclusion of all students.

Recommendations

As a result of this project the following recommendations have been suggested:

1. Inclusion programs should be provided for handicapped students to develop their potential to the maximum.
2. Inclusion programs should consist of teams of regular and special

education teachers.

3. Teachers should be provided with successful inclusion models to enhance the inclusion of all students.
4. A principal's knowledge should include special education and the laws associated with special education.
5. It is recommended that this model be adapted for use by secondary schools in other school districts interested in guaranteeing the rights of the handicapped.
6. Inclusion programs should address the new recommendations and requirements of PL. 101-476.
7. Finally, it is recommended that further study be conducted by those interested in developing model inclusion programs for students in the elementary grades.

References

- Affleck, J., Madge, S., Adams, A., & Lowenbraun, S. (1988). Integrated classrooms versus resource model: Academic viability and effectiveness. Exceptional Children, *54*, 339-348.
- Akerlund, P., & Carthum, H. (1991). Tactics for teaming. Curriculum in Context, *19*, 24-25.
- Bresko, J. (1993). Inclusion. R & R for American schools: Reform and revitalization transform education, pp. 152-160. Washington State Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D.K. (1987). Beyond special education: toward a quality system for all students. Harvard Educational Review, *57* (4) 367-382.
- Gillet, P. Pros and Cons on the Inclusion Movement. Paper presented at the Learning Disability Association of Washington's Annual Fall Conference. October, 1993.
- Jenkins, J., & Pious, C. (1991). Full inclusion and the REI: a reply to Thousand and Villa. Exceptional Children, *57*, 562-564.
- Jenkins, J., Pious, C., & Jewell, M. (1990). Special Education and the Regular Education Initiative: Basic Assumptions. Exception Children, *56* (6) 479-491.
- Kaskinen-Chapman, A. (1992). Saline Area Schools & Inclusive Community Concepts. In G. Wiggins (ed). Restructuring for Caring & Effective Education, (pp. 169-186). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.
- Keith S., & Girling, R. H. (1991). Education, Management, and Participation. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kritsonis, M.A. (1993-1994). A study of Tennessee elementary school principals' perceptions of their knowledge about special education. National Forum of Applied Education Research Journal, *7* (1).
- Patterson, J., Purkey, S., & Parker, J. (1986). Productive School Systems for a Nonrational World, Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Roach, V. (1991). Special Education: New questions, the state board connection. Issues in Brief, *11*, 1-16.

- Schubert, M. & Landers, M. (1982). Using the team concept to facilitate mainstreaming in secondary schools. NASSP Bulletin, 66, 79-84.
- Schattman, R., (1992). The Franklin Northwest Supervisory Union. A case study of an inclusive school system. In G. Wiggins (Ed). Restructuring for Caring and Effective Education, (pp. 143-159). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.
- Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1992). Controversial issues confronting special education. Divergent Perspectives, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1988). Educating students with severe disabilities in regular classes. Teaching Exceptional Children, 21, 16-19.
- Thousand, J., & Villa, R. (1992). Collaborative teams: A powerful tool in school restructuring. In G. Wiggins (Ed.). Restructuring for Caring and Effective Education, (pp. 73-107). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.
- Thousand, J., & Villa, R. (1990a). Sharing expertise and responsibilities through teaching teams. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.). Support Networks for Inclusive Schooling: Interdependent Integrated Education, (pp. 151-166). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Thousand, J., & Villa, R. (1990b). Strategies for educating learners with severe handicaps within their local home schools and communities. Focus on Exceptional Children, 23, 1-25.
- Vandercook, T. & York, J. (1989). A team approach to program development and support. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.). Support Systems for Educating All Students in the Mainstream, (pp. 21-39). Baltimore: Paul H. Books Publishing Co.