Inclusive School Practices Study Year One

Report 2007-2008

Gwen Marchand, Ph.D.

Brett D. Campbell, Ph.D.

Heather T. Fuchigami, Ph.D.

Clark County School District

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INCLUSIVE SCHOOL PRACTICES STUDY REPORT 3
Teachers and Administrators 5
Attitudes 5
Supports for Inclusive Practices 6
Students 7
Social Development 7
Academic Development 7
Children without Disabilities 8
Parents 8
Summary 9
INCLUSION IN CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 10
EVALUATION GOALS 10
METHOD 12
Participants 13
Measures 16
Demographic Information 16
School Staff Measures 17
Parent Measures 18
Student Measures 19
Procedures 21
RESULTS 23
School Case Studies 24
District Comparison Data 24
School A (ISP School) 26
School B (Non-ISP School) 30
School C (ISP School) 33
School D (Non-ISP School) 37
School E (ISP School) 40
School F (Non-ISP School) 44
Quantitative Teacher Outcomes 47
Parent Outcomes 55
Student Outcomes 58
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS 72
Implications for Practice 75
Limitations and Future Directions 75
Recommendations 76
REFERENCES 78
APPENDIX 81

INCLUSIVE SCHOOL PRACTICES STUDY REPORT

Historically, students with disabilities were treated as a separate population. Instruction often occurred disconnected from peers in what is now called the pullout instructional model. The pullout instructional model entails that special education students receive instruction dictated within their Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) from certified special education teachers in resource rooms. Students with IEPs are pulled out of the general education classroom for instruction, typically in core content areas such as English language arts or mathematics. Recent research suggests that the pullout instructional model is not as effective as originally thought. Savage (2006) and Weisch (2006) found that students in pullout instructional programs declined in their reading and spelling skills. Savage examined elementary school children, while Weisch looked at high school students. Jenkins (2005) has suggested that students in pullout instructional models learn a lower grade level curriculum. In addition, students in resource rooms have less homework than students not in a pullout instructional model (Vlachou, Didaskalou & Argyakouli, 2006).

A more recent approach, inclusion, acknowledges that the learning patterns of students are not homogeneous, but that special education students may gain greater academic benefits by staying in the general education classroom (Darling-Hammond, 1993).

> The fundamental principle of the inclusive school is that all children should learn together, whenever possible, regardless of any difficulties or differences they may have. Inclusive schools recognize and respond to the diverse needs of their students, accommodating both different styles and rates of learning and ensuring quality education for all through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, teaching strategies, resource use and partnerships with their communities (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 1994, p. 11).

The inclusion only approach emphasizes a “collaborative approach” in that, special education teachers and general education teachers collaboratively teach, or co-teach, special education students in a general education classroom. Special education students still receive accommodations to instruction and testing modifications as dictated in their IEP, but in the regular general education classroom.

Inclusive school practices are "those that lead to the creation of supportive educational communities in which services necessary to meet the individual needs of all students are available" (McGregor & Vogelsberg, 2000, p. 11). These practices may include but are not limited to student-centered scheduling, specific instructional strategies, in-class supports, and after-school programs. Research suggests that students at inclusive schools tend to have high levels of social interaction and opportunities to develop social competence and communication skills (Bear & Proctor, 1990; Calhoun & Fuchs, 2003; Vaughn & Klingner, 1998; Wilson & Michaels, 2006). There is also some evidence that the implementation of inclusive instructional practices are associated with better academic outcomes and school engagement for students with and without disabilities (Jenkins, 2005; McGregregor & Vogelsberg, 1998). For example, Calhoun and Fuchs (2003) found increases in mathematics achievement in elementary school students with IEPs in an inclusion classroom using peer tutoring. Gains in social skills for these students were also documented.

Vlachou and colleagues (Vlachou, et. al., 2006) surveyed academic and social skill among elementary school students with IEPs. They found these students enjoyed peer interactions and exposure to more subject matter. Students with IEPs reported needing the support of the special education teacher to improve understanding through instructional accommodations. Students assigned to a resource room considered their schoolwork easy.

The enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1991 (renewed in 1997, 2004) laid the foundation for inclusion of special education students into general education classrooms (Daniel & King, 2001). A variety of models have been adopted since the late 1970s to address the education of students with special needs in accordance with federal laws and guidelines. These models include collaboration between special and general education teachers in the general education classroom, supplemental assistance programs, and combined services models (Baker, 1995; Daniel & King, 1997; Marston, 1996).

The diverse array of models led to great debate and confusion about how to best educate students with special education needs and what exactly is meant by the use of the terms inclusion and inclusive school practices (McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998; Zigmond & Baker,

1996). This debate prompted researchers to examine how students develop academically and socially in different educational models. Further, as models of inclusion developed many educators recognized that these specific teaching practices were effective in helping all students to learn, not just those identified with special education needs. Thus, the inclusive practices research began to focus on both special and general education students, their families, and teachers. Positive outcomes related to inclusive practices include favorable school staff attitudes, a school culture of inclusion and adaptability, and gains in student academic achievement and social development. The following sections examine each research strand in detail.

Teachers and Administrators

Attitudes. In a study conducted on four elementary and four secondary inclusive schools, Idol (2006) found that both secondary and elementary general education teachers were supportive of the inclusion philosophy. Rheams and Bains (2005) examined attitudes of early childhood special education teachers in self-contained classrooms and early childhood general education kindergarten teachers about inclusive practices. Both groups favored inclusion. However, results also revealed that teachers of inclusive classrooms are more likely to report difficulties in teaching students with disabilities.

In a prior study, Marston (1996) found general education teachers who were more resistant to inclusion. General education teachers believed that the academic needs of students with IEPs could not be met in the general education classroom. One reported concern was that the general education classroom might be too distracting for children with IEPs. These teachers also believed that greater stigma is attached to children with IEPs because they are separated within the class. Research also revealed that general education teachers lacked co-teaching experience. Those without previous success in teaching students with disabilities and some secondary education teachers were less accepting of inclusion, with many favoring resource rooms rather than placement in general education classes (Idol, 2006; Larrivee & Cook, 2001; Minke et al., 2006).

Administrator perceptions about inclusion have been crucial for the success of inclusive school practices. Principals across school levels with positive attitudes toward inclusion and

students with disabilities were correlated with teachers with positive attitudes towards inclusion and better skilled at working with children with disabilities (Idol, 2006). Similarly, Daane and Beirne-Smith (2001) examined the perceptions of general education teachers, special education elementary school teachers, and school administrators about inclusion. All three groups acknowledged the right of students with IEPs for placement into general education classes. Contrary to Idol (2006), these administrators did not believe that students with disabilities could get the most out of their education in general education classes. They asserted that special education teachers should be primarily responsible for teaching students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms.

Supports for Inclusive Practices. Positive attitudes toward inclusion may be undermined by teachers' negative perceptions of lacking special education teaching competence, supports or professional development to develop skills, and low administrator support (Larrivee & Cook, 2001; Lindsay, 2007). In a recent review of inclusive practices literature, McGregor and Vogelsberg (1998) postulated that teacher attitudes toward inclusion vary depending on the types of support they receive in their general education classes. Teachers with supportive administrators reported more favorable attitudes toward inclusion (Burstein, Sears, Wilcoxen, Cabello, & Spagna, 2004; McGregor & Volgelsberg, 1998). These teachers had greater access to collaborative planning time and in-class supports. They also reported feeling more efficacious and competent in teaching students with disabilities (Minke, Bear, Deemer, & Griffin, 1996).

While research suggests teachers have positive attitudes toward inclusion, professional development and practical supports are often required to assist teachers in implementing inclusive practices (Lindsay, 2007). One recommendation is to hold "breaking down the barriers" conversations facilitated by master teachers about inclusive practice assumptions and practices. Other suggestions include visiting teacher observations and peer coaching to expose teachers to inclusive practices (Howes, Booth, Dyson, & Frankham, 2005). Further, strategies such as providing accommodations for low-achieving students were more likely to be implemented when teachers were involved in a co-teaching situation (one general and one special education teacher) in which adequate collaboration, communication, and cooperation among teachers was in place (Minke et al., 1996). This research underscores the importance of

appropriate professional development and continued supports to assist teachers in the implementation of inclusive school practices.

Students

Social Development. Authors of early inclusion studies reported that general education students did not generally accept students with disabilities. Specific inclusive strategies, such as collaborative skills training techniques, helped quell these attitudes (McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998). The prevailing theme of recent studies examining social interactions in inclusive classrooms was that students with disabilities reap social benefits in these environments. Social benefits included more regular peer interactions (McGregor & Vogelsberg), better communication, and greater social competence (Cole & Meyer, 1991). Students in more inclusive classrooms reported feeling less lonely, more accepted by their peers, and have fewer conduct problems than students in self-contained settings (Weiner & Tardif, 2004).

Further, students with disabilities favor inclusion as it helps them build friendships (Vaughn & Klinger, 1998). These friendships often extend beyond inclusive settings, resulting in strong, lasting bonds (McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998). Fryxell and Kennedy (1995) found that students placed in inclusive classrooms had a wider network of friends than students in non-inclusive settings. This pattern of friendship and social interaction is evident in children with severe disabilities (McGregor & Vogelsberg).

Social skills and school relationships have important implications for school adjustment. Some evidence suggests that students with healthy social relationships in school are less likely to exhibit conduct problems (Wiener, 2004); however, when students with disabilities have poor relationships with their teachers they are more at risk for conduct problems (Murray & Greenberg, 2006). Additionally, students with disabilities who have stronger perceptions of belonging in school are more likely to feel more academically competent (Murray & Greenberg, 2006).

Academic Development. Comparatively, less research has examined academic outcomes of students in inclusive classrooms versus those in resource or self-contained classrooms. Available research indicates that students with IEPs succeed academically in general education classrooms (Walther-Thomas, 1997) and are often equal in academic

achievement to their general education peers (Lindsay, 2007). Students with IEPs in general education classrooms are more academically engaged when properly supported (Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis & Goetz, 1994; McDougall & Brady, 1998).

A meta-analysis of eight studies examining attitudes toward inclusion of students with learning disabilities found that students with disabilities favored the *combined services* approach to inclusion. Students preferred resource rooms over general education classrooms because work was less difficult and help was more readily available (Vaughn & Klinger, 1998). However, most research ignores different types of academic material students with IEPs are exposed to in general versus special education classrooms. It should be noted that the social and academic success of students depends on the length of time they spend in general education classrooms, students' type and severity of disability, enrolled grade level, and personal competence.

Children without Disabilities. Evidence for the impact on the general education students in inclusive settings is inconclusive, but generally positive. Typically, the academic performance of general education students has not been negatively impacted by inclusion (Peck et al., 2004). However, Huber and colleagues (Huber, Rosenfeld, & Fiorello, 2001) reported that while low- and average- achieving general education students benefit from sharing a classroom with students with disabilities (following a school restructuring focusing on inclusive practices), higher-achieving students lost ground academically. Studies also show that general education students tend to gain from their social interactions with disabled students. Specifically, students gain higher self-esteem, are more appreciative of others (see Peck et al.), and acquire academic skills including effective problem solving (Manset & Semmel, 1997).

Parents

The final strand of research relevant to the current evaluation focuses on parental factors. Parents of special needs and general education students in elementary level grades are generally supportive of inclusion (McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998). Parents of children with disabilities have waged court battles to allow those children to be included into general education classes (see McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998). Parents view inclusion as an educational right and source of academic and social parity for the disabled child (Erwin & Soodak cited in

McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998). Parents usually expect educators to display positive attitudes toward inclusion, foster strong relationships with their children, and provide quality education (McGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998).

These same attitudes usually hold for parents of general education students as well. Peck, Staub, Gallucci, and Schwartz (2004) examined the perception of parents of non-disabled children and the effect of inclusion on these students. Generally, parents had positive or neutral perceptions about inclusion. A majority of parents believed that inclusion did not affect their child's academic achievement; inclusion helped their children's social and emotional development; and inclusion positively influenced classroom climate.

Summary

This literature suggests that students with IEPS receiving special education services as well as general education students may benefit socially and academically from time spent in inclusive classrooms. Research also indicates that supports for teachers are important in facilitating the implementation of inclusive practices and that experience with inclusion promotes positive teacher attitudes toward integrating special and general education teachers in the same classroom. Parents also tend to be generally supportive of inclusion. However, the research is less clear on specific aspects of inclusive settings, including practices and school culture. In addition, few studies examine change over time in student engagement and achievement in response to better implementation of inclusive practices.

The current evaluation is a necessary step to assist educators in Clark County in understanding how to best facilitate the implementation of inclusive practices, the success of professional development in changing classroom practices and teacher attitudes, and how practice and attitude influence student outcomes. The incongruity between the unique population of Clark County and the current literature results in a gap in knowledge on how to evaluate Clark County School District practice and policy decisions about students receiving special education services and their families.

INCLUSION IN CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

In 2004, the Clark County School District (CCSD) implemented an Inclusive School Practices (ISP) program designed to support schools in creating an inclusive, student-centered culture. The ISP initiative offered professional development for implementing instructional strategies such as differentiated instruction in classrooms and co-teaching professional development, on-site technical assistance, and additional funds to support activities that contribute to creating an inclusive school. Student Support Services Division (SSSD) sponsored the ISP initiative. Professional practices emphasized by the initiative were designed to increase academic achievement and create a positive environment for *all* students in CCSD. The stated goals of the Inclusive School Program were as follows: (1) close the achievement gap, (2) treat people with dignity and respect, and (3) create positive learning environments.

Despite the initial interest and participation of 120 schools, in 2006 CCSD personnel recognized that vast improvements were necessary in the promotion of inclusive school practices in the majority of CCSD schools. In an effort to address the needs of the transitive administrative and teacher populations and create sustainable change at schools, a revised professional development model was developed for implementation in 2007-2008. This model offered a differentiated approach to participating schools, targeting the professional development needs of individual teachers. The effectiveness of this approach in promoting the use of specific inclusive strategies, as well as enhancing teachers' perceptions of efficacy with these strategies, has not been systematically evaluated. Thus, the purpose of the present evaluation was to outline the challenges and successes in implementation of inclusive classroom practices and determine whether positive student outcomes could be detected in classrooms that are more inclusive.

EVALUATION GOALS

The first purpose of this project was to compare what practices were being used at schools that received inclusive practices professional development through the ISP initiative and schools that did not receive inclusive practices-related professional development. Prior to this study, very little data had been collected on what professional development was provided

on inclusive practices at these schools, whether these practices were implemented, factors influencing the implementation, and influences of participation in professional development on teacher attitudes.

Before any kind of analyses could be conducted, it was first necessary to describe what was happening around inclusive practices. This description was required to create a baseline. One reason this description was vital for any evaluative purposes is that the ISP initiative offers support for participating schools and professional development on inclusive practices that can come from a variety of sources; therefore, many schools in CCSD may have implemented inclusive practices to some extent. Thus, this description provides information on the degree to which each ISP and Non-ISP school utilized inclusive practices by comparing ISP schools with schools not receiving support. It should be noted that although schools may not have participated in the ISP initiative, they could be inclusive schools as defined.

A second purpose was to assess the influence of teacher attitudes regarding inclusion and efficacy on student achievement and engagement, as well as parent perceptions of school services. Inclusive schools should promote a culture of tolerance, dignity, and respect for all learners. If schools were successful in embracing this culture, then students and parents should report positive academic outcomes.

These two research goals were broken down into a number of specific study objectives. The first objective was to examine school staff exposure to inclusive practices and the implementation of those practices within classrooms. Two practices, co-teaching and differentiated instruction, were the main considerations. These have been frequently identified in the literature and are aligned with CCSD workshops. Specific professional development workshops were examined for school staff preference by number of teacher enrolled per workshop. It was assumed specific workshops might be seen as more relevant for school staff in the first year of ISP participation. A comparison between what was learned in the workshops and what was being applied in the classroom could be accomplished through classroom observations by the researcher coordinators.

The second objective was to identify what positive student outcomes are associated with inclusive practices. Three specific outcomes were the focus of this particular objective:

academic achievement, student sense of belonging in the classroom, and student engagement. CCSD researchers examined if schools dedicated to inclusive practices would be associated with higher academic achievement, a sense of belonging, and student engagement.

The third objective was to examine school culture. Do schools associated with inclusive practices promote a more tolerant, respectful environment? The researchers examined if teachers who participated in CCSD inclusive practice workshops would promote an inclusive culture, more than those teachers who did not participate. One specific avenue was to compare teacher attitudes in relation to the amount of exposure to the principles of inclusive practices. CCSD coordinators predicted those teachers who participated in CCSD sponsored workshops in inclusive practices, specifically differentiated instruction and collaborative teaching, would have more receptive attitudes toward all students. The second avenue was to interview principals about their knowledge and exposure to principles of inclusive practices schools.

The fourth objective was to compare parents' attitudes toward school staff between teachers who participated in ISP initiative and teachers from comparison schools who did not. CCSD coordinators predicted the positive school culture from the ISP schools would affect parent perceptions. Parents associated with ISP schools would have more positive perceptions towards school staff, than parents not associated with ISP schools.

This report is organized into several sections reviewing each evaluation objective. Following the methods section, results are broken into school case studies, implementation description, and outcomes. The case studies are designed to provide an overview of each school's demographic and testing data, school initiatives, professional development focus, and culture. Data regarding the extent to which ISP schools and staff attended the ISP professional development opportunities (classes and book studies) and utilized ISP funds is included in each case study. The implementation and outcome sections represent only students in grades 3 through 5, their teachers, and their families.

METHOD

To capture the complexities of the implementation and use of inclusive practices in CCSD, several research design elements were employed. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were included in the design. To describe the use of inclusive practices in schools, a

case study of each school was composed using principal interviews, teacher surveys, professional development records, and other archived data sources. A quasi-experimental component was included using 3 ISP and 3 comparison Non-ISP schools to determine if differences existed in student achievement and teacher, student, and parent attitudes between schools participating in the ISP initiative and those not.

Participants

Six schools were invited to participate in this evaluation. In an effort to control for differences in regional initiatives related to professional development and programs, the six schools were situated in the same region, the Superintendent's Schools Region of the Clark County School District. Three of the schools were first year participants in the CCSD Inclusive School Practices (ISP) initiative and 3 were not currently, and had never, participated in the initiative. Three comparison pairs were formed from these six schools based on demographic and testing data of students in grades 3 through 5 from the spring of 2007[1].

Schools A (ISP) and B (Non-ISP) were both small Title I schools with a predominantly African American student population. Schools C (ISP) and D (Non-ISP) also received Title I funding and were mid-sized elementary schools with a large majority of Hispanic students. Schools E (ISP) and F (Non-ISP) were mid-sized schools with magnet programs and evenly distributed student ethnicities with students at school E mostly African American or Caucasian students, whereas students at school F were predominantly African American or Hispanic students.

In October 2007, informational letters, consent forms, and parent surveys were distributed to the 1,282 students in grades 3 through 5 at these six schools. See Table 1 for information regarding the response rate.

---

[1] Data from the pairs were tested using t-tests to confirm that the two schools did not differ significantly on percent of students with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), percent of students who were Limited English Proficient (LEP), percent of students receiving Free or Reduced Lunch (FRL), and 06-07 CRT reading and mathematics scale scores. Ethnicity percentages were also compared using cross-tabs and chi-square tests. Although schools were statistically matched in most cases there were some differences: School A had more students with an IEP (15% vs. 7%) than school B (t-test = 1.95, $p = .052$); School D had a significantly greater percentage of LEP students (63% vs. 48%) than school C (t-test = 3.16, $p < .01$); Schools E and F differed significantly in their ethnic make-up (chi-square test = 19.47, $p < .001$).

Table 1. *Consent Information for Grades 3-5*						
School Name	October N	Consent	No Consent	No Response	Consent Rate	Return Rate
School A	145	69	11	65	47.6%	55.2%
School B	119	52	10	57	43.7%	52.1%
School C	228	148	23	57	64.9%	75%
School D	280	162	56	62	57.9%	77.9%
School E	247	156	26	65	63.2%	73.7%
School F	263	165	50	48	62.7%	81.7%
Total	1282	752	176	354	58.7%	72.4%

Table 2 provides the demographic and special education characteristics of students by school with parental consent for study involvement (N = 752). Overall, the students were evenly distributed by grade level. Students were 47.5% Hispanic, 25.8% African American, 13.8% Caucasian, 3.7% Asian/Pacific Islander, 0.3% American Indian, and 8.9% of unknown ethnic origin. Approximately 29% of the student participants were considered English Language Learners (ELL).

There were some changes to special education eligibility designations over the course of the 2007-2008 academic year. Because special education services may be initiated or stopped at any point throughout the school year, students had to receive at least 6 months of special education services to be considered a student receiving special education services for the purposes of this evaluation. Seventy-six students were designated to receive special education services. Of these, students primarily received services for a learning disability (61.8%) or a speech or language impairment (31.6%). Students with a special education designation, but who are not gifted or talented, made up 10.11% of the overall consenting sample of 752 students. This percentage is consistent throughout CCSD schools. The majority (76%; n = 58) of students with a special education designation were expected to spend between 80-100% of

their time in general education classrooms; 17 students (22%) were designated to spend between 40-79% of their time in general education classrooms; the placement for one student was unknown.

Table 2. *Demographic and Special Education Categories for Participating Students*

	Grade	Ethnicity	ELL	Special Education Designation Categories*
School A	3 = 22 4 = 22 5 = 25	Asian Am = 5.8% African Am = 43.5% Hispanic = 23.2% Missing = 27.5%	18.8%	58 = 1 61 = 4 70 = 2
School B	3 = 16 4 = 13 5 = 23	African Am = 53.8% Hispanic = 34.6% Missing = 11.5%	19.2%	58 = 1 61 = 5 63 = 1
School C	3 = 54 4 = 51 5 = 43	Asian Am = .7% African Am = 11.5% Caucasian = 0.7% Am Indian = 0.7% Hispanic = 75.7% Missing = 10.8%	47.3%	58 = 3 61 = 11 81 = 1
School D	3 = 52 4 = 56 5 = 54	Asian Am = 1.9% African Am = 4.3% Caucasian = 1.2% Hispanic = 78.4% Missing = 14.2%	64.2%	58 = 4 61 = 9
School E	3 = 37 4 = 55 5 = 64	Asian Am = 40.4% African Am = 24.4% Caucasian = 7.1% Am Indian = 0.6% Hispanic = 26.9% Missing = 0.6%	3.8%	58 = 12 61 = 11
School F	3 = 53 4 = 53 5 = 59	Asian = 20.0% African Am = 44.8% Caucasian = 8.5% Hispanic = 25.5% Missing = 1.2%	8.5%	58 = 3 61 = 7 66 = 1

Note. * Special education codes and placement data was retrieved throughout the year; all other demographic data was retrieved in September 2007.

For students whose parents refused consent (N = 176), it appears that third graders were slightly more likely to not have consent (39.2% of "no"). Hispanic parents were also more likely to reply with non-consent (55.1%), but this is in keeping with the ethnic distribution of the population. Thirty-five percent of the non-consents came from parents of students designated as ELL, but that is again in line with demographic expectations. Consent was not obtained from 32 students with special education designations. This makes up approximately 11.9% of the special education designated population at these schools.

The six schools had a total of 66 general and special education teachers on staff (this does not include specialists, school psychologists, or other more specialized staff) at the start of the 2007-2008 school year to work with students in grades 3 through 5. Of these teachers, one teacher had no students with consent to participate in her class. There were some minor changes to staffing in October 2007.

Finally, a moderate rate of attrition was expected from October 2007 to April 2008 due to the high transiency rates at some schools. Of the students with consent (N=752), 90.7% (N=682) were still enrolled in June of 2008. Schools had different rates of attrition. The percent of participating students no longer enrolled at the close of the school year were: 14.5% (School A), 19.2% (School B), 11.5% (School C), 11.7% (School D), 2.6% (School E), and 6.1% (School F).

Measures

Demographic information. Demographic information regarding participants was collected. Teacher information included gender, ethnicity, years teaching, and tenure at their current school location. Student information included gender, ethnicity, IEP designation, ELL designation, and number of years at their present school. For students with an IEP, information was also collected on their Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) placement, which is a recommendation for time in the school day that the child should spend in the general education classroom. Parents were asked about their role in the student's life, as well as their ethnicity, gender, age, and highest year of education completed via the parent survey.

School Staff Measures. Individual and school-level professional development participation was obtained through principal interviews, records kept by CCSD coordinators, and records from Pathlore (CCSD professional development registration and tracking system). This data provided a general indication which ISP workshops schools focused on during the past academic year, as well as any additional professional development teachers sought. Further, the data contributed a measure of how each ISP school accessed services offered through the ISP initiative, and whether Non-ISP schools participated in similar professional development that could serve to enhance their provision of services in an inclusive manner. Teachers were invited to participate in an on-line survey in October and April of the 2007-2008 academic year. The survey had four primary components. Each is described below.

Instructional practice implementation*.* Teachers were asked to report on their professional development experience and implementation of differentiated instruction practices, collaborative teaching, accommodations, and modifications.

The Teacher Efficacy Scale*.* The Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) has been widely used in the education literature in a variety of forms. The current form was a 16-item scale with two proposed subscales: Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE). The responses to these scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). In October 2007, the overall 16-item scale yielded sufficient reliability at $\alpha = .77$. The 9-item PEF scale reliability was $\alpha = .88$ and the 7-item GTE scale reliability was $\alpha = .82$. These estimates were based on complete data for 54 individuals. The April 2008 estimates were based on data for 39 individuals; overall 16-item scale reliability $\alpha = .72$, PEF $\alpha = .81$, and GTE $\alpha = .76$.

Teacher Opinions Relative to Integration Scale. (Antonak & Larrivee, 1995) The 25-item Teacher Opinions Relative to Integrations Scale (ORI) scale reached sufficient reliability as measured by Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = .88$; N = 43) in October 2007 and April 2008 ($\alpha = .87$; N = 31). The traditional use of ORI has been as a weighted continuous score with scores ranging from 0-150, with higher scores representing a more favorable attitude toward inclusion (ORI has provisions for including individuals missing up to 4 responses). In this use, responses are coded from strongly disagree (-3) to strongly agree (+3). The present research used a scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6).

Teacher Perception of School Climate. Teachers were asked 21 questions about their school climate and the administration. Teachers responded on the same 1-6 scale as previously described.

Teacher Report of Student Engagement. Separately, teachers were asked to report on their perceptions of individual student engagement in the classroom (Wellborn & Connell, 1987). Items focused on student emotional and behavioral engagement and their re-engagement in the face of challenge or failure. This measure included 32 questions with a response scale of 1 (Not at all true) to 4 (Very true). Teachers were surveyed in October 2007 (October) and April 2008 (April) of the 2007-2008 academic year. See the Appendix for the complete survey. The 32 item scale demonstrated a high degree of internal reliability in October 2007 ($\alpha = .96$; N = 537) and in April 2008 ($\alpha = .96$; N = 347). The 8-item behavioral engagement subscale reliability was $\alpha = .92$ and $\alpha = .91$ in October 2007 and April 2008, respectively. The 12-item emotional engagement scale reliability was .90 (October 2007) and .91 (April 2008) and the 12-item re-engagement scale alphas were .87 in October 2007 and .89 in April 2008.

Principal Interviews. Principals at each of the six schools were interviewed in April 2008 of the 2007-2008 academic year by a single trained interviewer. The interview utilized a semi-structured format, with set interview questions but the allowance for the interviewer to probe for more information. The interview questions focused on each principal's definitions and support for inclusive school practices, scheduling practices, the implementation of Response to Instruction (RTI) on their campus, and parent involvement opportunities.

Parent Measures

School's Impact on Child. Parents were asked five questions regarding their general perceptions of their child's experiences at school. An example of the survey item includes "My child is treated with respect". Cronbach's alpha for these 5 items was .96.

Parent Satisfaction with School. The general parent survey was adapted from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) Part B Family Survey (www.monitoringcenter.lsuhsc.edu). Although subscales for schools' efforts to collaborate with

parents and quality of services were found in the validation study by the NCSEAM using Rasch analyses, the present evaluation was not able to replicate these scales using traditional confirmatory factor analyses[2]. Additional data or analyses using the Rasch framework may yield these scales, but without evidence of a differentiated factor structure, a single score of general parent satisfaction was constructed from the 35 survey items. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .99 based on data from a sample of 154 parents.

Parent Participation Scale*.* Items from the NCSEAM were also used to construct a parent participation scale. The nine items focused on parent participation in formal school-related organizations, communications with school, and interaction with students around school activities. Cronbach's alpha yielded a reliability coefficient of .74 for this scale.

Opinions Relative to Integration Scale (ORI). Twelve items from Antonak & Larrivee's (1995) teacher opinion scale were included in the parent survey. Some evidence suggests that these items may form sub-scales related to perceived benefits of integration and opinions related to special versus integrated general education. Although Antonak & Larrivee's scale has not been used with parents, a measure of parental attitudes toward inclusion was desired. Further, use of the same items allowed a comparison between teacher and parent perceptions.

Supplemental Survey for Parents of Special Education Students. Parents of children with IEPs were asked to complete an additional survey relating to student-received special education services (in April 2008, only parents of students with an IEP were sent the supplemental survey). The supplemental survey included additional items from the NCSEAM Part B Family Survey that were more specifically oriented toward parents of students receiving special education services.

Student Measures

Nevada Criterion Referenced Tests (Nevada CRT). Nevada Criterion Referenced tests were designed to be aligned with Nevada state educational standards. There were three tests: Reading, Mathematics, and fifth grade Science. These exams are used to determine whether individual students and schools are academically proficient under state and federal guidelines.

[2] The NCSEAM recommends using the Rasch framework for analysis of their survey; however that was beyond the capacity of the present evaluation. The use of a mean or average response cannot be directly compared to Rasch analyses results.

AIMSweb. AIMSweb is a Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) system that provides standardized measures of basic skills (www.AIMSweb.com). For the purposes of this evaluation, the oral fluency probes and reading comprehension of the system were used. AIMSweb provides benchmark measures appropriate for each grade level and by tracking student performance at the 3 benchmark periods (October 2007, January 2008, and April 2008); student reading development can be measured within the grade year. The oral fluency measure consists of 3 one-minute probes that are read aloud by students. Trained testers calculate the number of words read correctly per minute and then take the median score of the three tests as the final score for that child.

Since different, non-equivocal reading passages are provided between each grade level, a third oral fluency probe called a common passage was added for this evaluation to compare all students. The common passage is a third grade probe that is given to third through fifth grade students so that student growth can be compared across years. This task was administered in the classroom setting by a trained tester.

The measure of reading comprehension is a multiple-choice close task completed by students in a silent reading setting. Student performance on the benchmark probes was analyzed based on the percentile cutoffs for each grade established through a national norming process.

Student Report of Engagement. Student perception of their emotional and behavioral engagement in the classroom was assessed with a 20-item survey. Ten of these items tapped behavioral engagement, including “I try hard to do well in school.” Students responded to ten items related to emotional engagement. Examples of these items are “When we work on something in class, I feel interested” and “When we work on something in class I feel bored” (reverse coded). This scale was averaged to form a composite of general engagement in previous research or may be used to assess each dimension separately (Patrick, Skinner, & Connell, 1993; Wellborn, 1991). In October 2007, the aggregate engagement measure (N = 563) yielded an acceptable Cronbach’s alpha of .86. The April 2008 survey yielded an aggregate Cronbach’s alpha of .85 based on 586 surveys with complete data.

Sense of Belonging Scale. (Anderman, 2003). The 5 items used to assess student belonging were adapted from Goodenow's (1993) Psychological Sense of School Membership Scale and reported in Anderman (2003). At Wave 1 (October 2007), the scale reliability coefficient $\alpha = .81$ (N = 614) and in April 2008 $\alpha = .83$ (N = 623). Each item was assessed on a four point Likert scale with 1 = Not at all True and 4 = Very True. The survey was read aloud to students in a group setting.

Behavioral Observation of Students in Schools. The Behavioral Observation of Students in Schools (BOSS) is designed to capture the engaged and off-task behaviors of a target student in 15-second intervals. Student behaviors are recorded as either actively (AET) or passively engaged (PET) at each 15-second time prompt. Then, during the remaining time until the next prompt, any motor (OFT-M), verbal (OFT-V), or passive (OFT-P) off-task behavior is recorded. Every fifth interval, a randomly selected peer is observed as a comparison and teacher-directed activities (TDI) are recorded.

Classroom Quality – Observed Indicators of Inclusive Activities. The Classroom Quality – Observed Indicators of Inclusive Activities (CQ-OIIA) was designed in collaboration by CCSD Research and Student Support Services staff. Following a review of existing classroom observation measures, the CQ-OIIA was developed to capture a range of teacher-driven activities and general student behaviors. The CQ-OIIA was revised after the January 2008 pilot to simplify the observation structure and as such the January data was not used for the present evaluation. In March and April, six testers attended professional development.

Procedures

Two data sources were used to describe implementation: staff surveys in October 2007 and April of 2008 and classroom observations in April 2008. Professional development logs were accessed to document the variety of district sources and types of professional development used by the staff at participating schools. The staff surveys focused specifically on differentiation of instruction, collaborative teaching, accommodations, and modifications. The observations focused on overall classroom climate and practices.

In both October 2007 and April 2008 of the 2007-2008 academic year, principals were sent a link to an on-line survey to distribute to their staff. Some principals chose to send the

survey to all of their staff, whereas others chose to send the survey link to their staff serving students in grades 3 through 5. Participant responses considered relevant for the current evaluation were specialists, special education, and general education teachers who reported serving multiple grades or students in grades 3 through 5. This resulted in 54 returned surveys: 76% general education teachers, 11% special education teachers, and 13% specialists in October 2007. In April 2008, 40 staff members took the survey: 83% were general education teachers, 7% were special education teachers, 7% were specialists, and the remaining participants were classified as "other". Twenty-eight staff members (teachers and specialists) completed the survey at both time points.[3] The data is presented for different groups, including all participants, general education teachers and specialists, and ISP/Non-ISP schools.

Parents of students with consent to participate received a survey in April 2008. All parent materials were translated into Spanish and provided with the English version. Parents were asked for some demographic information. The remainder of the survey included previously published surveys and all responses ranged on a scale of 1-6. With the exception of the parent participation scale (1= Never, 6 = Always), the responses ranged from 1=Very Strongly Disagree to 6 = Very Strongly Agree.

Classroom observations were conducted in January and April of 2008. The classroom observation consisted of multiple parts. In the first section, observers recorded features of the classroom such as whether an agenda was posted. Both observation tools, BOSS and CQ-OIIA, utilized time-sampling procedures in which activities were recorded in a certain time increment. Time sampling allows observers to glean information about the frequency and duration of activities rather than just the presence or absence of a behavior.

The January 2008 observation period was considered a pilot due to the new status of the CQ-OIIA and first time use of the BOSS. Seven observers participated in nine hours of professional development using video and discussion. To test inter-rater reliability and assure quality, the first 14 and the 19th (out of 28) observations were conducted in teams of two. Cohen's Kappa is considered a robust measure of inter-rater reliability because it corrects for chance agreement (Hintze, 2005). Kappa was adjusted for prevalence for high frequency

[3] Due to the relatively small number of survey respondents, caution should be taken in extrapolating this information to a larger sample.

behavior and bias for unique off-task behavior (PABAK; Byrt, Bishop, & Carlin, 1993). Both the traditional Kappa and the PABAK are presented. In general, values on these indices between .41- .60 are considered to reflect moderate agreement, .61- .80 substantial agreement, and .8 1- 1.00 nearly perfect agreement (Gelfand & Hartmann, 1975 in Hintze, 2005). In light of the novice status of the observers, agreement levels at moderate to substantial were desirable. There were some isolated incidents of low inter-rater statistics for the BOSS at the beginning of the process, and there were two observations were excluded from the analyses because of poor inter-rater agreement between two observers. The January BOSS estimates (averaged across 13 paired observations) were: AET Kappa = .54, PABAK = .76; PET Kappa = .51, PABAK = .55; OFT-M Kappa = .36, PABAK = .66; OFT-V Kappa = .43, PABAK = .90; OFT-P Kappa = .37, PABAK = .70; TDI Kappa = .51, PABAK = .66. Averaged across all 28 observation categories, April 2008 Kappa's (PABAK) with the testing video ranged from .59 (.74) to .73 (.82). If observers had low agreement with any category, they met with the researcher until the coordinator was satisfied that an adequate level of agreement had been reached.

Observers participated in 13 hours of professional development, including one hour of practice in a classroom for the April 2008 data collection period. Prior to conducting classroom observations, six observers coded the same segment of video as an inter-rater reliability test for the BOSS and the CQ-OIIA. If observers fell below the accepted PABAK value of .60 on any categories, they received additional individual professional development from the researcher until satisfactory understanding was achieved. The April BOSS estimates on the video test (averaged across the 6 observers) were: AET Kappa = .71, PABAK = .87; PET Kappa = .59, PABAK = .73; OFT-M Kappa = .45, PABAK = .86; OFT-V Kappa = .83, PABAK = .89; OFT-P Kappa = .22, PABAK = .91; TDI Kappa = .83, PABAK = .96. Of the 25 observations conducted in April 2008, 24% of observations were analyzed a second time as a reliability check.

RESULTS

The description of the school implementation includes information from all staff members at the six participating schools. However, when investigating student outcomes related to implementation, only data from students in grades 3 through 5 and their parents and

teachers were included. The case studies are presented first, followed by the quantitative data analysis.

School Case Studies

A description of each school involved in this evaluation is provided in the following sections. School improvement plans for 2007-2008 were submitted to the Nevada Department of Education in October of 2007, professional development logs from the 2007-2008 academic year, teacher survey responses from October 2007 and April 2008, and principal interviews from April of 2008 were used to construct a general overview of each school's goals and initiatives in 2007-2008. In particular, these sources provided information on the schools' emphasis on and support for inclusive practices. Demographic and testing data from the 2006-2007 Nevada Report Card, as well as teacher employment data from September 1, 2007, were also used to help describe each school.

District Comparison Data. The following district demographic data provides some context for the individual school site information. Table 3 provides a quick reference for district and school demographic and achievement data. In general, CCSD teachers (N=17,475) had an average number of 6.80 (median=4.83) years of experience. Just over 10% were new teachers at the start of the 2007 academic year and over half of CCSD teachers (54.6%) had 5 or fewer years of experience in CCSD. Seventy-five percent of CCSD teachers were considered highly qualified based on September 1, 2007 data.

Table 3. *Individual school demographics with district wide data for comparison.*							
	Student Enrollment	Average Class Size Ratio	Percent of IEP Students	Percent of LEP Students	Student Transiency Rate	Ave. Years of Teacher Experience	Made AYP?
District	305,967	22:1	10.7%	18.4%	35.7%	6.80	yes
School A (ISP)	340	17:1	7.4%	18.8%	56.3%	3.83	yes
School B (Non-ISP)	264	19:1	11.4%	20.8%	47.3%	5.29	no
School C (ISP)	474	19:1	18.6%	48.9%	45.3%	4.48	yes
School D (Non-ISP)	611	20:1	10.1%	67.8%	40.7%	6.13	yes
School E (ISP)	442	21:1	9.7%	8.6%	6.7%	10.37	no
School F (Non-ISP)	507	20:1	9.3%	12.0%	11.9%	6.43	yes
Note. Data source is 2006-2007 Nevada Report Card data (http://www.nevadareportcard.com/) and CCSD teacher data as of September 1, 2007.							

On average, the student-to-teacher ratio within the district was 25:1 in the third through fifth grades. According to 2007 accountability reporting by Nevada Report Card, 10.7% of all students in the district were identified as “students with disabilities” (also labeled IEP). CCSD student transiency was 35.7%. District wide, there were 5,787 incidents of expulsions or suspensions for “Violence to Other Students” and 651 cases involving discipline due to weapon possession.

With respect to activities of Inclusive Practice Schools (ISP) across the district, 38 ISP professional development sessions were offered during the 2007-2008 school year to all faculty members at ISP schools. District-wide, one or more staff members from ISP schools attended a range of 0 to 16 courses (mean = 4.08). In addition, 30 independent study ISP workshops in the form of book studies were offered to all teachers at ISP schools.

School A (ISP school). School A was a neighborhood school that receives funding through the federal Title I grant. Statistics reported by Nevada's Report Card in 2007 indicated that of the 340 students enrolled in 2006-2007, over 65% of students were African American, nearly 30% Hispanic, and the remainder largely Caucasian. Teachers at School A were 42% African American, 33% Caucasian, and 12% Hispanic. Eighty percent of teachers were female. Less than 40% of teachers on this campus were highly qualified and data from CCSD indicated over 50% of the staff were employed by CCSD for 2 years or less (median = 1.58) at the start of the 2007 school year. Accountability reports reflected that the teacher to student ratios in grades three through five averaged 17:1. There was 80% parent participation in parent/teacher conferences. This campus reported one case of disciplinary action due to violence against another student in 2006-2007.

Annual Yearly Progress. School A made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the 2006-2007 school year. Testing data revealed that roughly 30% of all tested students were found proficient in reading, 35% in writing, and 45% in mathematics. Twenty-five students with an IEP were tested school-wide. Of the 11 third to fifth grade students with an IEP who were tested in 2006-2007, none were found proficient in reading while nearly 30% reached mathematics proficiency. In the fifth grade, four IEP students took the writing proficiency exam. None of these students were deemed proficient.

School Emphasis and Initiatives*.* During the 2007-2008 academic year, School A focused on multiple school improvement activities. Based on school improvement plan goals and attendance at district and school professional development opportunities, it was clear that School A was committed to better implementation of the Response to Instruction/Intervention (RTI) strategies. Multiple members of the faculty attended professional development for tiered instruction and progress monitoring. Funding through the ISP initiative was also requested for campus-based professional development in RTI to support this effort. Further, this school planned to meet the needs of diverse learners and boost their initiative of sheltered and differentiated instruction through the use of Kagan and Marzano strategies and technology such as interactive white boards and *Leapfrogs®*. The principal reported that the goal of School

A was to meld these initiatives (RTI, High Quality Sheltered Instruction, Kagan strategies, etc.) and focus on a single school vision instead of compartmentalized views of instruction.

A focus on improving instruction in content areas was also important to School A as noted through staff participation in professional development on research based instruction. Language arts were emphasized through attendance at district professional development on *Reading First* literacy initiative, *Harcourt Trophies*, "chalk talks", and *Write from the Beginning*. Professional Development logs also showed that staff attended multiple mathematics professional development offered by the Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program (RPDP) and social studies textbook professional development.

Administration and staff at School A recognized that additional instructional and family services were important to improving the academic success of their students and therefore worked to increase the implementation of tutorial skills and morning homework assistance programs. During her interview, the principal reflected that communication with parents has been difficult as the school's ELL population grows, although some parents of ELL students had been involved in attending school activities with regularity. According to the principal, in the future School A will have to find ways to strengthen the Parent Advisory Council (PAC) since parental involvement in other campus activities was limited and sporadic in the past year. During 2007-2008, staff at School A did make inroads in educating staff on parent outreach, as multiple staff attended professional development on school-home relationships.

School A participated in professional development designed to assist staff in continuing to improve their classroom management and general skills. These opportunities included behavior planning sessions, new teacher professional development, Student Intervention Team (SIT) professional development, and leadership development through SSSD cohorts. Although School A has systems in place to help "cool students down" when they get upset, the principal stated that staff will need to examine ways to help students maintain respect and conduct when substitute teachers are present in order to curb behavioral issues. Otherwise, the School A principal reported that teachers have wonderful management skills in place and an effective school counselor and other support staff.

Finally, School A had the opportunity to refine their practices through participation in the district's Inclusive School Practices (ISP) initiative. As a new ISP school, professional development logs evidenced that one administrator participated in an ISP book study regarding reading instruction. In addition, 10 staff members (out of 33 licensed professionals) from School A participated in 10 professional development opportunities. Some of the workshops included *Models of Support and Collaboration, Coaches Professional Development, Differentiated Instruction: Strategies that Work, Peer Supports: Enriching the Educational Experience for Everyone, Teacher Roles in the Preparation and Decision-Making Process,* and *New Roles of Para-Educators and Their Teaching Partners*. Choice in session attendance demonstrated the school's emphasis on creating partnerships between para-educators and general education classroom teachers as well as providing staff a foundation of strategies for implementing multi-leveled, activity-based assignments and structures to access differentiated instruction. Special funding for two school-wide book studies on race and closing the achievement gap were provided to the school.

Campus Climate and Culture. When asked to define inclusion, School A's principal discussed that inclusion was ensuring that students at all levels can receive instruction at their level, not just the IEP students. This principal felt that it was important that she acted to support her special and general education teachers in effective collaboration, as well as to work to change attitudes and promote systematic change. However, this school was still overcoming barriers as some teachers struggled with beliefs that including IEP students in the regular classroom setting could lower test scores and reflect poorly on the teachers in the accountability for AYP. The principal recognized that School A also needed to focus on improving the delivery of the core instruction with impact in order to reach all students effectively and increasing the consistency of RTI implementation, as it has been used with different levels of emphasis.

Teachers at School A also contributed their opinions about school climate and culture. One third of K-5 staff members at School A responded to an Inclusive Practices Teacher Survey in October 2007. A majority of respondents had a positive attitude toward inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular education setting. Responding staff felt they had the

management techniques necessary to facilitate in cases of disruptive behavior. Most respondents felt that they could contribute to the success of their students through effort and the use of effective strategies, regardless of the student's home life and background. For one question, 100% of these teachers indicated assurance in being able to determine the "correct level of difficulty" of assignments for their students. In addition, 100% of responding teachers indicated that their administration treated them professionally and provided various types of support for school initiatives, including materials and collaboration. Respondents felt that administration had a clear vision for the school, which was shared by teachers. Faculty were a part of the decision making process and although students were not typically a part of that process, the staff felt that the administration did create a school atmosphere where students could feel welcome.

Finding ways to increase staff collaboration was an important part of School A's culture. Grade level classrooms were composed of students with mixed ability levels, and scheduling was blocked so that certain times of the day were untouchable and everyone on campus could contribute to assisting students who were struggling. This allowed for common preparation times where teachers could collaborate on strategies, materials, specific student needs, curriculum mapping, etc. while promoting departmentalization so that, in the words of the School A principal, "staff has more of a feeling that these are 'our kids' instead of 'these 10 are mine and those 10 are yours'…They're all ours".

School B (Non-ISP school). School B was also funded through Title I grant monies. Accountability reports indicated that student ethnic population consists of nearly 60% African American students, 40% Hispanic students, and the remaining students (2%) were Caucasian. CCSD teacher data indicated that 46% of the school staff (N=28) were Caucasian, 43% African American, and 11% Asian Pacific Islander or Other. Nearly 90% of the teacher population was female. Licensed staff members had a median of two years of teaching experience in the district and almost 40% of teachers had one or fewer years of experience. Nevada Report Card data showed that nearly 60% of the staff was highly qualified. Student-to-teacher ratio in grades 3 through 5 averaged 20:1. This campus did not report any incidence of disciplinary events in 2006-2007. Seventy-two percent of parents participated in conferences with teachers as detailed in the 2006-2007 accountability report.

Annual Yearly Progress. Although School B showed progress in English Language Arts (ELA) for the 2006-2007 school year, AYP was not consistently met for the subjects of mathematics, writing, or reading for the past four consecutive school years. Of the 17 students (total IEP students school wide N=30) in third grade through 5 with IEPs that completed the CRT, one was proficient in mathematics and one in reading. None of the fifth graders with IEPs (N=7) were found proficient in writing.

School Emphasis and Initiatives*.* According to the campus SIP, during the 2007-2008 academic year School B planned to focus on several areas of core curriculum to boost student achievement. They also intended to focus on consistency in subject alignment to district standards and benchmarks. For literacy, School B indicated a need to strengthen Tier I reading instruction and incorporate higher order thinking skills into daily lessons. School B also planned to administer monthly writing assessments to students and use several computer programs to provide interactive, supplemental learning activities for mathematics, reading, and science. School-wide implementation of the *Success For All* reading intervention program was initiated and a consultant from outside the district was also invited to train the staff in *Write from the Beginning* and *Thinking Maps*. Core curriculum and in particular, literacy goals, were advanced through staff attendance at professional development sessions regarding Reading First initiatives, AIMSweb, “chalk talks”, and Title I learning promotion for youngsters. For the future,

School B's principal hoped for more flexible and differentiated instruction in mathematics to mirror the school's success in reading.

Furthermore, peer coaching and observations were promoted, as well as staff collaboration time. The learning strategist and teacher mentor worked with classroom teachers to provide targeted interventions for students and to help teachers integrate writing across the curriculum. The literacy specialist was also able to model or co-teach lessons with classroom teachers on a weekly basis in order to boost student writing skills. Due to the number of new teachers on campus, many attended professional development for new CCSD employees. The principal also indicated that scheduling was an easy task because of the small student enrollment, which allowed teachers to meet together during various times each week for collaborative planning. Primary scheduling considerations also included making sure that the specialists' time is adequately allocated since these staff were shared with other campuses. Teacher survey responses confirmed that the staff felt collaboration time was allocated by administration.

School B was not an ISP school and thus did not have access to ISP services. However, some staff from School B attended professional development provided by literacy services that was specifically focused on differentiation of instruction and inclusion. The majority of special education specific professional development attended by School B staff focused on didactic professional development for students with low incidence disabilities, behavioral analysis, and use of the Encore system.

Campus Climate and Culture*.* Inclusion was defined by the School B principal as placing all students in the best climate possible, receiving the "same instruction" as their peers, and making sure that teachers are equipped with strategies so that students can access the grade level curriculum. The principal identified inclusive practices on the campus as making sure those students are being placed in the regular classroom as much as possible, being exposed to material in a variety of ways, and being challenged. The principal emphasized that school-wide teachers were working on creating active classrooms through constant questioning and conversation, saying, "A quiet room doesn't impress me. I like walking into a room and seeing students arguing points about a story. That's when you know learning is going on".

In an effort to reflect the cultures that make up their population, School B strives to invite ethnically diverse speakers to campus as well as decorate classrooms and the school with items that match student backgrounds. In 2007-2008, School B also implemented more frequent parent interaction nights, during which parents were able to discuss achievement data and grade level expectations, as well as neighborhood news and parent needs. Including parents in their children's education was a vital component for School B as evidenced in these words of the principal, "We are here to provide services for families, not just students".

School culture was also assessed by the October 2007 teacher survey to which nearly 50% of the licensed professionals on staff responded. Of these teachers, the majority felt that the administration had a clear vision for the school and that they shared in the vision. One hundred percent felt students can get better grades when teachers find "better ways of teaching". All but one responding teacher felt that they had effective classroom management skills and could deal with noisy, disruptive, or difficult students. According to the principal, the staff is still seeking a common language and set of procedures for behavioral supports and she hopes that as their instructional program gets stronger student engagement will increase and eliminate the behavioral issues that have arisen.

The staff collectively agreed that allowing special education students into the general education classroom would help students to understand and accept differences, but were split as to whether this would provide advantages beyond social adjustment. They were also divided as to whether or not students with disabilities would create behavioral problems in the regular classroom setting. There were discrepancies in responses regarding teachers' comfort level for working in inclusive classrooms; nearly all respondents desired additional professional development in inclusive practices. Eighty-five percent of responding teachers felt that students with disabilities could be better served by special education teachers than by teachers in general education classrooms.

School C (ISP school). School C was another school that receives funding through Title I. Accountability reports showed that the student population was nearly 80% Hispanic and 15% African American. Caucasians represented the minority, contrasted with a staff that is over 80% Caucasian, 10% African American, and 5% Hispanic (as indicated by CCSD data for 2007-2008). The staff (N=33) had a median of two years of experience. According to Nevada's Report Card, almost 90% of the staff was female. Over 55% of the staff was deemed "not highly qualified". The student-to-teacher ratio in grades 3 through 5 averaged 21:1. There were two reported incidents of violence-related disciplinary action in 2006-2007. Seventy-seven percent of parents participated in conferences with teachers during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Annual Yearly Progress. School C made Adequate Yearly Progress in the 2006-2007 school year. Of the 88 IEP students identified, 32 students in grades 3 through 5 took the CRT for reading and mathematics. Twenty-five percent of these students were found proficient in reading and almost 35% were proficient in mathematics. Forty-five percent of fifth graders with IEPs (N=9) passed the writing proficiency exam.

School Emphasis and Initiatives*.* According to school improvement documentation, School C would be centered on literacy for the next few years. The School Improvement Plans (SIP) for School C documented a focus on professional development and implementation of several new programs and strategies, including *Write from the Beginning* and *Thinking Maps*. Pathlore professional development logs indicated that multiple members of the staff attended professional development for literacy comprehension, *Harcourt Trophies, Compass Learning, Voyager Passport*, writing, comprehension, and AIMSweb to support literacy initiatives.

The principal of School C stated that teachers are expected to implement programs with fidelity and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all learners. The School Improvement Plan highlights a focus on Spencer Kagan's Cooperative Learning Structures, Ruby Payne's Children of Poverty, and differentiated instruction. Faculty from School C has worked to meet the individualized needs of their campus demographics by attending professional development sessions regarding ELL, differentiated instruction, behavior planning, and the Title I session of promoting learning.

School Improvement planning documents and an interview with the principal indicated that School C has a "pyramid of interventions", consisting of a solid core program (RTI) that is consistently implemented, a second layer of school-wide intervention, and then a third level for those students who are still unsuccessful. Further, according to the SIP, before-school tutoring and Saturday and summer school were planned as an option for non-proficient students. In the words of the principal, RTI is "a dream…something you aim for and hopefully you get" due to the dependency of the system on outside resources, including the family and the community. RTI is still a new concept for the campus, but administration says the teachers are very accepting of it.

School C is committed to collaboration among staff. Teachers have common preparation times by grade level, a required Professional Learning Community (PLC) time for every grade level, and a multi-grade leadership team that meets regularly. This collaboration is possible in part due to scheduling. Administration plans the master schedule with the needs of students and strengths of teachers in mind. However, the scheduling process is also developed by considering which changes should be made first. For instance, K-2 teachers might be teamed together so that students can be leveled by ability.

Student scheduling is an important process for School C. Teachers fill out a sheet on each student with lists information, such as student learning style, special needs, language needs, et cetera. The administration holds one-on-one meetings with teachers to find the best fit for each student. When class rosters are created, all available information is considered. Students receiving special education services may be concentrated into an "inclusion class" so that the regular education teachers who teach the classes can more effectively use the school's two paraprofessionals.

School C accessed the ISP services in a variety of ways. Staff from School C (18 teachers, 1 administrator) participated in nine ISP courses including: *School Improvement Planning Workshop, Models of Support and Collaboration, New Coaches Training, Experienced Coaches Training,* beginning and advanced sessions of *Differentiated Instruction, Teacher Role in the Preparation and Decision Making Process, New Roles of Para-Educators and Their Teaching Partners,* and an administrator session about staffing and scheduling. In addition, six teachers

participated in six book studies spanning topics in differentiated instruction and understanding by design, inclusion for parents and general education teachers, diverse teaching strategies, and teaching reading to struggling students. School C also requested funding for on-site AIMSweb and MANDT (Managing People) professional development. The wide variety of topics studied by 55% of the staff demonstrates how the campus has embraced its role as a new ISP school.

Campus Climate and Culture*.* The principal defined inclusion as students who have special needs are included in the regular classroom. However, in further description, the principal noted that in essence, inclusion at School C is about meeting the needs of all students through individualized interventions. Inclusive practices at School C are closely tied to the scheduling process in that "Students are placed in the classrooms that meet their needs, period, regardless of whether they have a handicap or not because we have a range of abilities". School C's principal reported that when inclusion is happening in a classroom, the "special ed. staff" meets with the assistant principal on a weekly basis to discuss techniques such as co-teaching, IEP modifications, push-ins, and other issues.

Staff also provided input on school culture and climate. Over 90% of the staff returned for the 2007-2008 school year at School C. Clearly, the majority of faculty felt respected and supported by administration, as was supported by responses to the teacher survey. About a third of the staff participated in the October 2007 survey and nearly 25% participated in April 2008. Most respondents felt encouraged to collaborate with other teachers. Student need was deemed prevalent in decision-making, but ratings were split as to whether instruction was differentiated to meet the same need. Participants were varied in their views towards inclusive practices in regard to behavior and benefits. The majority felt that regular education teachers did not have the abilities required to work with students with disabilities.

One hundred percent of survey respondents felt that diverse learners were welcome at School C and a majority felt that effort to build relationships with families was made. All but one of these participants felt that they could reach difficult students, but could do even more if parents were more involved. According to School C's principal, engaging families is an important part of the school culture. Through constant talking to outside sources and

community-based interventions, the principal hopes to provide the necessary support to strengthen families within the school community. By strengthening families, the principal hopes to improve student outcomes. School C sponsors multiple parent opportunities, which are published on a master calendar and updated once monthly, including weekly University Medical Center visits, foster grandparent programs, Boys and Girls clubs, parenting classes and GED opportunities. The majority of parent participants are Hispanic, which is consistent with the student population. The principal believes this outreach has impacted School C in that, "We have no tagging, no abductions, no assaults...no fights, no vandalism…the community respects what we're doing here."

School D (Non-ISP school). School D was a large Title I school. The ethnic background of the student population was 85% Hispanic, 10% African American and 2% Caucasian. The 2007-2008 teachers were 70% Caucasian, 15% Hispanic, 5% African American, and 5% Asian/Pacific Islander. The 49 licensed staff members had a wide range of experience, from new teachers to one teacher with over 36 years of experience (median = 3.83). Accountability reporting showed that more than 85% of the staff was female and almost 55% were highly qualified. According to the 2007-2008 school improvement plan, School D had a teacher transiency rate of about 20%. During the 2006-2007 academic year 83% of parents participated in teacher conferences and there were no reported disciplinary incidents.

Annual Yearly Progress. School D made AYP in the 2006-2007 school year. School wide there were 62 students identified with an IEP. Of these students, 24 third through fifth graders were tested in reading and mathematics and 9 fifth graders took the writing proficiency exam. Nearly 5% of students with an IEP were found proficient in reading and mathematics, while about 10% of the fifth grade students were proficient in writing.

School Emphasis and Initiatives*.* School D's 2007-2008 school improvement documentation revealed a concern for the IEP subgroup due to a low rate of daily attendance and poor engagement when compared school-wide and with other subgroups. Although not an ISP school, the campus planned to expand inclusive practices through a focus on techniques such as differentiated instruction, progress monitoring with AIMSweb, literacy centers, High Quality Sheltered Instruction (HQSI), and a tiered reading model, and use of materials such as *Wikki-Stix®* and highlighter tape. School leaders also planned to find research-based resources to promote higher order thinking skills across all subjects and implement a mentoring program to promote student engagement. Pathlore professional development logs confirmed that members of the faculty received professional development in student interventions, differentiated instruction, paraprofessional professional development, and Universal Practices curriculum mapping. The entire campus received differentiated instruction professional development on-site from a consultant. The principal was disappointed with the implementation of the strategies, so she asked each teacher to choose several strategies that they are comfortable with and incorporate these and Marzano's strategies into weekly lessons.

The principal reported that through this type of targeted focus and monitoring, teachers are slowly incorporating these strategies into their daily practice.

School D also had a major initiative in 2007-2008 to use fully the district's tiered reading model. School D changed from the *Success For All* reading model to *Harcourt Trophies*, which represented a huge shift in the campus's reading philosophy. The principal reported progress in implementing reading interventions at tiers one, two, and three. Professional development logs showed that multiple faculty members attended various professional development workshops for literacy from RPDP, *Harcourt Trophies*, and *Voyager Passport*, as well as hosted in-house professional development for literacy. The in-house professional development calendar provided by School D documented professional development throughout the year in tiered intervention, AIMSweb, *Voyager Passport*, and other language arts topics. The campus proposed an on-campus book study about using DIBELS data but no teachers opted to participate. Although literacy was a focus, the staff also attended professional development in mathematics, school improvement planning, grading, and use of data on the Information Data Management System® (IDMS).

The school initiatives mentioned above were designed to meet the needs of School D's diverse learners. Classroom populations were balanced by sex, ethnicity, language, and special needs, while keeping in mind the matching of teaching to learning styles. To deal with the particular needs of School D, multiple members of staff attended CCSD professional development to promote learning for youth through Title I. Administration also wanted to focus on GATE students who were not receiving services (as of August 2006) and School D now has a GATE teacher allocated to the campus for 40% of the academic year.

In response to questions about RTI, the principal noted that the implementation of Response to Instruction (RTI) is also in its infancy stage, but that RTI is connected to the school's focus on differentiated instruction and tiered intervention. The school has formulated a Student Intervention Team (SIT) and invested resources into properly training the team. However, the principal noted that she believes that staff is unable to describe when and why they are using RTI strategies. She noted that "[the teachers are] doing it, they don't realize they are doing it".

School D has highly transient student population, which has led to a focus on outreach to families and meeting the needs of diverse learners. Several parents volunteered daily on campus during 2007-2008 and there were monthly events that averaged about a hundred families in attendance. After school Curriculum Clubs were also offered to provide extended tutorial activities for proficient and non-proficient students, as well as a summer writing academy. School D is now creating a PTA (Parent Teacher Association) and plans to start 2008-2009 with a fundraiser.

Campus Climate and Culture*.* School D staff's ideas about inclusion are "defined by the needs of a child who has an IEP". The principal of School D expressed that "we have to meet the needs of any child that walks through our doors on a case by case basis". According to the principal, new hires in special education were screened for belief in inclusion as the campus' philosophy continues to evolve. However, the principal expressed disappointment with the state of inclusive practices on campus as of April 2008. To date, most special education services were pull-out and collaborative instructional programs are still in the stages of coordinating homework between the regular education and special education teachers. Administration would like to see a move to co-planning, co-teaching and meaningful collaboration.

A combined 25% of the staff responded to the October 2007 and April 2008 teacher surveys, where 80% indicated they felt they were treated as professionals and supported by administration. The majority of respondents felt they shared in the administration's vision for the school. Most respondents also felt that administration promoted collaboration, but less felt that time was actually allocated for this purpose. All but one teacher responded that administration made students feel welcome at school. One hundred percent of respondents indicated confidence in their teaching ability and classroom management skills. In most cases, teacher effort would help students succeed regardless of home life. They generally felt positively that inclusion of students in the general education setting would provide social benefits to those students, but attitudes toward other factors of inclusion like behavior, and need for teacher professional development were mixed. The staff was split as to whether differentiated instruction was implemented per the needs of students. These responses mirror the principal's comments about ongoing implementation of collaborative and differentiation instruction practices.

School E (ISP school). School E was a non-Title I magnet school. According to Nevada's Report Card, the student ethnic population was more evenly distributed than some of the other schools involved with this evaluation, with about 35% Caucasian, 30% African American, 25% Hispanic, 5% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1% American Indian students. Teachers were 78% Caucasian, 8% African American, and 3% Hispanic. Thirty-six percent of the staff (total staff N=37) had five or fewer years of CCSD experience (median = 9.0). Accountability reports showed that nearly 80% of the teachers at School E were highly qualified—the highest percentage of highly qualified teachers among the six schools. Eighty percent of the teachers were female. The average student-to-teacher ratio for grades 3 through 5 was 25:1. There were zero incidences of disciplinary action and 91% of parents participated in teacher conferences during 2006-2007.

Annual Yearly Progress. School E did not make adequate yearly progress in 2006-2007. Forty-three students had an IEP and 28 were tested in the third through fifth grades. Fifty-five percent of these students were found proficient in reading and 6% were proficient in mathematics. Of the 7 fifth graders with an IEP who took the writing proficiency exam, none were found proficient.

School Emphasis and Initiatives*.* The 2007-2008 school improvement plan showed that School E planned to increase student use of rubrics and *Thinking Maps* to improve writing skills. On-site professional development in writing was provided and Pathlore professional development logs indicated that multiple staff members received professional development on *Harcourt Trophies* and AIMSweb. Other in-house professional development initiatives focused on grading practices, mathematics investigations for boosting student achievement, and site based technology integration.

The principal reported that integration of the arts with core curriculum is a major emphasis on campus. To this end, the school struggles at times to successfully merge this emphasis with district mandates such as tiered instruction and interventions. For example, when asked about RTI at School E, the principal reported that although School E has a strong student intervention team, the implementation of RTI was limited. This may be due to time constraints as teachers sometimes find it difficult to integrate RTI with their full magnet

schedule. The principal reported that while Tier I and II interventions were in place, the campus struggled with "level three"; although, Pathlore logs show that several staff members did attend the CCSD professional development for the three tiered model. Despite occasional struggles, this school was often successful at creatively merging their emphasis with district initiatives as evidenced by a School E request for funding from the ISP initiative for an out-of-district consultant to train teachers in activities to boost reading comprehension for English Language Learners and resource students using drama.

School E's 2007-2008 school improvement plan indicated that a drop in test scores of students with IEPs was a priority concern. The plan indicated that because these students had already been receiving services, they had not been targeted for before and after school tutoring programs. School E also wanted to see growth with their GATE students' achievement. The staff therefore planned to increase collaboration, co-teaching, and differentiated instruction within their inclusive practices, and include students with IEPs in tutorial opportunities.

School E hoped to increase their use of these inclusive practices by accessing ISP services. Two administrators attended the ISP session, *Leadership Processes Supporting Inclusion*, and one went to the ISP Administrative Overview. Five non-administrative staff attended seven ISP sessions; some workshops included *School Improvement Planning Workshop, New Coaches Training, Advanced Coaches Training, Shared Teaching,* and *Differentiated Instruction: Strategies that Work*. Six staff members participated in 14 different book studies. Topics covered teaching reading, collaboration for inclusive education, the importance of teaching, standards, instructional strategies, curriculum-based instruction, differentiated instruction and understanding by design, peer coaching and collaboration, and culture. Choices in sessions and book topics reveal a broad spectrum of introductory material for inclusive practices, instruction, and collaboration.

Campus Climate and Culture. When asked about inclusive practices on campus, the principal reported supporting a culture of inclusion, where teachers are there to support all who need it and that someone coming on campus would not know one child from another. For instance, the resource teacher should help all students in need, and not separate resource from non-resource students; "it should be seamless" according to the principal. The principal

believes that she should be able to enter any classroom and observe good instruction at all times for all students. The level of co-teaching was emphasized by the principal as indicative of the kinds of inclusive practices happening on her campus. In her words, general education teachers and special education teachers "plan together, they deliver instruction together…it's very fluid, like a dance" and that co-teaching occurred on a daily basis, sometimes with three teachers together. Pullout instruction was available for students if those services were seen as beneficial to them.

To meet the needs of diverse learners, teacher input about each student's learning needs was sought and classes were balanced by gender and special needs. School staff was experimenting with clustering to meet the needs of students. For example, an ELL classroom was created to provide direct instruction and support for ELL students. To facilitate this effort, several teachers attended an ELL professional development, *Poverty Matters*. The overall master schedule has remained consistent for several years as it is driven by the magnet schedule, as the principal reported, "…if it isn't broke, why fix it?"

Over half of the faculty participated in the October 2007 and April 2008 teacher surveys, providing a solid indication of teacher perceptions of school culture and climate. The majority were sure that students felt a sense of welcome and belonging thanks to the administration. Furthermore, the respondents felt supported by administration and shared in their vision for the school. Altogether, they generally felt that student needs and teacher input were considered when making decisions. Collaboration time was promoted and supported, but there was also an abundance of "paperwork and other non-instructional activities" to deal with.

According to the principal, the teachers worked with high expectations and focused on positive verbal reinforcement and encouragement. The majority of faculty respondents felt that they could meet the needs of their students, even in the face of behavioral problems. The staff felt that they were competent teachers, but require additional professional development to implement inclusion effectively. Attitudes were mixed toward the benefits of inclusive practices, although the social growth of students with disabilities was viewed positively by most.

Of the respondents, 80% felt that time in class would influence students compared to their home influences, but that students would have even greater success if parents did more. However, the staff was pleased with parent outreach. According to the SIP, School E participated in P.I.E. Night (Parents Involved in Education) at the beginning of the school year and monthly parent meetings. The principal indicates that the PTA was involved and supportive and, "Our parents love our school because we are a school of choice." Because of parental choice in students attending the magnet school, behavioral issues were minimal and the possibility of probation was a deterrent for misbehavior. In terms of behavior, the counselor acted as additional classroom support, and there was a school-wide "Community of Caring" program in place with "five core values: responsibility, respect, trustworthiness, caring, family".

School F (Non-ISP school). School F was a mid-sized magnet school that does not receive Title I funding. The 2006-2007 ethnic background of the student population was a follows: 50% African American, almost 30% Hispanic, 20% Caucasian, and 5% Asian/Pacific Islander. Per CCSD information, 65% of teachers at School F were Caucasian, 25% African American, 5% Hispanic, and 3% Asian Pacific Islander. Ninety-two percent of the staff was female. Fifty percent of School F staff (N=36) had three or more years of experience (median = 3.0). Accountability reporting showed nearly 70% of teachers were highly qualified. The student-to-teacher ratio was 24:1 in the third through fifth grades. Ninety percent of parents participated in teacher conferences. One reported weapons-related incident led to disciplinary action in 2006-2007.

Annual Yearly Progress. School F was a High Achieving school that made AYP in the 2006-2007 school year. Of 47 students identified to receive special education services, 24 students in grades 3 through 5 took the CRT. Thirteen percent of these students were found proficient in reading and 30% of students were proficient in mathematics. Ten fifth grade students with IEPs took the writing proficiency exam with a 30% pass rate.

School Emphasis and Initiatives*.* Implementation of a tiered intervention system was a key initiative of School F during the 2007-2008 academic year. The principal reported that all members of her staff are responsible for all tiers of instruction, creating a school-wide system of support. This is the first full year of implementation of the RTI model, which School F defines as looking at all of their children within instruction. The school evaluates how children respond and how teachers are teaching when checking whether students are on target for grade-level benchmarks. If students are not responding to Tier I instruction as identified by progress monitoring, they are moved into another tier with additional instruction as an intervention. The principal recognized "intervention needed to be additional and different. We didn't have the 'different'". In order to solve this problem, School F principal utilized *Reading Triumphs* reporting that teachers are excited about the gains students have made in response to the initiative. Faculty members attended multiple sessions of CCSD's RTI professional development and progress monitoring tools.

Differentiated instruction was also an important focus for School F during 2007-2008 to help meet the needs of diverse learners. Teachers create classes with a balance of student

academic levels, gender, and ELL, GATE, and special education coding. Faculty prepared to meet their students' needs by attending ELL sessions on cultural diversity and sessions on poverty, as noted on *Pathlore* logs. When persistent behavioral problem arose, teachers were able to access the Student Intervention Program (SIP) for ideas. Further, the campus participated in a Carol Ann Tomlinson book study and other CCSD differentiated instruction professional development. School F is planning to focus on differentiation in Tier I instruction in 2008-2009. The school plans to identify student-learning styles and offer a greater variety of choice or menu activities in the future.

To foster collaboration, classroom teachers participated in Structured Teacher Planning Time (STPT) once a week, and as a TeachFirst school also participated in monthly Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings. According to the principal, these activities help teachers build trusting relationships and collaborate on effective strategies. Collaboration with their family community is also important to School F. The school kept communication lines open with parents. School F had an active PTO (Parent Teacher Organization) and every teacher was able solicit parent volunteers for classroom support. School F organized a "Principal Roundtable" tri-annually, hosted parent nights, and invited parents to the school leadership fair. Parents of younger students seemed to be more involved than those of intermediate students. Some staff members trained on use of *ParentLink*.

School F also identified a range of planned curricular and instructional strategy improvements in the 2007-2008 school improvement plan. This school documented concerns about campus implementation of *Thinking Maps*, *Write from the Beginning*, higher orders of Bloom's taxonomy, and mathematics vocabulary. To address these issues, School F participated in both in-house staff development and CCSD professional development on "Curriculum Cliff Notes", DIBELS and AIMSweb, *Write from the Beginning*, informational text strategies, and scientific inquiry and literacy integration. They also looked at other areas of curriculum by attending science textbook professional development, mathematics courses, holistic scoring, and new teacher professional development. Finally, School F was interested in increasing their use of technology as an instructional tool and sponsored staff development for Promethean

boards. The variety of professional development activities reflects School F's commitment to their initiatives.

Although not an ISP school, School F focused on inclusive practices by promoting differentiated instruction and collaboration among special and general education staff. The staff also participated in Encore professional development, a didactic professional development, a paraprofessional conference, and several speech-language professional development sessions.

Campus Climate and Culture*.* When asked about inclusion, School F's principal provided the following definition "providing children with special needs an education in the least restrictive environment. For us, that is the regular classroom". Push-in for identified students is the norm and there is often a resource teacher and/or aide working with students in the regular education setting to meet the needs of students in the classroom. There is the additional barrier that some regular education teachers feel that the other person in the room is watching and judging their teaching practices.

Twenty-five percent of faculty at School F responded to the teacher survey. This small number may not represent of attitudes of the entire staff. These teachers were confident about their classroom management techniques and teaching abilities. Most felt that regardless of issues that may arise at home, students are able to receive solid educations. Respondents were generally positive about the social and academic growth of students with disabilities included in the general education classroom. However, some teachers felt that general education teachers might not have sufficient professional development to teach students with disabilities. Teachers were split in opinion about whether including students with disabilities took attention away from other students and monopolize teacher time.

Concerning the general climate of the school, respondents felt that both students and faculty felt respected by administration, and that for the most part, effort was made to reach out to parents. All respondents felt instructionally supported and encouraged to collaborate. They also felt that student needs were at the center of decision-making. Teachers who responded felt that administration had a clear vision for the school and that they supported that vision.

Quantitative Teacher Outcomes

Professional Development Exposure. Inclusive practices professional development was examined first. Data came from *Pathlore*. Schoolteachers could participate in up to 18 sessions covering different inclusive practice topics, each session lasting between three and eight hours. *Pathlore* data was coded into general categories for the purpose of this evaluation. The numbers presented represent the number of times all staff members (not just those involved with students in third through fifth grades) attended professional development on a particular topic; note that some staff members attended multiple sessions on the same basic topic. A review of CCSD Pathlore professional development data showed in general, differentiated instruction professional development was attended 89 times by ISP school staff and 22 times by staff at the Non-ISP schools. Both ISP and Non-ISP teachers participated in AIMSweb professional development. At the three ISP schools, collaborative teaching professional development was attended 19 times compared to twice at the Non-ISP schools. It is interesting to note from the survey data that 5 staff members (serving third through fifth grade students) at Non-ISP school reported receiving professional development in collaborative teaching during the 2007-2008 school year. This discrepancy between the self-report and *Pathlore* data indicates that importance of using multiple data sources to gather data, as peer coaching or school-based professional development may not show up in *Pathlore* logs.

Accommodations and modifications are often incorporated into special education and differentiated instruction professional development. Professional development included in the more general "special education" code tended to be professional development on specific disabilities, low-incidence disabilities, or using Encore—an IEP management system. ISP (30) and Non-ISP (28) staff attended the same number of professional development workshops. Finally, in relation to the topics relevant for the current evaluation, paraprofessional professional development showed up 23 times in ISP school staff records and 9 times in Non-ISP staff records. RTI (including progress-monitoring assistance) appeared 82 times in the ISP school staff records and 71 times in the Non-ISP staff records. Overall, the professional development data in the Pathlore system for these six schools indicated that staff at ISP schools

was more likely than their Non-ISP counterparts to be exposed to professional development related to students with special needs and inclusive practices.

Self-reported teacher survey data suggested that a slightly higher percentage of staff at ISP schools were exposed to inclusive practices professional development than the Non-ISP schools prior to the 2007-2008 academic year. Several staff members from both ISP and Non-ISP schools reported that they had received substantial professional development in other states and on-the-job professional development through experiences in co-teaching classrooms and professional development. Staff reported multiple professional development sources, but the most commonly reported professional development sources for differentiated instruction professional development were school-based colleagues, the CCSD Curriculum Professional Development Division, and the Southern Nevada Regional Professional Development Program. Only 3 participants reported receiving differentiated instruction professional development from SSSD since beginning teaching at CCSD. Outside consultants or school-based colleagues most frequently provided collaborative teaching professional development. School-based colleagues were also instrumental in assisting respondents in developing their accommodation and modification skills. While the ISP teachers did receive more professional development--specifically in differentiated instruction—they also sought out more inclusion professional development on their own than did the Non-ISP teachers.

There were significant differences in professional development contact hours in between the Non-ISP and ISP group, $t_{(25)}$ 3.56, $p = .002$. The Non-ISP teachers completed, on average 2 professional development hours (Non-ISP $M = 2.33$, ISP $M = .33$), more than the ISP teachers. The Non-ISP teachers completed more AIMSweb professional development hours than ISP teachers as well (Non-ISP $M = 7.85$, ISP $M = 1.17$). While the ISP group received differentiated instruction sponsored by Student Support Services Division, 4 teachers from the Non-ISP group sought similar professional development through Literacy Services. Five teachers from the ISP group completed the same Literacy Services professional development. Comparing professional development contact hours on differential instruction was significant, $t_{(25)} = 2.36$, $p = .03$, $d = .94$.

Table 4. Percent of teachers reporting receiving professional development in ISP since working at CCSD (October 2007 Survey) and median number of professional development hours.			
	ISP (n = 33)	Non-ISP (n = 22)	All Respondents
Differentiated Instruction	75% (10)	68.2% (9)	27.8% (10)
Collaborative Teaching	40.6% (6)	18.2% (4)	68.5% (6)
Accommodations	40.6% (6)	31.8% (15)	63.0% (9)
Modifications	34.4% (8)	36.4% (8)	64.8% (8)

While the number of inclusive practices professional development hours was not significant, an unexpected finding did occur. Teachers in the ISP schools sought additional inclusion professional development. Compared to the 4 Literacy Services professional development courses sought by the Non-ISP teachers, the ISP teachers sought an additional 23 courses related to inclusion, collaboration, English Language Learners, and special education. However, the average number of professional development courses per ISP group designation ($t_{(25)} = .48$, $p = .63$) and the total number of hours of professional development was not significant ($t_{(25)} = .46$, $p = .65$). The average number of professional development courses a member of the ISP group took was 3.06 with mean of 10.94 hours. The average number of professional development courses for the Non-ISP group was 2.67 for an average of 9.41 hours.

The April 2008 survey focused more on the kinds of professional development received during 2007-2008 (since August of 2007). The next table (Table 5) shows the professional development responses from ISP and Non-ISP staff (total April 2008 n = 22 and 18, respectively) from the April 2008 survey.

Table 5. Percent of teachers attending professional development in 2007-2008 and approximate number of hours by ISP and Non-ISP school respondents				
	ISP		Non-ISP	
	Percent	Median Hours	Percent	Median Hours
Differentiated Instruction	95.5	12	83.3	8
Collaborative Teaching	54.5	6.50	27.8	10
Accommodations	54.5	8	27.8	5
Modifications	50.0	4	16.7	6

Almost 40% of the Non-ISP staff reported receiving professional development in differentiated instruction from school-based colleagues and 27.8% Non-ISP staff participated in professional development utilizing outside consultants. The ISP school staff also reported receiving support from school colleagues (36.4%), but more commonly reported participating in professional development provided by consultants (45.5%). For collaborative teaching, accommodations, and modifications, survey participants reported a variety of sources for professional development, including CPD, RPDP, SSSD, on-line courses, school-based colleagues, and consultants.

The results of the ISP professional development exposure can be summarized by two main findings. First, more ISP school teachers participated in ISP related professional development workshops sponsored by the district than Non-ISP schoolteachers. However, the mean number of contact hours was not different between ISP and Non-ISP teachers. Four teachers from Non-ISP schools participated in literacy-focused inclusive practices professional development. Second, ISP teachers participated in additional inclusive practices professional development beyond what was provided through the ISP initiative.

Feelings about Practices. Three basic questions were asked about the four practices targeted in the teacher survey. Participants were asked to respond whether (1) each specific strategy "is a useful strategy to help all children learn"; (2) "I feel confident in delivering (each specific strategy) in the classroom"; and (3) "I need more professional development to better implement (each specific strategy) in my classroom." The participants responded on a 6-point scale (1 being strongly disagree, 6 being strongly agree), but the data from eligible participants in October 2007 and April 2008 were re-coded to show the general level of agreement with each question. Teachers generally had positive attitudes about the usefulness of each of the four strategies, with over 80% of respondents in October 2007 and April 2008 at both ISP and Non-ISP schools agreeing that these strategies help students learn. When asked about their confidence in using the strategies, teachers were more confident about their ability to deliver differentiated instruction than about their use of collaborative teaching, accommodations, or modifications. In October 2007, teachers felt least confident in their use of modifications (72.6%), but in April 2008 the respondents felt least confident about collaborative teaching

(63.6%). The majority of the responses were closer to “Agree” (4) than “Strongly Agree” (5) or “Very Strongly Agree” (6). When asked about professional development needs, most teachers felt that additional professional development was needed to better implement each practice (over 60% agreed in October 2007 and April 2008); the strongest indicator for differentiated instruction in October 2007 was that 76.9% agreed more professional development was needed.

When asked about the frequency of each strategy use, 89% of both ISP and Non-ISP participants reported daily use of differentiated instruction strategies in October 2007 as compared to 82% in April 2008. Staff at the ISP schools reported daily use of this strategy at both time points; two Non-ISP participants downgraded their use from October 2007 to April 2008 from daily to weekly. In October 2007, 44% of both ISP and Non-ISP participants reported collaborative teaching daily or weekly (1 respondent reported always teaching alone) and in April 2008, 38% of participants reported daily or weekly use with 4 teachers always teaching alone.

In October 2007, 11 of the 12 participants who responded daily or weekly participation were from ISP schools (69% of the ISP respondents), and in April 2008 18% of the Non-ISP and 53% of the ISP respondents reported daily or weekly use of collaborative instruction. Teachers who participated at both survey administrations reported using accommodations on a daily or weekly basis across the school year (88.8% in October 2007 and 85.7% in April 2008). The percentages were nearly the same for ISP and Non-ISP participants. The self-reported use of modifications was similarly high in October 2007 and April 2008, with over 70% of staff reporting daily or weekly use. Again, these percentages were similar for both ISP and Non-ISP staff. The survey data did not indicate any major self-reported changes in the use of these four strategies for these participants.

Table 6 shows the mean ratings for the four questions dealing with perceived usefulness of each practice for helping all children to learn. The sample size was not large enough to detect any meaningful statistical differences over time or between groups. Overall, staff at both ISP and Non-ISP responded favorably regarding the four instructional strategies.

The general trend for this group indicates that the usefulness perceptions of staff at ISP schools increased from October 2007 to April 2008 for all categories. However, with the exception of accommodations, staff at ISP schools implemented these strategies with less frequency in April 2008 than they did in October 2007.

Table 6. Perceived usefulness of strategies - October 2007 and April 2008 mean rating on a 6 point scale.				
	Mean			
	ISP		Non-ISP	
	October	April	October	April
Differentiated Instruction	5.31	5.50	5.00	4.58
Collaborative Teaching	4.46	4.85	4.00	4.14
Accommodations	4.40	4.93	4.40	4.50
Modifications	4.53	4.80	4.55	4.46

A second survey, the Opinions Related to the Integration of Students with Disabilities (ORI), examined teachers' attitude towards inclusive practices. A 2 (ISP group) x 3 (grade) x 2 (repeated measure) ANOVA design was conducted. This approach allows analysis of differences in change over time between the two school groups at each grade level. A significant interaction would mean that ISP teachers' attitudes changed over time to a different degree than Non-ISP teachers' attitudes, with specific changes between grade levels. In this case there was no significant interaction, $F_{(2,19)} = .80$, $p = .47$. No subscale of the ORI produced significant interactions. With no statistically significant interaction a main effects analysis followed. Main effect analysis examines differences between individual variables. This would be akin to conducting three separate analyses of variance (one-way ANOVAs) for differences in ISP school designation, differences between grade level, and changes over time. There were no main effects between ISP and Non-ISP schools or grade level on changes in perception of strategy utility. There was no change in perceptions over time either. However, with so few teachers completing the survey in October and April these results cannot be considered conclusive.

One of the outcomes was change in teacher efficacy over time on personal teaching efficacy. There was no significant interaction, $F_{(2,19)} = .23$, $p = .80$. The main effect for ISP group approached significance, $F_{(1,19)} = 3.89$, $p = .06$, with the ISP designation having higher personal efficacy (M = 4.38) than the Non-ISP group (M = 4.00). The same mixed design ANOVA was applied to general teaching efficacy. There was no significant interaction $F_{(2,19)} = .53$, $p = .53$, nor significant main effects.

There were few correlations between the teacher efficacy scale and ORI in either administration. There were no correlations between the October 2007 and April 2008 administration of the ORI, personal teacher efficacy, or general teacher efficacy. There was a moderate positive correlation between general teacher efficacy and ORI in October 2007 and April 2008 (see Table 7).

Table 7. Correlations teacher efficacy and the ORI between times of administrations (* = p < .05; ** = p < .01).

	ORI October	PE October	GE October	ORI April	PE April	GE April
ORI October	-	-.05	.41**	.08	-.24	.57**
PE October		-	.03	.45*	.20	-.30
GE October			-	.03	-.63**	.17
ORI April				-	.04	.24
PE April					-	-.31

The final survey measured teachers' perceptions of school climate. The survey was administered in October 2007 and again in April 2008. A mixed ANOVA design was conducted with ISP designation (ISP vs. Non-ISP) as the between group variable and the repeated administrations (change over time) as within group variable. There were no interaction between the two variables, $F_{(1, 16)} = 1.01$, $p = .33$. Means of the teachers summed rankings are in Table 8.

Table 8. Means of teacher perceptions of school climate.

	October 2007	April
ISP	91.18	87.45
Non-ISP	87.00	87.45

Classroom observations occurred in April 2008 using the Classroom Quality-Observed Indicators of Inclusive Activities (CQ-OIIA). Six scales were examined: positive teacher activities, negative teacher activities, positive teacher interactions with students, negative teacher interactions with students, and student environment. Each analysis consisted of a 2 (ISP group) x 3 (grade) ANOVA for each scale. For positive teacher activities there were no interactions ($F_{(2, 25)} = .20$, $p = .82$) or main effects. Univariate analysis of each positive teacher activity revealed one significant effect for ISP on the "presentation of material is multi-modal", $F_{(1, 25)} = 4.99$, $p = .04$, partial $\eta^2 = .17$. ISP classes (M = 9.83) scored higher on this item than the Non-ISP classes (M = 5.20). There were no significant interactions ($F_{(2, 25)} = .86$, $p = .44$) or main effects for negative teacher activities.

For positive teacher interactions with students there was no significant interaction ($F_{(2, 25)} = .001$, $p = .99$) or significant main effects. For negative teacher interactions with students there was no significant interaction ($F_{(2, 25)} = .36$, $p = .70$). The grade variable did approach significance ($F_{(2, 25)} = 3.33$, $p = .052$) with fourth grade teachers (M = 5.38) having more negative interactions than third grade teachers (M = 1.37). A univariate analysis of variance showed a significant effect for the item, "Teacher appears unaware of disruptive behavior", $F_{(2, 25)} = 4.01$, $p < .03$, partial $\eta^2 = .24$. Fourth grade teachers (M = 3.5) were perceived as less aware of disruptive behavior than fifth grade teachers (M = .001).

For positive student environment, the interaction was not significant, $F_{(2, 25)} = .01$, $p = .99$. However, both grade level ($F_{(2, 25)} = 4.16$, $p =.03$, partial $\eta^2 = .25$) and ISP designation ($F_{(1, 25)} = 4.16$, $p = .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .14$) had significant main effects. Third grade classrooms (M = 21.32) were more positive than fifth grade classrooms (M = 8.04). Fourth grade classrooms (M = 14.38) were not significantly different from either third or fifth grade classrooms. ISP classrooms (M = 18.67) were more positive environments than the Non-ISP classrooms (M = 10.49). There was an interaction between grade and ISP for the item "adaptive environment", $F_{(2, 25)} = 3.72$, $p = .04$, partial $\eta^2 = .23$. Third grade Non-ISP teachers (M = 2.14) adapted instruction more than ISP classes (M = .50). However, in fourth grade the ISP teachers (M = 4.75) were more adaptive than the Non-ISP classes (M < .001).

There were significant effects on grade for the items "students work collaboratively" ($F_{(2, 25)} = 6.34$, $p = .006$, partial $\eta^2 = .34$) and "students reading silently or sitting listening" ($F_{(2, 25)} = 15.40$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .55$). Third grade students (M = 7.20) worked more collaboratively than fifth grade students (M = .63; fourth grade M = 2.13). Fifth grade students (M = 12.71) were seen sitting quietly more than third grade students (M = 2.32). There was no difference between fourth grade students (M = 6.13) and third or fifth grade students. There was no interaction ($F_{(2, 25)} = .51$, $p = .61$) or main effects for the negative student environment scale.

To summarize, the teacher survey and observation findings suggest that teachers from both ISP and Non-ISP schools rated their knowledge of inclusive practices as high, but reported a need for further training. Teachers from the ISP schools demonstrated gains in personal teacher efficacy, or sense of competence in teaching, over the course of the school year. Non-ISP teachers did not show the same increase in personal teacher efficacy. From the classroom observations, ISP teachers differentiated instruction to meet their studetents' needs by using multi-modal presentations more frequently than the Non-ISP teachers.

Parent Outcomes

Overall, the parent survey return rate was 26.60%. For parents who had students with IEPs, 24.00% returned surveys. Grade level representation was equitable. The parent survey was broken down into five scales: Impact of school on my child, School's efforts to collaborate with parents, Teacher quality, Parent participation, and Parent perceptions towards inclusion. A 2 (ISP group) x 3 (grade level) ANOVA was conducted for each scale.

For parent perception for the scale *perceived impact of the school* on their child, there was no interaction between ISP school designation and grade level, $F_{(2, 189)} = .44$, $p = .65$. A main effect for ISP designation approached significance, $F_{(1, 189)} = 3.23$, $p = .074$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. Parents of a child in ISP designated schools had slightly more favorable attitudes towards school personnel (M = 24.98) than parents associated with Non-ISP scores (M = 23.26). A 2 (ISP designation) X 3 (grade level) ANOVA of individual items indicated two significant items for ISP designation (a main effect for the ISP designation): "my child is treated with respect" ($F_{(1, 185)} = 4.10$, $p = .04$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$) and "my child is welcomed in his or her class ($F_{(2, 185)} = 3.95$, $p = .05$,

partial η^2 = .02). These results suggest specific positive attributes are more readily seen in ISP school staff than in Non-ISP staff.

For School's efforts to partner with parents, there were no significant interactions ($F_{(2, 186)}$ = .02, p =.98) or main effects for the ISP or grade independent variables. Parent perceptions of teachers and administers did not have a significant interaction ($F_{(2, 172)}$ = .28, p =.75) nor main effects. There were no significant interactions ($F_{(2, 175)}$ = 4.16, p =.03) or main effects for school influence.

For Parent perception of teacher quality there was no significant interaction, $F_{(2, 171)}$ = .02, p =.98. There was a main effect for the ISP designation, $F_{(2, 171)}$ = 4.07, p =.05, partial η^2 = .02. Parent perceptions were higher for teacher quality in ISP schools (M = 47.75), than Non-ISP schools (M = 44.38). There was no significant interaction or main effects for Parent perception of school quality, $F_{(2, 167)}$ = .21, p =.81. While parents saw school quality as identical, parents associated with ISP schools perceived those schools as having higher quality teachers than parents associated with Non-ISP schools.

There was no interaction between reported Parent participation and ISP designation, $F_{(2, 166)}$ = .36, p =.70, or main effects. There was no interaction for either Parents seeing the benefits of integration ($F_{(2, 152)}$ = .45, p =.64), or negative perceptions of integration ($F_{(2, 140)}$ = 1.10, p =.34). There were no main effects for ISP designation or grade level for either analysis.

Students with IEPs*.* The survey return rate for parents who had students with IEPs was 22.67%. No parents of children with IEPs in fourth grade at a Non-ISP school returned a survey, and only 3 parents of children with IEPs in fifth grade submitted surveys. Only third grade was analyzed for differences between ISP and Non-ISP schools. For third grade students, significant differences were found on two items. Parents associated with ISP schools (M = 25.00) had more favorable perceptions of the impact ISP schools had on their children, than parents associated with Non-ISP schools (M = 13.2), $t_{(6.17)}$ = 2.52, p = .04, d = 2.52. Parents associated with ISP schools (M = 43.4) also perceived schools as putting forth more effort than parents associated with Non-ISP schools (M = 22.60), $t_{(8)}$ = 2.89, p = .02, d = 2.04.

Parents who had children with an IEP completed a second survey specific to the educational needs of their child. Three scales were examined: experiences with the school,

positive impacts on child's progress, and services that have helped the family. Since only 20 surveys were returned, the grades were collapsed and only differences in ISP designation were examined. The only significant difference was on the scale of positive impact between ISP and Non-ISP schools, $t_{(18)} = 2.88$, $p = .01$, $d = 1.35$. Parents associated with ISP schools (M = 30.27) reported more positive outcomes than parents associated with Non-ISP schools (M = 17.11). Significant positive outcomes were mathematics ($t_{(18)} = 2.12$, $p = .05$, $d = 1.00$), social/emotional ($t_{(18)} = 3.09$, $p = .006$, $d = 1.46$), behavioral ($t_{(18)} = 2.43$, $p = .03$, $d = 1.15$), and organizational and planning skills ($t_{(18)} = 2.56$, $p = .02$, $d = 1.21$). Means are in Table 9.

Table 9. Means of IEP associated parent's perception of positive outcomes between ISP and Non-ISP schools. Stars represent significant differences for that item where * equals p < .05, and ** equals p < .01.

Outcome	ISP	Non-ISP
Reading	4.91	3.44
Writing	4.36	2.44
Mathematics	4.27	2.22*
Speech/Language	3.91	3.67
Social/Emotional	4.45	1.67**
Behavioral	4.09	1.67*
Organizational and Planning Skills	4.27	2.00*

ELL Students. The return rate of parent surveys for ELL students was 21.65%. A 2 (ISP group) x 3 (grade) ANOVA was conducted for each scale for parents with ELL students. There were no significant interactions on any of the eight scales. There were no main effects from these analyses. Parents with ELL students reported less parent participation (M = 33.10) than students who did not have the ELL designation (M = 38.21), $t_{(170)} = 4.07$, $p < .001$, $d = .62$. Parents who did not have ELL students had higher negative scores (M = 21.39) towards integration than parents with ELL students (M = 18.38), $t_{(170)} = 2.50$, $p = .01$, $d = .38$.

To summarize the parent survey data, parents associated with ISP schools had more favorable impressions of the school staff than those parents associated with Non-ISP schools. ISP school staff received higher quality ratings from parents than Non-ISP school staff. Specifically, parents associated with ISP schools reported school staff was more welcoming and

respectful of the students, compared to the Non-ISP school staff. Parents of students with IEPs were more positive towards ISP school staff than Non-ISP school staff reporting that ISP school staff worked hard with their students. Parents of students with IEPs associated with the ISP schools reported positive impacts on their children in mathematics, social adjustment and organizational skills.

Student Outcomes

A 3 (grade) x 2 (ISP group designation) ANOVA was conducted to examine CRT reading scale scores. There was no interaction ($F_{(2, 716)} = .59$, $p = .55$), but there was a main effect for grade level ($F_{(2, 716)} = 4.29$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$), but not for ISP designation. Third grade students had higher CRT reading scores than fifth grade students while fourth grade CRT reading scores did not significantly differ from third or fifth grade CRT reading scores. The mean CRT reading scores are seen in Table 10.

Table 10. Means for CRT reading scale scores by grade and ISP designation.

Grade	ISP	Non-ISP	Total
3	291.24	301.52	296.38
4	290.21	289.28	246.19
5	278.54	273.85	289.75
Total	286.43	287.63	287.03

A 3 (grade) x 2 (ISP group) ANOVA was conducted to examine CRT mathematics scale scores. There was a significant interaction between grade and ISP, $F_{(2, 716)} = 7.29$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. There was also a significant main effect for grade level (fourth grade students had higher CRT mathematics scores than third grade students), but not for ISP designation. All mean CRT mathematics scores are in Table 11. Non-ISP students in third grade had statistically significant higher CRT mathematics scores than ISP students. ISP students in fifth grade had significantly higher CRT mathematics scores than Non-ISP fifth grade students.

Table 11. Means for CRT mathematics scale scores by grade and ISP designation.			
Grade	ISP	Non-ISP	Combined
3	281.82	319.73	301.28
4	325.79	321.63	323.76
5	316.29	302.58	309.33
Total	309.11	314.20	311.67

Only fifth grade CRT science scale scores were analyzed. An independent t-test was used to analyze the CRT science scale scores. Differences between ISP and Non-ISP students on science scores approached significance, $t_{(253)} = 1.77$, $p = .08$. Students from ISP schools had higher CRT science scores (M = 290.48) than students from Non-ISP schools (M = 274.83).

For the AIMSweb oral fluency raw scores a mixed ANOVA was conducted with the repeated measures as the within group variable and ISP designation (ISP vs. Non-ISP) was the between group variable. There was a significant interaction between the three test administrations and ISP designation, ($F_{(2, 1194)} = 4.58$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .008$). Non-ISP schools had significantly higher oral fluency scores than the ISP schools in the January and April administrations. When looking at individual grade levels the interaction appeared only in Third grade, ($F_{(2, 356)} = 4.05$, $p < .02$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$). The means are in Table 12. The Non-ISP students started with higher oral fluency scores and maintained the lead across the three test administrations. Grades 4 and 5 showed growth across the test administrations, but there were no differences between the ISP and Non-ISP schools.

Table 12. Means for AIMSweb oral reading probe raw scores over three testing administrations displayed by grade.					
Group	Grade	October	January	April	Gains
ISP	3	65.67	86.28	97.01	31.34
	4	93.89	105.87	118.08	24.19
	5	108.81	122.64	133.81	25.00
Non-ISP	3	79.17	99.94	115.93	36.76
	4	98.36	114.93	123.37	25.01
	5	103.55	121.93	132.60	29.05

To directly compare grades for oral fluency the common passage oral fluency probe was analyzed separately using a mixed ANOVA with the ISP designation and grade as between group variables and the three testing administrations as the within group variable. There was no

interaction between ISP, grade, and the common oral fluency passage scores ($F_{(4, 908)} = 1.64$, $p = .16$), but there was an interaction between grade and reading probe ($F_{(4, 908)} = 5.28$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$) and between reading probe and ISP group ($F_{(2, 908)} = 4.54$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$). There was no significant interaction between ISP and grade ($F_{(2, 454)} = 2.57$, $p = .08$). There were main effects for gains in reading probe grade and ISP designation. Grade levels means and mean gain scores are in Table 13. There were significant differences between all three grades with fifth grade having better reading probe than Fourth grade. Both grade levels 4 and 5 had higher reading probe than Third grade. For each testing administration, the Non-ISP schools had higher reading probe scores.

Table 13. Means for AIMSweb oral fluency common passage over three testing administrations separated by grade level.

Group	Grade	October	January	April	Gains
ISP	3	75.69	91.61	108.17	32.48
	4	105.32	118.84	133.67	28.35
	5	126.84	142.28	155.42	28.58
Non-ISP	3	103.31	120.15	136.64	33.33
	4	124.48	137.95	144.03	19.52
	5	133.33	151.55	158.74	25.41

For the AIMSweb reading comprehension raw scores a mixed ANOVA was conducted with the repeated measures as the within group variable and ISP designation (ISP vs. Non-ISP) was the between group variable. There was a significant interaction between the three test administrations and ISP designation, $F_{(2, 1064)} = 3.65$, $p < .03$, partial $\eta^2 = .007$. All students made significant gains across each test administration, but there were no differences between the ISP and Non-ISP schools. The means are in Table 14. Analysis was also conducted at each grade level. There was a significant interaction for Fourth grade, $F_{(2, 352)} = 4.08$, $p < .02$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. Fourth grade ISP students made greater gains than Non-ISP students. Significant gains occurred across the three test administrations in third and fifth grades.

Table 14. Means for AIMSweb reading comprehension over three testing administrations separated by grade level.					
Group	Grade	October	January	April	Gains
ISP	3	7.64	11.17	13.60	5.96
	4	11.50	15.97	20.35	8.85
	5	14.85	19.54	23.79	8.94
Non-ISP	3	10.15	13.57	16.12	5.97
	4	12.01	16.82	19.16	7.15
	5	14.22	18.05	23.79	9.52

Students with IEPs. The next step was to examine achievement gains among students with IEPs. A 3 (grade) x 2 (ISP group) ANOVA was conducted on CRT reading scale scores for students with IEPs. There was no interaction ($F_{(2, 69)} = .30$, $p = .74$), nor main effects for reading scores for either grade ($F_{(2, 69)} = 2.07$, $p = .13$) or ISP designation ($F_{(1, 69)} = 2.67$, $p = .11$). Means by grade level and ISP designation are in Table 15.

Table 15. Means for CRT reading scale scores by grade and ISP designation for students with IEPs.			
Grade	ISP	Non-ISP	Total
3	247.69	230.36	240.63
4	221.62	168.56	199.91
5	212.43	188.33	201.31
Total	228.33	197.22	215.05

A 3 (grade) x 2 (ISP group) ANOVA was conducted on CRT mathematics scale scores for students with IEPs. There was no interaction ($F_{(2, 69)} = .36$, $p = .70$), nor main effects for mathematics scores for either grade ($F_{(2, 69)} = .99$, $p = .38$) or ISP designation ($F_{(1, 69)} = .01$, $p = .92$). Means by grade level and ISP designation are in Table 16.

Table 16. Means for CRT mathematics scale scores by grade and ISP designation for students with IEPs.			
Grade	ISP	Non-ISP	Total
3	224.06	239.36	230.30
4	260.54	275.78	266.77
5	248.64	224.13	237.09
Total	243.09	244.13	243.53

For the Fifth grade students with IEPs CRT science scores an independent t-test was used to analyze differences between ISP and Non-ISP schools. ISP students (M = 264.64) had significantly higher science scores than the Non-ISP students (M = 186.82), $t_{(23)} = 2.98$, $p = .007$, $d = 1.24$.

For gains in the AIMSweb oral fluency task for students with IEPs, a mixed ANOVA with ISP designation as the between group variable and the scores from the 3 AIMSweb administrations was used as the within group variable. There was no interaction between ISP designation and the 3 tests administrations, $F_{(2, 110)} = .20$, $p = .82$. Score means and gain scores are in Table 17. Students did show gains in oral fluency across all 3 tests administrations. There were no differences between the ISP and Non-ISP school groups at grade level.

Table 17. Means for students with IEPs oral fluency over three testing administrations for ISP and Non-ISP groups.

Group	Grade	October	January	April	Gains
ISP	3	47.23	64.15	71.77	24.54
	4	61.18	70.45	82.09	20.91
	5	72.64	88.82	98.42	25.78
Non-ISP	3	28.86	41.86	58.71	29.85
	4	53.43	69.57	70.57	17.14
	5	76.00	91.38	96.50	20.50

For the common oral fluency passage, there were no interactions for the IEP students between the repeated measures, ISP or grade (see Table 18). There were main effects for the common oral fluency passage scores ($F_{(2, 76)} = 46.56$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .55$) and grade ($F_{(2, 38)} = 6.13$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$). Fifth grade students (M = 115.60) had higher scores than both third (M = 65.38) and fourth grade students (M = 71.40). There were no differences between third and fourth grade scores. Students with IEPs made consistent gains in oral fluency across all testing administrations, but there was no difference between ISP and Non-ISP schools.

Table 18. Means for students with IEPs common oral fluency passage over three testing administrations for ISP and Non-ISP groups.					
Group	Grade	October	January	April	Gains
ISP	3	69.55	75.73	89.36	19.81
	4	72.00	76.73	91.45	19.45
	5	98.20	118.90	131.50	33.30
Non-ISP	3	44.00	48.67	65.00	21.00
	4	50.60	68.00	69.60	19.00
	5	102.50	115.00	127.50	25.00

For the reading comprehension there was a no significant interaction between achievement and ISP school group, $F_{(4, 100)} = 1.02$, $p = .32$. As can be seen in Table 19, gains between each test administration were significant. While gains at each test administration were also significant at third and fourth grade, no difference between ISP and Non-ISP schools were identified. Fifth grade did meet significance ($F_{(2, 28)} = 4.05$, $p < .03$, partial $\eta^2 = .22$) . Fifth grade ISP students made greater gains in reading comprehension than Non-ISP students.

Table 19. Means for students with IEPs reading comprehension over three testing administrations for ISP and Non-ISP groups.					
Group	Grade	October	January	April	Gains
ISP	3	5.92	7.54	9.77	3.85
	4	6.64	9.27	12.64	6.00
	5	9.09	11.18	15.27	6.18
Non-ISP	3	5.00	5.67	11.33	6.33
	4	9.17	11.33	12.33	3.16
	5	12.00	14.60	12.40	0.40

ELL students. The second subpopulation examined was ELL students. A 3 (grade) x 2 (ISP group) ANOVA was conducted on CRT reading scale scores for ELL students. There was no interaction between grade and ISP group, $F_{(2, 205)} = .05$, $p = .95$. There was a main effect for grade, $F_{(2, 205)} = 4.71$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. Fifth grade students had lower reading scores than Third grade students (see Table 20). Fourth grade ELL reading scores did not differ with either third or fifth grade CRT reading scores.

Table 20. Means for CRT reading scale scores by grade and ISP designation for ELL students.			
Grade	ISP	Non-ISP	Total
3	265.59	279.86	274.19
4	234.15	253.98	245.59
5	227.73	239.65	234.48
Total	242.61	259.28	252.33

A 3 (grade) x 2 (ISP group) ANOVA was conducted on CRT mathematics scale scores for ELL students. There was a significant interaction between grade and ISP designation, $F_{(2, 205)} = 43.62$, $p = .03$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. Third grade Non-ISP students had higher mathematics scale scores than the ISP students (see Table 21). Fifth grade ISP students had higher mathematics scale scores than the Non-ISP students.

Table 21. Means for CRT mathematics scale scores by grade and ISP designation for ELL students.			
Grade	ISP	Non-ISP	Total
3	268.10	314.64	296.15
4	301.42	298.71	299.86
5	309.27	284.65	295.32
Total	292.76	300.52	297.28

An independent t-test was used to analyze the fifth grade CRT science scale scores. The ISP ELL students (M = 280.19) had significantly higher CRT science scores than the Non-ISP ELL students (M = 234.88), $t_{(56.46)} = 2.97$, $p = .004$, $d = .79$.

Another 3 x 2 x 3 mixed ANOVA examined grade and ISP designation as between group factor and the 3 AIMSweb administrations as the within group variable for ELL students. There was a significant interaction between ISP designation and the 3 test administrations, $F_{(2, 370)} = 3.58$, $p = .03$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. Non-ISP students had higher oral fluency scores across all three test administrations. There were no differences between ISP and Non-ISP students at the grade level (see Table 22).

Table 22. Means for ELL students oral fluency over three testing administrations for ISP and Non-ISP groups.					
Group	Grade	October	January	April	Gains
ISP	3	47.91	63.86	80.36	32.45
	4	75.00	88.27	100.53	25.53
	5	83.38	98.95	105.81	22.43
Non-ISP	3	65.12	85.56	103.53	38.41
	4	84.97	99.34	115.26	30.29
	5	89.76	107.58	118.06	28.30

A 3 x 2 x 3 mixed ANOVA was used to examine ELL student grade level, ISP designation and the common oral fluency passage. There were no interactions between reading achievement scores, ISP designation or grade (see Table 23). There were main effects for oral fluency scores ($F_{(2, 174)} = 98.54$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .53$) and grades ($F_{(2, 87)} = 3.10$, $p = .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$). Fifth (M = 114.26) and fourth grade ELL students (M = 111.91) had higher oral fluency scores than third grade ELL students (M = 114.26), but there was no difference between fourth and fifth grade scores.

Table 23. Means for ELL students' common oral fluency passage over 3 testing administrations for ISP and Non-ISP groups.					
Group	Grade	October	January	April	Gains
ISP	3	54.18	69.55	91.50	37.32
	4	86.63	102.00	115.57	28.94
	5	102.50	122.10	133.15	30.65
Non-ISP	3	88.63	107.13	115.63	27.00
	4	110.38	122.75	134.13	23.72
	5	101.00	107.20	119.60	18.60

A 2 x 3 mixed ANOVA was examined with ISP designation as the between group factor and the 3 reading comprehension administrations as the within group variable for the reading comprehension task. There was no interaction between reading comprehension scores, and ISP designation ($F_{(2, 312)} = 2.65$, $p = .07$). There were differences at Fourth grade ($F_{(2, 110)} = 3.11$, $p = .049$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$), but not third and fifth grades. Fourth grade Non-ISP students made gains

between October and January, but made no gains in reading comprehension in April, while ISP students made gains across all three test administrations (see Table 24).

Table 24. Means for ELL students reading comprehension over three testing administrations for ISP and Non-ISP groups.

Group	Grade	October	January	April	Gains
ISP	3	5.41	7.95	10.09	4.68
	4	8.23	11.90	15.33	7.10
	5	10.77	12.91	16.82	6.05
Non-ISP	3	7.94	11.11	12.14	4.20
	4	7.30	13.96	14.44	7.14
	5	9.14	13.59	17.82	8.68

As a side note, correlations between the achievement measures (CRT reading, CRT mathematics, CRT science, oral fluency, reading comprehension, and reading probe) were strongly significant. Correlations are in Table 25. Correlations between the 3 testing administrations within the same tests were strong, positive correlations: AIMSweb reading oral reading probe were between .91 and .94 across the October 2007, January 2008 and April 2008 administrations, AIMSweb reading comprehension were between .81 and .85, the reading probe score were between .91 and .93 across the 3 testing administrations.

Table 25. Correlations between CRT subject achievement test scale scores and April 2008 administration AIMSweb reading scores. All correlations are significant at .01. Correlations are listed by grade level.						
Grade 3	**CRT read**	**CRT math**	**Oral fluency**	**Common oral fluency passage**	**Reading comprehension**	
CRT read		.68	.79	.81	.70	
CRT math			.66	.74	.53	
Oral fluency				.96	.83	
Common passage					.84	
Grade 4	**CRT read**	**CRT math**	**Oral fluency**	**Common oral fluency passage**	**Reading comprehension**	
CRT read		.70	.73	.76	.73	
CRT math			.55	.56	.59	
Oral fluency				.94	.78	
Common passage					.80	
Grade 5	**CRT read**	**CRT math**	**CRT science**	**Oral fluency**	**Common oral fluency passage**	**Reading comprehension**
CRT read		.66	.70	.71	.69	.66
CRT math			.69	.54	.52	.55
CRT science				.56	.47	.54
Oral fluency					.93	.74
Common passage						.78

To summarize the results relating to student achievement, ISP schools demonstrated higher achievement in science and reading. ISP schools had higher CRT science test scores than the comparison schools, specifically in the IEP and ELL student populations. All students showed improvement in oral fluency and reading comprehension over the three test administrations. Fourth grade students from the ISP schools showed greater gains in reading comprehension than the students from the comparison schools. Fifth grade students with IEPs from the ISP schools made greater gains in reading comprehension than fifth grade students with IEPs from the comparison schools.

Student Engagement. Three measures were used to assess student engagement: a student self-report survey, a teacher survey, and observations of student engagement. The surveys were administered twice: in October 2007 and April 2008. The student survey examined both sense of engagement and sense of belonging.

A 3 x 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA was conducted on student sense of belonging for all students. The grade and ISP group were the between group variables and the two survey administrations were the within group variable (change over time). There was a significant interaction between all three variables, $F_{(2, 515)} = 3.34$, $p = .04$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. There was also an interaction between ISP and grade, $F_{(2, 515)} = 6.74$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. There were main effects for grade, ISP group and student sense of belonging. There were no significant differences between the two administrations of sense of belonging among third grade students. However, sense of belonging for all students did drop for both ISP and Non-ISP students between January 2008 and April 2008 administrations (means can be seen in Table 26). For fourth grades students, sense of belonging also dropped between administrations for both groups; however, the ISP students had a higher sense of belonging than did the Non-ISP students in both administrations. Sense of belonging for fifth grade students decreased for both ISP and Non-ISP students between the two survey administrations. The ISP students had a significantly higher sense of belonging in both survey administrations. In essence, the drop between the two administrations was less severe in the ISP students than in the Non-ISP students.

Table 26. Student sense of belonging means by grade and ISP group designation across the October 2007 and January 2008 survey administrations.			
ISP group	Grade	October	January
ISP	3	3.63	3.25
	4	3.53	3.33
	5	3.59	3.44
Non-ISP	3	3.60	3.56
	4	3.40	3.05
	5	3.30	2.86

A 3 x 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA was conducted on student sense of engagement for all students. The grade and ISP group were the between group variables and the two repeated measures were the within group variable. There were no interactions between the three variables. There were significant main effects for grade ($F_{(2, 447)} = 9.88$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$), and sense of engagement ($F_{(1, 447)} = 24.96$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$). Fourth grade students (M = 3.21) had a lower sense of engagement than either third (M = 3.39) or fifth grade students (M = 3.23). There were no differences in sense of engagement between third and fifth grade students. Students' sense of engagement dropped between October 2007 and April 2008 administrations.

A 3 x 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA was conducted on students' with IEPs sense of belonging. The grade and ISP group were the between group variables and the two repeated measures were the within group variable. There were no significant interactions ($F_{(2, 37)} = .88$, $p = .42$) or main effects between the variables.

A 3 x 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA was conducted on students' with IEPs sense of engagement. The grade and ISP group were the between group variables and the two repeated measures were the within group variable. There were no interactions between the three variables. There was one main effect for the ISP group, $F_{(1, 31)} = 8.09$, $p = .008$, partial $\eta^2 = .21$. Students in the Non-ISP group (M = 3.49) had a higher sense of engagement than the ISP students (M = 3.18).

A 3 x 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA was conducted on ELL students' sense of belonging and sense of engagement. The grade and ISP group were the between group variables and the two

repeated measures were the within group variable. There were no significant interactions or main effects between the variables in either sense of belonging or sense of engagement.

Teacher survey. A 3 (grade) x 2 (ISP designation) x 2 (repeated measures) mixed ANOVA was conducted on teachers' sense of student engagement. The grade and ISP group were the between group variables and the two repeated measures were the within group variable. There were no interactions or main effects between the variables for all students. Analysis of teacher perceptions of students with IEPs did not detect any differences on student engagement. For ELL students one main effect approached significance ($F_{(1, 100)} = 3.71$, $p = .057$), no significant results.

BOSS. Student observations of student engagement occurred in April 2008 using the BOSS protocol. Five categories of student behavior were monitored: engaged, off-task, peer-engaged and peer off-task, and teacher direction. Twenty-five students were observed. Data was not analyzed by grade since there were too few subjects to conduct an analysis by grade. Summed engagement score (passive and active engagement) and summed off-task scores were compared first. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine differences between ISP designation and academic engagement and off-task behavior (see Table 27). The MANOVA indicated that there was no interaction between ISP group and the two observations sum scores, Wilks $\lambda = .85$, $F_{(2, 23)} = 2.04$, $p = .15$.

Table 27. Percent intervals of observed student engagement between ISP and Non-ISP using BOSS.

Measure	ISP	Non-ISP
Engaged total	**.67**	**.78**
Active engaged	.37	.34
Passive engaged	.30	.44
Off-task total	**.42**	**.22**
Off-task motor	.18	.10
Off-task verbal	.13	.04
Off-task passive	.11	.07

The results of the student engagement surveys and observations can be briefly summarized. Students from the ISP schools reported a greater sense of engagements, specifically among students with IEPs. Unfortunately, the observations did not identify the same finding between the ISP and Non-ISP student observations. However, the observers did not specifically track students with IEPs to verify this finding. While students with IEPs at the ISP schools may have been more engaged, they may not have been observed during the observation protocols. ISP school students reported a greater sense of belonging than students from the Non-ISP schools.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The first objective was to identify the effects of the ISP initiative on teacher practices between teachers who participated in the ISP initiative and those who did not. As would be expected, ISP staff accessed more professional development related to inclusive practices than their Non-ISP peers. Professional development effects were not significantly different when evaluating the average professional development contact hours. One explanation may be that ISP teachers did not take full advantage of the opportunity presented to them through the ISP initiative.

A second factor may be that implementation of inclusive practices may take time to unfold as teachers improve the frequency and consistency of these practices. These ISP schools were in the first year of implementation. As knowledge and experience increase, school personnel may find which strategies are most effective for them. Greater gains would be expected with more time working with inclusive practices. Self and colleagues' (Self, et al., 1991) Cooperative Teaching Project followed the implementation of an inclusive practices program over three years. The first year was spent modifying the student selection criteria. Greater student gains were found in year 2, and again, in year 3.

ISP schoolteachers did seek out additional venues outside of the ISP initiative to inform themselves about inclusive practices. Why these teachers looked outside of the ISP initiative cannot be explained with the available data. Teacher workshops, through the ISP initiative or elsewhere, appear to support a culture of inclusion.

This study replicates previous research in improving student academic and social skills (Larrivee & Cook, 2001; Lindsay, 2007). This preliminary evidence suggests that the ISP initiative was influential in teacher promotion of academic achievement and social skill gains among students with special needs. Furthermore, personal teacher efficacy, or sense of competence at teaching, did increase over the year. Based on available evidence, this does suggest the ISP initiative did directly affect teachers' perceptions as teachers. One alternative explanation could attribute the increase to experience; but the same gains were not present in teacher efficacy from the Non-ISP teachers.

The second objective was to survey teacher and principal support of a culture of inclusion. CCSD researchers predicted that ISP schools would promote a culture of tolerance, dignity and respect for all learners more than those schools not associated with the ISP initiative. Results between types of schools (ISP vs. Non-ISP) did not differ in perception towards a culture of inclusion; though classroom observations indicated that ISP teachers had more positive classroom environments and were more adaptable to student needs. More ISP teachers did use multi-modal instruction than the Non-ISP teachers.

The themes that emerged from principal interviews were based on stated goals of differentiated instruction, defining inclusion, and school culture of collaboration. There was consensus among principals that differentiated instruction was a specific goal for every school. Two of the three ISP principals also had a specific goal to increase teacher collaboration. Whereas, there was no collaboration goals stated by the Non-ISP principals.

How principals defined inclusion was revealing. ISP principals defined inclusion as supporting the needs of all students. The class of students was seen as the unit of intervention; whereas Non-ISP principals saw inclusion as meeting the needs of students with IEPs. How school leadership defines inclusion may be a primary factor in teacher implementation of inclusive practices. Principal support can affect teacher buy-in. Teacher buy-in would then dictate the degree and frequency of inclusive practices implementation. Principals who promote inclusion as a school-wide initiative have practices that are more inclusive in the classroom; whereas principals who perceive inclusive practices as a special education student strategy have less acceptance and implementation of inclusive practices.

Collaboration was defined by 2 ISP principals as co-teaching in the classroom, whereas the third school engaged in collaborative planning. Two of the Non-ISP schools also engaged in collaborative planning. The final school principal stated that the school staff was working towards collaboration, but did not provide specific details. It was inferred from the differences in attitudes between the two school groups that the ISP initiative promoted positive school culture of inclusion. Support for school personnel has been considered a vital element in supporting an inclusive school culture (Burstein, et. al., 2004; Idol, 2006; Howes, et. al., 2005; Marston, 1996).

The consensus of the staff of 1 ISP and 1 Non-ISP school was that general education teachers lacked the skill and knowledge to use inclusive practices in their classroom. This finding suggests inclusive practices professional development directed at administration may be an important element in supporting a culture of inclusion. The ISP initiative does include a strand of inclusion workshops for administrators but this study did not examine whether any of the ISP school principals participated in this professional development.

The third objective was to survey parent perceptions of school services within each classroom. Parents who had children attending an ISP school had more favorable attitudes toward school staff than those parents associated with Non-ISP schools. Specifically, ISP parents perceived their children's classes as welcoming and respectful. The positive results reflect Peck and colleagues (Peck et. al., 2004), who found parents strong advocates for inclusion. ISP initiative may have played a part in supporting the welcoming school environment.

Parents who had children with IEPs had attitudes that are more favorable toward ISP schools than Non-ISP schools. Specifically, Parents perceived ISP school staff as applying more effort towards students. Furthermore, ISP schools were perceived as having a positive impact on mathematics, social adjustment, behavior, and planning skills. Parent perceptions, whose home language was not English, did not differ between ISP and Non-ISP schools.

The final objective examined how effective the ISP initiative improved student achievement scores, sense of belonging and student engagement. All students associated with the ISP schools made gains in science and reading achievement with IEP and ELL populations specifically benefiting from the ISP initiative. The gains in achievement parallel's Jenkins (2005; MacGregor & Vogelsberg, 1998) who identified gains in mathematics achievement. Further, these results discount Huber and colleagues (Huber, Rosenfeld, & Fiorello, 2001) who found high-achieving students drop in achievement scores within inclusive classrooms. In this case, all students made gains in science and reading.

ISP students had a greater sense of belonging than the Non-ISP students. However, sense of belonging did drop in the April 2008 administration. All ISP students expressed greater sense of belonging, but the same perception did not appear among the students with IEPs or ELL students. This is disappointing since it is with these student populations who need to feel

more included in an inclusive school. There were no differences at any level in the degree of student engagement. A likely factor for the drop in student sense of belonging and engagement in April 2008 may be that these surveys were administered immediately after mandated state and district testing. CCSD students are heavily involved in testing February through March.

Implications for Practice

The ISP initiative can be an effective means of introducing school personnel to inclusive practices. The ISP initiative provides an overview of several inclusive practices, but focus primarily on differentiated instruction and co-teaching. These courses provide a framework of adapting the presentation of information in a manner consistent to the needs of each student. In the pull-out instructional model, special education teachers provide specific learning strategies that benefit students in the resource room. When the same strategies are applied in a co-teaching model, students who do not have IEPs benefit from the different presentations and activities while working under the same curriculum framework. Continued support through additional participation in ISP workshops—such as moving from the basic workshops to the advanced workshops may have benefit.

Those schools who participated in the ISP initiative had a vision of supporting all children by adapting to specific individual needs. ISP activities are available for administration and paraprofessionals bringing school staff to a common vision. A number of benefits can arise from a common vision. A teacher's perspective can move from what an instructor teaches to a goal of how each student learns. Teaching practices may change through the activities, for example, co-teaching extending to new collaborations throughout a school. This common vision has the potential to extend and include families.

Limitations and Future Directions

The greatest limitation of this study was teacher participation in the professional development. It is clear that participants in ISP sponsored professional development did not realize that they were attending ISP professional development. While this is not a fundamental problem, it is troublesome when considering that the ISP initiative is focused on building a sustainable culture of inclusion at the school. The lack of school participation would lead to low

awareness or education about the ISP initiative. Low awareness would then lead to low implementation of strategies promoted in ISP workshops. The ISP initiative may need to tie together the string of professional development opportunities to the larger goal of the program, so that staff is more likely to see the vision of ISP.

The link between specific classroom activities and positive student outcomes is tenuous in this study due to data and sampling limitations. The results of this study are promising, but only 6 elementary schools were evaluated out of 217 district elementary schools. Accessing more schools would have provided a more accurate picture of what is occurring in ISP and Non-ISP schools. Furthermore, these 3 ISP schools were in the first year of implementation. Studying elementary schools that have been associated with the ISP initiative for four years may to provide a different picture.

It is not clear from the self-reported implementation data whether ISP participants increased or changed their use of strategies from October 2007 to April 2008. ISP teachers appeared to have started off with a higher level of usage than Non-ISP staff. This could be due to different perceptions of what it means to use a strategy. Observational data is highly recommended to confirm and capture what teachers are actually doing in the classroom and the extent to which this changes over time. Evaluating ISP schools with different years of engagement in the ISP initiative should provide a better picture of inclusive strategy implementation.

Recommendations

These results can be considered preliminary at best, but we can suggest that over time, schools that participate in ISP professional development may have more implementation of certain practices due to the focused and sustained nature of the ISP professional development. This study does replicate previous research in that student gains in academic achievement are documented. This research demonstrates specific gains in science and reading. We documented positive attitudes in parents of children engaged in inclusive practices. Additional research could pinpoint which aspects of the ISP initiative should be kept or modified, and which aspects will not be effective.

Knowledge and experience with inclusive practices among CCSD teachers runs along a continuum. There are teachers who are successfully co-teaching in classrooms, and teachers who are highly resistant to working with an inclusive model. Teachers at specific levels of knowledge could be identified with the goal of providing those teachers a framework supporting successful inclusive practices in their classrooms. Workshops focusing on one or two strategies may lead to more cohesive systematic implementation. Targeted workshops may be a more effective use of time and resources by removing redundancies between professional development and experience. Targeting the needs of the teachers involved in the ISP initiative by providing additional differentiated professional development models the philosophy we wish to promote."

Related, a culture that supports inclusive practices needs to be promoted. Without the support of the school community, these practices may be attempted or applied for only a short period. Schools with inclusive cultures need to be identified and recognized. Studying the culture of these schools may lead to identifying elements that can be taught and emulated in other schools. While certain schools in this study reflect an inclusive culture, more studying is needed to distinguish personal philosophy and practice from perceived socially appropriate responses.

REFERENCES

Anderman, L. (2003). Academic and social perceptions as predictors of change in middle school students' sense of school belonging. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 72*(1), 5-22.

Antonak, R. F., & Larrivee, B. (1995). Psychometric analysis and revisions of the Opinions Relative to Mainstreaming Scale. *Exceptional Children, 62*, 139-149.

Baker, J.M. (1995). Inclusion in Washington: Educational experiences of students with learning disabilities in one elementary school. *The Journal of Special Education, 29(2),* 155-162.

Bear, G. g. & Proctor, W. A. (1990). Impact of a full-time integrated program on the achievement of nonhandicapped and mildly handicapped children. *Exceptionality, 1*, 227-238.

Burstein, N., Spears, S., Wilcoxen, A., Cabello, B., Spagna, M. (2004). Moving toward inclusive practices. *Remedial and Special Education, 25(2),* 104-116.

Byrt, T., Bishop, J. and Carlin, J.B. (1993). Bias, prevalence and Kappa. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 46*, 423-439.

Calhoon, M. & Fuchs, L. (2003). The effects of peer-assisted learned strategies and curriculum -based measurement on the mathematics performance of secondary students with disabilities. *Remedial & Special Education, 24,* 235.

Cole, D.A., & Meyer, L.H. (1991). Social integration and severe disabilities: A longitudinal analysis of child outcomes. *Journal of Special Education, 25*, 340-351.

Daane, C.J., Beirne-Smith, M., & Latham, D. (2001). Administrators' and teachers perceptions of the collaborative efforts of inclusion in the elementary grades. *Education, 121(2),* 331-338.

Daniel, L. G., & King, D. A. (2001). Impact of inclusion education on academic achievement, student behavior and self-esteem, and parental attitudes. *The Journal of Educational Research, 91(2*), 67-80.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). Reframing the school reform agenda. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*, 753-761.

Erwin, E.J. & Sodak, L.C. (1995). I never knew I could stand up to the system: Families' perspectives on pursuing inclusive education. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 20(2*), 136-146.

Fryxell, D., & Kennedy, C.H. (1995). Placement along the continuum of services and its impact on students' social relationships. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 20*, 259-269.

Gibson, S. & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(4*), 569-582.

Goodenow, C. (1993). The Psychological Sense of School Membership among adolescents: Scale development and educational correlates. *Psychology in the Schools, 30*, 79-90.

Hintze, J. (2005). Psychometrics of direct observation. *School Psychology Review, 34(4*), 507-519.

Howes, A., Booth, T., Dyson, A., Frankham, J. (2005). Teacher learning and the development of inclusice practices and policies: Framing and context. *Research Papers in Education, 20(2*), 133-148.

Huber, K., Rosenfeld, J., & Fiorello, C. (2001, November). The differential impact of inclusion and inclusive practices on high, average, and low achieving general education students. *Psychology in the Schools*, *38(6),* 497.

Hunt, P., Farron-Davis, F., Beckstead, S., Curtis, D., & Goetz, L. (1994). Evaluating the effects of placement of students with severe disabilities in general education versus special classes. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 19(3),* 200-214.

Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education: A program of evaluation of eight schools. Remedial and special education, 27(2), 77-94.

Larrivee, B., & Cook, L. (2001). Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teacher attitude. *The Journal of Special Education, 13 (3),* 315-324.

Lindsay, G. (2007). Educational psychology and the effectiveness of inclusive education/mainstreaming. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*, 1-24.

Manset, G., & Semmel, M. I. (1997). Are inclusive programs for students with mild disabilities effective? A comparative review of model programs. *Journal of Special Education, 31(2),* 155-180.

Marston, D. (1996). A comparison of inclusion only, pull-out only, and combined service models for students with mild disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education, 30(2),* 121-132.

McDougal, D., & Brady, M.P. (1998). Initiating and fading self-management interventions to increase mathematics fluency in general education classes. Exceptional Children, 64(2), 151-166.

McGregor, G. & Vogelsberg, R. T. (1998). *Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

McGregor, G. & Vogelsberg, R. T. (2000). *Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Minke, K.M., Bear, G.G., Deemer, S.A. & Griffin, S.M. (1996). Teachers' experiences with inclusive classrooms: Implications for special education reform. *Journal of Special Education, 30(2*), 152-186.

Murray, C., & Greenberg, M. (2006). Examining the importance of social relationships and social contexts in the lives of children with high-incidence disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education*, *39(4),* 220-233.

Patrick, B., Skinner, E., & Connell, J. (1993). What motivates children's behavior and emotion? Joint effects of perceived control and autonomy in the academic domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65(4),* 781-791.

Peck, C. A., Staub, D., Gallucci, C., & Schwartz, I. (2004). Parent perception of the impacts of inclusion on their nondisabled child. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 29(2*), 135-143.

Rheams, T.A., & Bain, S.K. (2005). Social interaction interventions in an inclusive era: Attitudes of teachers in early childhood self-contained and inclusive settings. *Psychology in the Schools, 42*, 53-63.

Savage, R. (2006). Effective early reading instruction and inclusion: Some reflections on mutual dependence. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 10 ,* 347-361.

Shapiro, E. S. (2004). *Academic Skills Problems Workbook*. The Guilford Press.

Vaughn, S. & Klingner, J. K. (1998). Students' perceptions of inclusion and resource room settings. T*he Journal of Special Education, 32(2),* 79-88.

Vlachou, A., Didaskalou, E. & Argyrakouli, E. (2006). Preferences of students with general learning difficulties for different service delivery modes. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 21(2), 201-216.*

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1994) *The Salamanca statement on principles, policy and practice in special needs education framework for action*. Salamanca, Spain. Retrieved October 7, 2008, from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0009/000984/098427Eo.pdf

Walther-Thomas, C.S. (1997). *Co-teaching experiences: The benefits and problems that teachers and principals report over time*.

Weisch, R. (2006). In or out: Surprises in reading comprehension instruction. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 41(3),* 175-179.

Wiener, J. (2004). Do peer relationships foster behavioral adjustment in children with learning disabilities? *Learning Disabilities, 27(1*), 21-30.

Wiener, J., & Tardif, C. (2004). Social and emotional functioning of children with learning disabilities: Does special education placement make a difference? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 19(1*), 20-32.

Wilson, Gl. L. & Michaels, C. A. (2006). General and special education students' perceptions of co-teaching: Implications for secondary-level literacy instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 22*, 205-225.

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

APPENDIX

Teacher Perception of School Climate

	Vision
	The school administration has a clearly defined vision for the school.
	I share the school administration's vision for our school.
	Staff at my school is attentive and responsive to the needs of others.
	Negative language and actions are discouraged at my school.
	Our school administrators actively promote the philosophy that it is the goal of the staff to help students meet their full academic potential.
	Providing special education students access to the curriculum is a goal of my administration
	Positive Environment
	My administrators make sure that students feel like they belong at our school.
	Diverse learners are welcomed at our school.
	I feel respected as a professional by my administration.
	People in our school make an extra effort to build personal relationships with students and their parents.
	Support and Resources
	The school administration provides staff with instructional supports to meet the needs of diverse learners.
	My administration responds to my professional needs.
	Collaboration among teachers is encouraged by school administrators.
	The school administration allocates time for teacher collaboration.
	I have enough time to effectively teach my students.
	I spend too much time on paperwork and other non-instructional activities.
	My administration often visits my classroom to see how things are going.
	The school allocates its resources to give all students the instruction and materials they need to learn.
	Decision-Making
	The school administration takes my opinion into consideration when making instructional decisions
	I am able to make instructional decisions in my classroom
	Decisions at our school are based on staff needs.
	Decisions at our school are based on student needs.
	Instruction in our school is adapted to fit the individual needs of students.
	Decision-making groups or teams include students

Teacher Efficacy

A number of statements about organizations, people, and teaching are presented below. The purpose is to gather information regarding the actual attitudes of educators concerning these statements. There are no correct or incorrect answers. We are interested only in your frank opinions. Your responses will remain confidential.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of each statement.

KEY: 1=Strongly Agree 2=Moderately Agree 3=Agree slightly more than disagree 4=Disagree slightly more than agree 4=Moderately Disagree 6=Strongly Disagree

1. When a student does better than usually, many times it is because I exert a little extra effort.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. If students aren't disciplined at home, they aren't likely to accept any discipline.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5. I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6. When a student is having difficulty with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it his/her level.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7. When a student gets a better grade than he/she usually gets, it is usually because I found better ways of teaching that student.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9. A teacher is very limited in what he/she can achieve because a student's home environment large influences on his/her achievement.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Teachers are not a very powerful influence on student achievement when all factors are considered.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11. When the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I found more effective approaches.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12. If a student masters a new concept quickly, this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching that concept.	1 2 3 4 5 6
13. If parents would do more for their children, I could do more.	1 2 3 4 5 6
14. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15. The influences of a student’s home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.	1 2 3 4 5 6

16. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18. If one of my students couldn't do a class assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty.	1 2 3 4 5 6
19. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.	1 2 3 4 5 6
20. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.	1 2 3 4 5 6
21. Some students need to be placed in slower groups so they are not subjected to unrealistic expectations.	1 2 3 4 5 6
22. My teacher training program and/or experience has given me the necessary skills to be an effective teacher	1 2 3 4 5 6

From Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*, 81-91. Originally based on the Teacher Efficacy Scale developed by S. Gibson & M. Dembo (1984). Teacher Efficacy: a construct validation*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 569-582.

Student ID Number _____ Teacher Last Name or Initials _____

	INCLUSIVE PRACTICES STUDY **Teacher Report of Student Engagement**	**Not At All True**	**Not Very True**	**Sort Of True**	**Very True**
A.	When we start something new in class, this student…				
	1. participates in discussions……	1	2	3	4
	2. doesn't pay attention……	1	2	3	4
	3. is enthusiastic……	1	2	3	4
	4. thinks about other things……	1	2	3	4
	5. seems restless……	1	2	3	4
B.	In my class, this student…				
	1. works as hard as he/she can……	1	2	3	4
	2. does just enough to get by……	1	2	3	4
	3. seems interested ……	1	2	3	4
	4. is anxious……	1	2	3	4
	5. is angry……	1	2	3	4
	6. does more than is required……	1	2	3	4
	7. seems unhappy……	1	2	3	4
	8. comes unprepared……	1	2	3	4
C.	When working on classwork in my class, this student…				
	1. appears worried……	1	2	3	4
	2. seems to feel good ……	1	2	3	4
	3. appears frustrated……	1	2	3	4
	4. appears involved……	1	2	3	4
	5. seems uninterested……	1	2	3	4
D.	When I explain new material, this student…				
	1. doesn't seem to care……	1	2	3	4
	2. listens carefully……	1	2	3	4
E.	When faced with a difficult problem or assignment in my class, this student…				
	1. "attacks" it……	1	2	3	4
	2. gives up quickly……	1	2	3	4
	3. becomes frustrated……	1	2	3	4
	4. doesn't even try……	1	2	3	4
	5. gets angry……	1	2	3	4
	6. just keeps trying……	1	2	3	4
F.	When this student doesn't do well on a test or assignment in class, he/she…				
	1. feels terrible……	1	2	3	4
	2. bounces back……	1	2	3	4
	3. is devastated……	1	2	3	4
	4. gets angry……	1	2	3	4
	5. gets depressed……	1	2	3	4
	6. works harder the next time……	1	2	3	4

Opinions Relative to the Integration of Students with Disabilities

General Directions: Educators have long realized that one of the most important influences on a child's educational progress is the classroom teacher. The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information that will aid school systems in increasing the classroom teacher's effectiveness with students with disabilities placed in his or her classroom. Please circle the number to the left of each item that best describes your agreement or disagreement with the statement. There are no correct answers: the best answers are those that honestly reflect your feelings. There is no time limit, but you should work as quickly as you can.

Please respond to every statement.

KEY

-3: I disagree very much
-2: I disagree pretty much
-1: I disagree a little
+1: I agree a little
+2: I agree pretty much
+3: I agree very much

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	1. Most students with disabilities will make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	2. Integration of students with disabilities will necessitate extensive retraining of general-classroom teachers.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	3. Integration offers mixed group interaction that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	4. It is likely that the student with a disability will exhibit behavior problems in a general classroom.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	5. Students with disabilities can best be served in general classrooms.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	6. The extra attention students with disabilities require will be to the detriment of the other students.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	7. The challenge of being in a general classroom will promote the academic growth of the student with a disability.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	8. Integration of students with disabilities will require significant changes in general classroom procedures.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	9. Increased freedom in the general classroom creates too much confusion for the student with a disability.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	10. General-classroom teachers have the ability necessary to work with students with disabilities.
-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3	11. The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.

Please respond to every statement.

KEY

-3: I disagree very much
-2: I disagree pretty much
-1: I disagree a little
+1: I agree a little
+2: I agree pretty much
+3: I agree very much

-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	12. The behavior of students with disabilities will set a bad example for students without disabilities.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	13. The student with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a general classroom than in a special classroom.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	14. Integration of the student with a disability will not promote his or her social independence.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	15. It is not more difficult to maintain order in a general classroom that contains a student with a disability than in one that does not contain a student with a disability.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	16. Students with disabilities will not monopolize the general-classroom teacher's time.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	17. The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	18. Students with disabilities are likely to create confusion in the general classroom.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	19. General-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach students with disabilities.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	20. Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the student with a disability.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	21. Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in the general classroom where possible.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	22. The classroom behavior of the student with a disability generally does not require more patience from the teacher than does the classroom behavior of the student without a disability.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	23. Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special- than by general-classroom teachers.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	24. Isolation in a special classroom has a beneficial effect on the social and emotional development of the student with a disability.
-3	**-2**	**-1**	**+1**	**+2**	**+3**	25. The student with a disability will not be socially isolated in the general classroom.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Barbara Larrivee

Richard F. Antonak

© ORI 1993

Principal Interview Questions

1. What do you take into consideration when you are developing your master schedule?
2. Who, how, and when is your master schedule developed?
3. What is the make-up of individual classes and how is that determined?
4. Describe the collaborative teaching practices on campus.
5. How would you define inclusion? What does it mean to you? Describe the inclusive practices on your campus.
6. What teaching practices and philosophies are endorsed/used school wide (e.g. Marzano, etc)?
7. What direction do you see your school moving with RTI?
8. How does your staff deal with behavior issues on your campus?
9. How would you describe the parental involvement and parent outreach at your school?
10. What sorts of services to do you have to meet the needs of diverse learners at your school?

* We need a list or schedule of school-based professional development activities provided in 2007-2008

Parent/Family Inclusive Practices Study Survey

Section A

INFORMATION ABOUT ME

My role in this child's life
Mother
Father
Grandparent
Guardian
Other

Race / Ethnicity
White
Black or African - American
Hispanic or Latino
Asian or Pacific Islander
American Indian or Alaskan Native

Gender
Male
Female

Highest Year of Education Completed
Less than 8th grade
8th grade
9th grade
10th grade
11th grade
12th grade/high school graduate
GED
Some college
Associate's degree
Bachelor's degree
Master's degree
M.D./Ph.D.

Age in years

Section B

The following questions are about you and your child's experiences with your child's school.

		Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
		-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
	Impact on My Child						
1	*My child* feels safe at school.						
2	*My child* is treated with respect.						
3	*My child* is welcomed in his or her class.						
4	*My child* is valued as a learner in his or her class.						
5	*My child* has friends to play with at school.						
	Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents						
6	I have a good working relationship with my child's teacher(s).						
7	Information is provided to me in a language I understand.						
8	Written information I receive is written in an understandable way.						
9	I was given information about the curriculum and materials used with my child.						
10	I was given information about the behavior and discipline policies of my child's school.						
11	I was given information about the instructional methods used with my child.						
12	I was given information about expectations about what my child will be able to achieve.						
13	I am comfortable asking questions and expressing concerns to school staff.						
14	I feel welcome when I come into my child's classroom.						
	Teachers and administrators						
15	*My child's teachers* are available to speak with me.						

		Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
16	*My child's teachers* are good at working with families.						
17	*My child's teachers* answer my questions.						
18	*Teachers and administrators at my child's school* respect my cultural heritage.						
19	*Teachers and administrators at my child's school* seek out parent input.						
20	*Teachers and administrators at my child's school* expect parents to participate in decision-making.						
21	*Teachers and administrators at my child's school* acknowledge parents' efforts.						
22	*Teachers and administrators at my child's school* respect my family's values.						
23	*Teachers and administrators at my child's school* show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities and their families.						
	The school						
24	*My child's school* offers parents training if they need help understanding the curriculum being taught to their child.						
25	*My child's school* explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.						
26	*My child's school* gives parents the help they need to play an active role in their child's education.						
27	*My child's school* has a person on staff who is available to answer parents' questions.						
28	*My child's school* offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers.						
29	*My child's school* gives me enough information to know whether or not my child is making adequate progress.						
	Quality of Services						
	Teachers and administrators						
30	*My child's teachers* know how to meet my child's needs.						
31	*My child's teachers* expect my child to succeed.						
32	*My child's teachers* set appropriate goals for my child.						
33	*My child's teachers* consider my child's interests when developing teaching activities.						
34	*My child's teachers* understand my child's behavior.						
35	*My child's teachers* show a willingness to learn more about my child's needs.						
36	*My child's teachers* are knowledgeable and professional.						
37	*The school principal* sets a positive and welcoming tone in the school.						
38	*The school principal* is available when I need his/her help concerning my child.						
39	*The school principal* does everything possible to support appropriate special education services in the school.						
40	*Teachers and administrators at my child's school* effectively manage incidents of teasing or bullying.						
41	*Teachers and administrators at my child's school* set a climate for acceptance of diversity.						
42	*Teachers and administrators at my child's school* ensure that students with disabilities have the same opportunities to learn and participate in school activities as students without disabilities.						
	The school						
43	*My child's school* offers students without disabilities and their families the opportunity to learn about students with disabilities.						
44	*My child's school* has a written policy about harassment, teasing, and bullying of students.						
45	*My child's school* is a friendly place.						

		Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
46	I am part of a state or district level special education committee.						
47	I participate in the school's Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) or Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO).						
48	I participate in activities sponsored by the PTA/PTO.						
49	I work with others to improve the special education system.						
50	I participate in school-sponsored activities.						
51	I ask my child about his or her homework assignments.						
52	I engage in learning activities with my child at home.						
53	I communicate with my child's teacher(s) by phone or email or notes.						
54	I read material sent to me by the school.						
55	I am satisfied with the quality of services that my child receives.						

*This survey is adapted from the NCSEAM Part B Family Survey

Section C

This section is about your opinion of including special education students in general education classrooms. It is ok if you do not have a student with special needs – you can still participate in this part of the survey. Please answer to the best of your knowledge.

		I disagree very much	I disagree pretty much	I disagree a little	I agree a little	I agree pretty much	I agree very much
		-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
56	Integration offers mixed group interactions that will foster understanding and acceptance of differences among students.						
57	Students with disabilities can best be served in general classrooms.						
58	The challenge of being in a general classroom will promote the academic growth of the student with a disability.						
59	Integration of students with disabilities will require significant changes in general classroom procedures.						
60	The presence of students with disabilities will not promote acceptance of differences on the part of students without disabilities.						
61	The student with a disability will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a general classroom than a special classroom.						
62	Integration of the student with a disability will not promote his or her social independence.						
63	The integration of students with disabilities can be beneficial for students without disabilities.						

64	Integration will likely have a negative effect on the emotional development of the student with a disability.						
65	Students with disabilities should be given every opportunity to function in the general classroom where possible.						
66	Teaching students with disabilities is better done by special- than by general- classroom teachers.						
67	Isolation in a special classroom has a beneficial effect on the social and emotional development of the student with a disability.						

***** Section C adapted from the *Opinions Relative to the Integration of Students with Disabilities* survey from Antonak and Larrivee.

Additional comments:

Thank you for Participating

Supplemental Survey for Parents of Special Education Students

INFORMATION ABOUT MY CHILD

Please answer the following questions by checking the boxes if they apply to your child …

A. Does your child have any disabilities?			**C. Does your child have an Individualized Educational Program (IEP)?**	
Yes			Yes	
No			No	
B. If yes, what is your child's primary exceptionality/disability?			**D. If yes, please select all areas in which your child has goals on his or her Individualized Educational Program (IEP):**	
Autism			Not applicable	
Deaf - Blindness			Reading	
Deafness			Writing	
Emotional Disturbance			Mathematics	
Hearing Impairment			Speech/Language	
Mental Retardation (MR)			Social/Emotional	
Multiple Disabilities			Behavior	
Orthopedic Impairment			Independent living/adaptive skills	
Other Health Impairment (OHI)				
Specific Learning Disability (LD)			**E. Age Upon Referral to Early Intervention or Special Education:**	
Speech or Language Impairment			Under 1 year of age	
Traumatic Brain Injury			***OR***	
Visual Impairment including Blindness			Age in Years	
Other (please state):				

	The following questions are about you and your child's experiences with your child's school.	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
1	*My child's school* responds appropriately to my child's needs.						
2	*My child's school* encourages student involvement in IEP meetings.						
3	*My child's school* ensures that after-school and extracurricular activities are accessible to students with disabilities.						
4	*My child* is not teased in school because of his/her disability.						
5	*My child* is being taught the general curriculum to the maximum extent possible based on his/her needs and goals.						

	The following questions are about you and your child's experiences with your child's school.	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
6	*My child's teachers* understand their role in implementing my child's Individualized Educational Program (IEP).						
7	I was given information, at the annual IEP, about my rights as a parent of a child who is eligible for special education services.						
8	I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs.						
9	We discussed whether my child could be educated satisfactorily in the regular classroom with appropriate aids and supports.						
10	At the IEP meeting, we discussed accommodations and modifications that my child would need.						
11	General education teachers make accommodations and modifications in the regular education class as indicated on my child's IEP.						
12	General education and special education teachers work together to assure that my child's IEP is being implemented.						
13	I am satisfied with the quality of services that my child receives.						
Over the past year, special education services have had a positive impact on my child's progress in the following areas (skip any items that do not apply to your child):							
14	- Reading						
15	- Writing						
16	- Mathematics						
17	- Speech/Language						
18	- Social/Emotional						
19	- Behavior						
20	- Organizational and planning skills						
Over the past year, special education services have helped me and/or my family:							
21	- cope with stressful situations.						
22	- feel more confident in my skills.						
23	- keep up friendships for my child and family.						
24	- know about my child's and family's rights concerning special education services.						
25	- be able to evaluate how much progress my child is making.						
26	- be more effective in managing my child's behavior.						
27	- get the services and supports that my child and family need.						
28	- do things with and for my child that are good for my child's development.						
29	- understand my child's special needs.						
30	- communicate more effectively with the people who work with my child and my family.						

*This survey is adapted from the NCSEAM Part B Family Survey

Thank you for Participating

Student Survey – Inclusive Practices Study

The school district is doing a study about what schools are doing to help students learn. We would like to ask you to take a short survey that has questions about how you feel about school. Your opinions are very important and will help us know what you think about your school.

Your answers will be kept secret and no one at your school, even your teacher, will be able to see them when you are finished with the survey.

Your parents have said that it is ok for us to ask you if you would like to participate in the study. It is up to you whether or not you decide to take the survey or answer all the questions. If you don't want to do the survey, just tell your teacher. No one will be upset with you if you decide not to participate.

Do you have any questions?

If you want to answer the survey questions, we are going to begin now.

Thank you for helping us out today!

---

1. What is your name? **Please write your first and last name.**

   _____

2. Who is your teacher? Please circle your teacher's name.

Mrs. O'Farrell	Mrs. Wright-Clancy	Mr. Quinn
Ms. Muhammad	Ms. Stites	Mrs. Soto
Mr. Martin	Ms. Hutchinson	Ms. Daffan
Mr. Grundy	Ms. Simpson	

Observation Protocol for the CCSD
Inclusive Practices Study

Before Arriving at School

Call the office and make sure that the teacher you plan to observe is present in the classroom that day.

Upon Arrival at School

Check in with the office manager and sign the visitor log. If the principal or assistant principal is available, stop by and advise them of your visit (will know in advance the week of observations). Check with the front office to see if anyone is available to escort you to the classroom. Be sure to ask your escort to identify the students you will be observing if they know them. If not, try to find out from the classroom teacher.
Always follow all school rules and protocols. No exceptions.

Prior to the Observation

If students are occupied or if it is during a transition time when you enter the room, introduce yourself to the teacher, reminding him/her that you are part of the Inclusive Practices Study (they will be notified ahead of time that an observer may be present during the week). Let the teacher know that you do not need anything special, you just want to quietly observe for about an hour. Make sure to ask if they have any questions.

If you enter during the middle of a class session, either quietly take a seat or, if acknowledged by the teacher, briefly explain your presence, sit down, begin observations, and wait until a break in the class to approach with more information.

Observation Time Structure (at minute mark)

- 0-5 minutes: Get settled and record the classroom checklist information.
- Coordinate with partner and turn on cue tape.
- 5-25 minutes: Target student observations
- 25-28 minutes: Break and transition to classroom observation
- 28-64 minutes: Classroom observation

Things to Remember

- For partnered observations, please share a tape recorder so that there are no problems with timing.
- Make every effort to be as least disruptive as possible. Minimize any talking or movement during the observational period. You may want to bring a small pad of scratch paper should you wish to write a note to your partner.
- Take a seating chart with you if available and make notes if appropriate to record relevant events.

Classroom Checklist

Teacher:_____ Date:_____

Observer:_____

Observation Partner:_____

Time Entering Class:_____

Time Leaving Class:_____

As you enter the room, before beginning timed observations, take a moment to assess the classroom environment. Use the checklist below to indicate the presence (with a checkmark √) or absence (leave blank) of these **visible**, static characteristics. Do not use the checklist to describe elements of the classroom that are fluid: that is what the timed observation is for.

Samples of student work displayed		Curriculum standards clearly displayed	
Essential questions/content objective for the day posted on board		Posters display cultural diversity	
Agenda for day posted on board		Information about, and mementos of, those who spend time together in the classroom displayed	
Procedures/guidelines/class rules displayed			

Behavioral Observation of Students in Schools (BOSS)

Child Observed: _____ Academic Subject: _____

Date: _____ Setting: ___ ISW:TPsnt ___ SmGp:TPsnt

Observer: _____ ___ ISW:TSmGp ___ LgGp:TPsnt

Time of Observation: _____ Interval Length: _____ Other: _____

Moment	1	2	3	4	5*	6	7	8	9	10*	11	12	13	14	15*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	16	17	18	19	20*	21	22	23	24	25*	26	27	28	29	30*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	31	32	33	34	35*	36	37	38	39	40*	41	42	43	44	45*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	46	47	48	49	50*	51	52	53	54	55*	56	57	58	59	60*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		

OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	61	62	63	64	65*	66	67	68	69	70*	71	72	73	74	75*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	76	77	78	79	80*	S	P	T
AET								
PET								
Partial								
OFT-M								
OFT-V								
OFT-P								
TDI								

Target Student

S AET _____ % AET _____

S PET _____ % PET _____

S OFT-M _____ % OFT-M _____

S OFT-V _____ % OFT-V _____

OFT-P _____ % OFT-P _____

Total Student Intervals Observed

_____

*Peer Comparison

S AET _____ % AET _____

S PET _____ % PET _____

S OFT-M _____ % OFT-M _____

S OFT-V _____ % OFT-V _____

OFT-P _____ % OFT-P _____

Teacher

S TDI _____

% TDI _____

Total Peer and Teacher Intervals Observed _____

How I Feel About School Survey

Let's practice a question together. Read Question #3 and then **circle** the answer that best fits how you feel. Only circle **1** answer.

3. I like dogs.
   A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

Let's move on to the next questions. Follow along as I read, then click the ONE answer that best fits how you feel.

4. I try hard to do well in school.
   A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

5. I enjoy learning new things in class.
   A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

6. When we work on something in class, I feel discouraged.
   A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

7. In class, I do just enough to get by.
   A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

8. Class is fun.
   A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

9. In class, I work as hard as I can.
   A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

10. When I'm in class, I feel bad.
    A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

11. When I'm in class, I listen very carefully.
    A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

12. When I'm in class, I feel worried.
    A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

13. When we work on something in class, I get involved.
    A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

14. When I'm in class, I think about other things.
    A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

15. When we work on something in class, I feel interested.
    A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

16. Class is not all that fun for me.
    A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

17. When I'm in class, I just act like I'm working.
    A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

18. When I'm in class, I feel good.
    A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

19. When I'm in class, my mind wanders.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

20. When I'm in class, I participate in class discussions.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

21. When we work on something in class, I feel bored.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

22. I don't try very hard at school.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

23. I pay attention in class.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

24. I wish I were in a different school.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

25. I feel like a real part of this school.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

26. I am proud of belonging to this school.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

27. I can really be myself in this school.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

28. Sometimes I feel as if I don't belong here.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

29. If I decide to learn something hard, I can.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

30. I can't get good grades, even if I want to.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

31. I can do well in school if I want to.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

32. I can't stop myself from doing poorly in school.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

33. I can get good grades if I want to.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

34. I can't do well in school, even if I want to.
A) Not at all true B) Not very true C) Sort of true D) Very true

Good Job! Thank you so much for answering the questions!

Classroom Quality – Observed Indicators of Inclusive Activities (CQ-OIIA)

Students pulled out of class:

Number of students and/or Names	Reason for pullout if known	Time out	Time in

General Coding

Use the following coding structure to denote the presence (with a checkmark √) or absence (leave blank) of a behavior.

Remember – you are recording what happens during the observation period. For example, you will record everything that happens during the first observation period, second observation period (2 minutes each), etc., NOT what happens only when you hear "1".

Special Codes for Classroom Observation

- Students off-task – this is the only code with a slightly different protocol. Record your estimate of the number of students off-task at the moment when you hear the prompt "1", etc.
    - 0 = no students off-task
    - 1 = less than 25% of students off-task
    - 2 = 25-50% of students off-task
    - 3 = 50-75% of students off-task
    - 4 = 75-100% of students off-task

Note subject/topic changes above the observation period																		
Observation Period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Students off-task (***use codes***)																		
Teacher activities – Teacher…																		
Whole group instruction																		
Facilitating/coaching/assisting individuals or small groups in support role																		
Direct instruction in small group setting																		
Administrative tasks (gradebook, attendance, distributing materials, etc)																		
Presentation of learning material is multi-modal (i.e. auditory, visual, tactile/kinesthetic)																		
Encourages student exploration of ideas (e.g. open-ended questions, reframe ideas, etc.)																		
"Shuts down" student exploration of ideas (e.g. ignores student, provides overly simplistic answer, etc.)																		
Lesson links knowledge to meaningful, real-world contexts																		
Teacher interactions with students – Teacher…																		
Clearly communicates expectations																		
Appears unaware of disruptive behavior																		
Ignores disruptive behavior																		
Responds to disruptive behavior negatively																		
Intervenes calmly to address disruptive behavior																		
Redirects negative or disruptive behavior and/or explains why the behavior is wrong																		
Is aware of, and addresses, teasing or bullying																		
Does not intervene in teasing or bullying																		
Allows sufficient time for child to respond																		
Does not allow time for child to respond																		
Student Work Environment																		
Classroom climate is positive and supportive																		
Classroom climate is negative																		
Individual students working independently																		
Students working collaboratively																		
Student presentations																		
Student work is activity based																		
Student work is paper and pencil based																		
Students reading silently or sitting listening																		
Adaptive environment																		
Prescribed and rigid environment																		

Field Notes/Narrative (use as needed before, during, after observations)

Behavioral Observation of Students in Schools (BOSS)

Child Observed: _____ Academic Subject: _____

Date: _____ Setting: ___ ISW:TPsnt ___ SmGp:TPsnt

Observer: _____ ___ ISW:TSmGp ___ LgGp:TPsnt

Time of Observation: _____ Interval Length: _____ Other: _____

Moment	1	2	3	4	5*	6	7	8	9	10*	11	12	13	14	15*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	16	17	18	19	20*	21	22	23	24	25*	26	27	28	29	30*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	31	32	33	34	35*	36	37	38	39	40*	41	42	43	44	45*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		

OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	46	47	48	49	50*	51	52	53	54	55*	56	57	58	59	60*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	61	62	63	64	65*	66	67	68	69	70*	71	72	73	74	75*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	76	77	78	79	80*	S	P	T
AET								
PET								
Partial								
OFT-M								
OFT-V								
OFT-P								
TDI								

Target Student

S AET _____ % AET _____

S PET _____ % PET _____

S OFT-M _____ % OFT-M _____

S OFT-V _____ % OFT-V _____

OFT-P _____ % OFT-P _____

Total Student Intervals Observed

_____

*Peer Comparison

S AET _____ % AET _____

S PET _____ % PET _____

Teacher

S TDI _____

% TDI _____

S OFT-M _____ % OFT-M _____

S OFT-V _____ % OFT-V _____

OFT-P _____ % OFT-P _____

Total Peer and Teacher Intervals Observed _____

Behavioral Observation of Students in Schools (BOSS)

Child Observed: _____ Academic Subject: _____

Date: _____ Setting: ___ ISW:TPsnt ___ SmGp:TPsnt

Observer: _____ ___ ISW:TSmGp ___ LgGp:TPsnt

Time of Observation: _____ Interval Length: _____ Other: _____

Moment	1	2	3	4	5*	6	7	8	9	10*	11	12	13	14	15*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	16	17	18	19	20*	21	22	23	24	25*	26	27	28	29	30*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	31	32	33	34	35*	36	37	38	39	40*	41	42	43	44	45*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	46	47	48	49	50*	51	52	53	54	55*	56	57	58	59	60*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		

Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	61	62	63	64	65*	66	67	68	69	70*	71	72	73	74	75*	S	P	T
AET																		
PET																		
Partial																		
OFT-M																		
OFT-V																		
OFT-P																		
TDI																		

Moment	76	77	78	79	80*	S	P	T
AET								
PET								
Partial								
OFT-M								
OFT-V								
OFT-P								
TDI								

Target Student

S AET _____ % AET _____

S PET _____ % PET _____

S OFT-M _____ % OFT-M _____

S OFT-V _____ % OFT-V _____

OFT-P _____ % OFT-P _____

Total Student Intervals Observed

_____

*Peer Comparison

S AET _____ % AET _____

S PET _____ % PET _____

S OFT-M _____ % OFT-M _____

S OFT-V _____ % OFT-V _____

OFT-P _____ % OFT-P _____

Teacher

S TDI _____

% TDI _____

Total Peer and Teacher Intervals Observed _____

From *Academic Skills Problems Workbook* (rev. ed.) by Edward S. Shapiro. Copyright 2004 by The Guilford Press.