

Longwood University

## Digital Commons @ Longwood University

---

Theses, Dissertations & Honors Papers

---

5-1-1996

# The Integration of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities in a Rural School System

Catharine B. Kerr  
*Longwood College*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.longwood.edu/etd>



Part of the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kerr, Catharine B., "The Integration of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities in a Rural School System" (1996). *Theses, Dissertations & Honors Papers*. 506.  
<https://digitalcommons.longwood.edu/etd/506>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Longwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations & Honors Papers by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Longwood University. For more information, please contact [hamiltonma@longwood.edu](mailto:hamiltonma@longwood.edu), [alwinehd@longwood.edu](mailto:alwinehd@longwood.edu).

The Integration of Students with Specific Learning  
Disabilities in a Rural School System

Catharine B. Kerr

Longwood College

This thesis was approved by:

Dr. Ruth Lyn Meese, Chair: Ruth Lyn Meese

Dr. Patty Whitfield, Member: Patty Whitfield

Dr. Rachel Mathews, Member: Rachel Mathews

Date Approved: May 1, 1996

Running Head: RURAL INTEGRATION

Abstract

This study analyzed data collected from a small, rural school division to determine how the integration of students with SLD into general education classrooms was being implemented. Specifically, a survey was conducted to determine if appropriate accommodations were being made for these students and how student outcomes were being evaluated. Respondents included all personnel who were involved in the evaluation and eligibility processes for students with SLD (N=140). Results indicated that, although some active efforts are occurring to integrate students with SLD into general education classrooms, no formal plan for implementation exists in the school division surveyed. General education teachers were required to make minimal accommodations for students with SLD. In addition, outcomes were not being evaluated, and no category-specific outcome-monitoring measures were reported.

### Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge the contributions of Dr. Ruth Meese, Dr. Rachel Mathews, and Dr. Patty Whitfield for their time, patience, and fortitude in the direction of my thesis. I am also grateful for the support of my consultant, Judy Mason, and her husband, Ronald. Finally, I would like to thank my family and my parents, without whose support and understanding, this thesis would not have been possible.

## Table of Contents

List of Appendices by Title	6
List of Tables by Title	7
Literature Review	8
Introduction	8
Specific Learning Disability Defined	8
The Regular Education Initiative	10
Legal Implications of REI	14
Implications of REI for Students with Learning Disabilities	15
Teacher Attitudes Toward REI	16
Considerations in the Implementation of REI	18
Statement of Purpose	20
Method	22
Setting	22
Subjects	22
Procedural Details	22
Survey Instrument	23
Internal Validity	25
Data Analysis	25
Limitations of the Study	25
Results	26
How Integration is Being Implemented in a Rural School Division	26
General Education Teacher Accommodations for Students with SLD	28
How Student Outcomes are Being Evaluated	29
Discussion	29
References	34

Appendices	39
Tables	55
Biography of Author	70

## List of Appendices

Appendix	Title	Page
A	Permission Letter to School Division	39
B	Permission from School Division to Conduct Research	41
C	Letter of Request to Participate	43
D, D-1	Survey Instrument	45
E	School Division Policy on Integration	53

## List of Tables

Table Page	Title	
1	Survey of Subject Record	56
2	Overview Across Groups to Increase Integration	57
3	Reported Presence of Documents Designed to Increase Integration of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities	58
4	Summary of Factors Present to Support Increased Integration for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities	59
5	Summary of the Extent to Which Elementary Regular Education Teachers are Required to Make Accommodations for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities.	60
6	Summary of the Extent to Which Middle School Regular Education Teachers are Required to Make Accommodations for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities.	62
7	Summary of the Extent to Which Secondary Regular Education Teachers are Required to Make Accommodations for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities.	64
8	<u>t</u> -test for Group Differences	66
9	<u>t</u> -test for Item Analysis	67
10	Report of Data Systematically Collected for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities	69



The Integration of Learning Disabled Students  
In a Rural School Division

Introduction

A dramatic increase has occurred in the number of students identified with Specific Learning Disabilities in the past decade (Houck & Rogers, 1994). Of the 4.3 million students with disabilities served during the 1990-1991 school year, 2.1 million were identified with a Specific Learning Disability (SLD). Much debate exists about the nature of Specific Learning Disabilities, and consequently, how students with these learning disabilities may best be served. By law, a least restrictive environment (LRE) is required for students with Specific Learning Disabilities. Supporters of a separate special education system agree with the LRE concept, but these professionals maintain that pull-out services rendered by special education teachers are necessary (Bryan, Bay, & Donahue, 1994; Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988; Kauffman, Willis, Baker, & Riedell, 1995; Keogh, 1988; McKinney & Hocutt, 1988). Supporters of the Regular Education Initiative (REI) advocate *integrating* students with Specific Learning Disabilities into regular education classrooms where all of their needs will be met (Gardner & Lipsky, 1987; Lilly & Pagach, 1986; Reynolds & Wang, 1986; Stainback & Stainback, 1984); however, no specific implementation guidelines are available. The educational needs of students with Specific Learning Disabilities will best be served by research not only on REI

implementation procedures, but also on which approach for serving these students is most effective.

### Specific Learning Disability Defined

Since its creation in 1966, the definition for SLD has been controversial (Bryan, Bay, & Donahue, 1988). Task Force I conceived the etiology of learning disabilities to be from specific localized damage to, or dysfunction in, the brain which was referred to as *minimal brain dysfunction* in the original definition and in all definitions to date (Clements, 1966). The current definition of Specific Learning Disability used by educators is:

a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell or do mathematical calculations. The term includes such conditions as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. The term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage (Virginia Department of Education, 1994, p. 10-11).

Although we lack the technology to verify the existence of *minimal brain dysfunction* in children, some empirical basis for the notion exists. The controversy over the

definition of SLD and its implied biological basis have been valuable. As scientists and educators have continued their efforts to operationalize the intent and purpose inherent in the definition, a vast empirical data base has been established (Bryan, Bay, & Donahue, 1988).

The current trend in rural schools is for students with Specific Learning Disabilities to spend most of their time in a regular education setting and to receive intervention in a special education setting (Steinberg 1989; Reganick, 1993). Regular Education Initiative (REI) advocates suggest that students with Specific Learning Disabilities be placed in a regular education class and receive no outside resources (Skrtic, 1991).

#### The Regular Education Initiative

Prior to the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (EHA), segregated special classrooms were maintained for students with disabilities. The concept of *mainstreaming* emerged as a solution when segregated classroom practices were criticized for being racially biased, instructionally ineffective, and socially and psychologically damaging (Skrtic, 1991). Implementation of the EHA formalized the spirit of mainstreaming into law; thus began the movement to limit special placements and *integrate* students with mild disabilities, including Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), into regular education classrooms (Hallahan, Kauffman, Lloyd, & McKinney, 1988). Mainstreaming practices are currently being attacked by

Regular Education Initiative (REI) supporters who charge that they are no more effective than those practices employed in segregated classrooms (Skrtic, 1991).

In the regulations accompanying Part B of the EHA (1975; IDEA-B, 1992), Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) is a legal concept defined as a set of procedures states should follow to assure that, to the maximum extent appropriate, disabled children are educated with children who are not disabled (Sawyer, McLaughlin, & Winglee, 1994). *Integration* is the term frequently used to describe the placement of students with disabilities in general education settings. IDEA-B gave impetus to the advocates of REI.

In 1981, the Regular Education Initiative (REI) was conceptualized by Maynard Reynolds and Margaret Wang (Hallahan, Kauffman, Lloyd, & McKinney, 1988). In 1986, the REI received formal recognition by the Assistant Secretary for the United States Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Madeleine C. Will, who stated that: [the] "so-called *pull-out* approach to the educational difficulties of students with (SLD) had failed in many instances to meet the educational needs of these students" (Hallahan, 1988, p. 3).

The Regular Education Initiative advocated the creation of a partnership between regular and special educators which would serve students who are failing to learn (Schumaker & Deshler, 1988). Such a partnership entails a restructuring of education services. The number of students with Specific

Learning Disabilities, as well as underachievers, would be drastically increased in regular classrooms where all students would share the same resources, opportunities, and supports (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1993). This would create an atmosphere which would strengthen the achievement level of students with Specific Learning Disabilities and their underachieving peers. Although four fields of thought exist among advocates of REI, all call for eliminating the EHA classification system, and all propose restructuring the separate general and special education systems into one system (Skrtic, 1991). REI advocates differ only in their views of which disabled students would be served in regular education classrooms.

Many philosophical arguments have been leveled against the REI. For example, Skrtic (1991) argued that REI proponents do not recognize the connection between special education practices and the assumptions in which they are grounded. He argues

"disabilities are pathological; differential diagnosis is objective and useful; special education is a rationally conceived and coordinated system of services that benefits diagnosed students; [and] progress results from rational technological improvements in diagnostic and instructional practices (Skrtic, 1991, p. 152).

In other words, REI advocates ignored the basic assumptions that school failure is pathological and which must be

diagnosed and treated by special education specialists and that progress will result from improved diagnostic procedures and special education teaching methods.

REI advocates argued that the current school system's practices (i.e., separation of special education and general education) are fundamentally flawed and cannot and should not be salvaged (Skrtic, 1991). They argued that Special Education is not a rational system that is consistent with democratic, educational ideals. REI opponents believed that Special Education is a politically rational system in that it provides resources and personnel to students with disabilities who would not otherwise receive them. REI proponents advocated a restructuring of the school system; whereas REI opponents believed that the current separate special education system could be rendered instructionally rational through additional research and development aimed at improving diagnostic and instructional practices.

Much debate also occurs among educators and educational professionals with regard to the implementation of REI. First, REI advocates disagreed as to how students with disabilities should be served. Stainback and Stainback (1984) proposed the integration of all regular and special education students, including those with the most severely and profoundly disabling conditions, within each classroom. Students may be grouped according to their instructional needs. This proposal considered social competence as a primary objective. Reynolds and Wang (1983) argued that

most students with disabilities should be served exclusively in regular education classrooms, and those with severe and profound disabilities may be served in separate settings. Gardner and Lipsky (1987) proposed that all students with mild and moderate disabilities be educated in a general education setting, while severely and profoundly disabled students would receive their primary instruction in separate classrooms within the regular education setting. Lilly and Pagach (1986) argued that only students with mild disabilities should be served exclusively in regular education classes.

Kauffman, Gerber, and Semmel (1988) cited REI advocates' assertions that a *schism* exists between regular and special education and argued that federal data indicates that a majority of students with mild disabilities are now receiving most of their education in general education classrooms. Finally, McKinney and Hocutt (1988) argued the need for policy analysis in evaluating REI: "Much of the debate about the merits of the REI flows solely from the prospective of policy advocacy, not policy analysis" (p. 13).

#### Legal Implications of the REI

Huefner (1994) and Vacca (1995) have analyzed Federal Appellate standards for cases involving Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) for students with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD). Huefner's study indicated that a school must accommodate an instructionally integrated student by

providing supplementary aids and services and by modifying its regular education program. These accommodations include: resource room and itinerant special education services, speech and language therapy, special education training for general education teachers, behavior management programs, modifications to regular education programs, and other needs and services appropriate to the needs of a given child. These requirements, however, represent overlapping judicial standards which are dependent upon physical, social, or instructional, and/or economic criteria in a given school setting.

*Inclusion*, which involves the same basic idea as *integration* (Sawyer, McLaughlin, & Winglee, 1994), refers to a concept used by REI advocates to describe the use of new methods, techniques, and strategies to teach students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers in the same classroom (Reganick, 1993). *Inclusion* (i.e., abolishing special education settings and integrating virtually all students with disabilities into regular education classrooms) is the current thrust of the REI movement (Huefner, 1994).

According to Vacca (1995), no consensus of opinion exists among the courts with regard to a legal definition for *inclusion*. A definition that may be inferred from an analysis of recent legal decisions, however, may be:

"inclusion means the integration (not separation) of all



students in the mainstream of a regular education setting to the maximum extent practicable" (Vacca, 1995, p. 3).

Kauffman, Willis, Baker, and Riedel (1995) have offered what they believe to be a practical and legally defensible definition of *inclusion*: "a variety of placements that offer the conditions under which any individual feels safe, accepted, and valued and is helped to develop his or her affective and intellectual capacities" (Kauffman, p. 545). In other words, placement of a disabled student in a regular education classroom may occur only after a careful analysis of all relevant factors in each individual situation (Vacca, 1995); therefore, the regular education setting may or may not be the appropriate placement.

#### Implications of REI for Students with Learning Disabilities

According to Pudlas (1993) the Regular Education Initiative (REI) was intended for students with Learning Disabilities, but its implementation places both students with Specific Learning Disabilities and their general education teachers at risk. The REI assumption that these students will learn more effectively if they are integrated into a regular education classroom for the entire day is based on a second assumption: that teachers and students with Specific Learning Disabilities will be able to attain a balance between their aspirations and their ability to achieve success. Keogh (1988) proposed that it is impossible for the general education system to accommodate students who have previously failed in that system.

Kauffman, Semmel, and Gerber (1988) questioned whether it is possible for regular education teachers to distribute educational resources to achieve desired outcomes. Those school systems which do not mandate support activities and preservice and in-service education will place students and teachers at risk (Pudlas, 1993).

Bryan, Bay, and Donahue (1988) argued that students with Specific Learning Disabilities differ from normally achieving individuals. The reference to minimal brain dysfunction that may be found in each definition assumes that these students have heterogeneous problems which makes it unlikely that classroom modifications alone will meet their complex needs. Although the existence of minimal brain dysfunction cannot be verified, some scientific evidence exists that students with Specific Learning Disabilities do have central nervous system problems (Bryan et al, 1988).

#### Teacher Attitudes Toward REI

As the number of students with Specific Learning Disabilities in general education classrooms increases, professionals must examine the attitudes of teachers who must assume new roles and develop new competencies as they face new instructional and management challenges (Chow & Winzer, 1992). A teacher's attitude will determine his or her response to the needs of a special student and may be the determining variable in the success or failure of

attempts to implement REI for students with Specific Learning Disabilities.

In a study examining the attitudes of Michigan educators toward the REI, Davis and Maheady (1991) found a general agreement with the majority of REI goals and procedures and an acceptance of implementation methods. They also found that these educators recognized the need for technical assistance in implementing REI procedures. This was a verbal report study, however, and actual implementation procedures were not examined.

Schumm and Vaughn (1991) assessed the willingness of teachers to make adaptations for students with disabilities in their classrooms. Results indicated that teachers find instructional and curricular adaptations desirable but not feasible. They are not willing to make specific modifications in their instructions, use of materials, or environment. They are willing, however, to provide encouragement and support for academic success for the student with disabilities.

Rodden-Nord, Shinn, and Good (1992) investigated general education teachers' attitudes toward integration. Previous studies have found general education teachers to be unenthusiastic or neutral about the integration of students with disabilities into their classrooms. Findings were consistent with previous research; however, providing teachers with significant achievement data resulted in a more positive attitude toward integration.

Regular and special education teachers in California expressed a preference for their current pullout services for special education students and a belief that this currently mandated intervention needs to be protected (Semmel, Abernathy, Butera, & Lesar, 1991). Improvement as a result of REI reforms was unforeseen: the full-time placement of students with Specific Learning Disabilities in regular education classrooms would negatively affect the distribution of instructional classroom time. In addition, teachers do not perceive themselves as having the skills for adapting instructional material, and teachers believe that no positive social benefits will occur. Research reveals that regular education teachers have neither the skills for making accommodations nor a general willingness to make needed adaptations (Houck & Rogers, 1994). If REI efforts to integrate students with Specific Learning Disabilities totally into the regular education classroom are to be successful, school staff will need to change their perceptions, perspectives, and expectations regarding the educational process (Whitworth, 1994).

#### Considerations in the Implementation of REI

A number of school systems across the United States are attempting to implement the Regular Education Initiative (REI) (Hazazi, Johnston, Liggett, & Shattman, 1994; Houck & Rogers, 1994; Whitworth, 1994). Research has provided three key elements that are necessary for the implementation of the process. Of primary consideration is a formal, written

plan and a commitment from virtually all system-wide school staff members to change the educational process (Schumm & Vaughn, 1991; Steinberg, 1989; Whitworth, 1994).

Simultaneously, school administrators, faculty, and support staff must be in agreement that problems of low achievement and failure are the responsibility of all educators in the system, and not merely the responsibility of special education teachers (Schumaker & Deshler, 1988).

The second key element to consider in the successful implementation of the REI is teacher training (Kauffman, Willis, Baker, & Riedel, 1995; NJCLD, 1988; Pudlas, 1993; Skrtic, 1991; Steinberg, 1989; Whitworth, 1994). Preservice and in-service training must be provided for teachers in the different methods and skills which they will use to instruct students with disabilities; in collaborating and consulting with special education specialists; and in evaluating student outcomes and instructional methods. Positive teacher attitudes are correlated with the reintegration of students with disabilities into the general education classroom (Rodden-Nord, Shinn, & Good, 1992).

The final key element for the successful implementation of integration of the REI is research (Davis & Maheady, 1991; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1993; Hallahan, Keller, McKinney, Lloyd, & Bryan, 1988; Houck & Rogers, 1994; Keogh, 1988; McKinney, Lloyd, & Bryan, 1988; Pudlas, 1993; Schumaker & Deshler, 1988; Steinberg, 1989). Little research has been conducted to date regarding program efficacy for students

with SLD (Keogh, 1993). Formal and informal research is essential in the assessment of student outcomes as well as the effectiveness of teaching methods (Whitworth, 1994). Educational reform (i.e., integrating students with Specific Learning Disabilities into general education classrooms) should be based solely on data and accountability (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1993).

### Statement of Purpose

The number of students with Specific Learning Disabilities in general education classrooms is increasing (Houck & Rogers, 1994; Sawyer, McLaughlin, & Winglee, 1993). Moreover, a formal plan and a commitment by school administration and staff, teacher training, and research provide a sound basis for the implementation of *integration*. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to determine: (1) how the *integration* of students with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) into general education classrooms was being implemented in a small rural school division; (2) to what extent regular education teachers were making appropriate accommodations in their classrooms for students with SLD; and (3) how students' outcomes were being evaluated. The answers to these questions will suggest where we are in the process of implementing integration so that we may know where we need to go. Furthermore, this information may give us a basis for comparison to other school divisions.

## Method

### Setting

The study was conducted in a small rural county school division in central Virginia. The general population of the division is 11,100, and the school population is 2,115. The district was characterized socio-economically as low to middle income and it has a high unemployment rate. Sixty-two percent of the students receive free lunches. Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) number 188, and 15 SLD teachers are employed. In-school placement options for students with SLD were reported as self-contained, resource, collaborative, and monitored.

### Subjects

Subjects for the study were a special education supervisor, a general education curriculum supervisor, four building principals and four assistant principals, six guidance counselors, a school psychologist, 108 academic general education teachers and 15 SLD teachers. In addition, because she participates in the special education identification and eligibility processes, a school nurse was requested to participate.

### Survey Instrument

The instrument was adapted from two studies: Houck and Rogers (1994) and Schumm and Vaughn (1991) (See Appendices C and D). The survey consisted of two parts. The first part contained demographic information. The second part contained eighty-nine closed-form response questions in a

four-point Likert Scale format. Part One solicited demographic information, requested copies of written policies and guidelines for the integration effort, and offered subjects an opportunity to request a summary of the research findings. Additional demographic information was requested from building principals and supervisors (See Appendix D).

Part Two of the instrument consisted of six sections. Section one addressed the degree of effort the school district was making toward integration and if the school had a written plan to implement integration. Sections two and five were designed to indicate an overall picture of how integration was being implemented. Section three asked respondents to indicate what data were recorded to monitor the impact of increased integration (i.e., how student outcomes were being measured). Section four duplicated section two with a different response format and was designed to provide data for comparison studies. Section six requested subjects to indicate what accommodations were required of general education teachers for students with Specific Learning Disabilities, how outcomes were being measured, and if teachers had had specialized training in integration techniques. Open-form questions included in the Houck and Rogers (1994) study were omitted. The Schumm and Vaughn (1991) study asked teachers what accommodations they believed to be *desirable* and *feasible*. The current study



asked teachers what accommodations are *required* of them for students with SLD.

Reliability and validity of the aggregated instrument have not been determined. The Houck and Rogers (1994) instrument was reviewed internally at the Virginia Polytechnic and State University's Office of Measurement and Research Services, and externally by eight North Carolina educators. Schumm and Vaughn (1991) used the Adaptation Evaluation Instrument (AEI) which directs a teacher to rate adaptations for students with Specific Learning Disabilities who are mainstreamed in terms of how much the teacher would like to implement the adaptation in his or her classroom (i.e., desirability), and how practical it would be to implement the adaptation (i.e., feasibility). Reliability of this instrument was 0.97 for the desirability subscale and 0.95 for the feasibility subscale.

#### Procedural Details

Permission to conduct the study in the winter of 1996 was obtained from the superintendent of the school division (See Appendix A). Survey material and a copy of the letter of permission were hand delivered to building principals at which time each principal's support of the research was solicited. All other subjects received instruments through the school inter-office mail delivery system.

The instrument was encoded to enable tracking of returned and non-returned surveys and offered a telephone number for subjects who had questions or needed assistance.

A cover letter (see Appendix B) requested voluntary participation and assured confidentiality and anonymity. Subjects were requested to return the survey material directly to the researcher within one week in a stamped envelope provided with the survey material.

#### Internal Validity

Survey data were tabulated by two individuals. Subject bias may be relevant to the results. The Likert Scale response format increased a tendency toward socially acceptable or noncommittal midscale responses.

#### Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the results. An independent sample *t-test* was employed to examine group differences in section six.

## Results

Questionnaires were sent to 140 educators. Of the surveys returned, 62 (44.29%), and all were usable. (See Table 1). Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data.

### How Integration is Being Implemented in a Rural School System

Although the entire research instrument was designed to measure how the integration of students with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) was being implemented, questions one through three and 52 through 57 were directly related to this research question. Questions one through three dealt with the extent to which the school division was actively attempting to increase the amount of time students with SLD spend in the regular classroom at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels.

An examination of the results across all groups for items 1-3 indicated that 37 (19.89%) of the respondents reported *extensive active efforts* to increase the amount of time students with SLD spend in the regular or general education classroom. *Some efforts* were reported by 52 (27.96%), and 6 (3.23%) reported *no active efforts*. The *no opinion* option was reported by 91 (48.92%) of the respondents. (See Table 2).

The most extensive efforts were reported at the elementary level. Eighteen (29.03%) reported *extensive active efforts* and 18 (29.03%) reported *some efforts*. *No active efforts* were reported by one (1.61%), and 25 (40.32%) reported *no opinion*. *Extensive active efforts* also were reported by

nine (14.52%) of middle school respondents. *Some efforts* were reported by 17 (27.42%), and two (3.23%) reported *no active efforts*. The *no opinion* option was reported by 34 (54.88%) of the middle school respondents. Similarly, on the secondary level, 10 (16.13%) of the respondents reported *extensive active efforts*, and 17 (27.42%) reported *some efforts*. *No active efforts* was reported by three (4.84%), and 32 (51.62%) reported no opinion. (See Table 2).

Question number four examined whether or not the school division had adopted any guidelines, written philosophies, or policies which are specifically designed to increase the time students with SLD spend in the regular classroom. An examination across all groups indicated that 17 (27.87%) reported the existence of such documents. Of the total group, 21 (34.43%) reported that no such documents existed, and 23 (37.70%) reported that they could not judge whether or not the school division had adopted an integration policy. The Special Education Supervisor reported that a document does exist. (See Table 3).

Questions numbered 52 through 57 dealt with six specific attributes supporting change. Mean scores across all groups indicated that *flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools* (i.e., Item #55) and *involvement of key stakeholders* (i.e., Item #52) are facilitative features of the school division's efforts to increase integration. Other facilitative features associated

with successful programmatic change were ranked *present to some extent*. (See Table 4).

#### General Education Teacher Accommodations for Students with SLD

Questions 58 through 89 examined to what extent regular education teachers are required to make specific accommodations in their classrooms for students with SLD. An examination of the results showed that *respect learning disabled students as individuals with differences* ranks as the highest requirement on both the elementary and the middle level, whereas *provide extra time* ranked as the highest requirement on the secondary level. *Receive specialized training in integration techniques and procedure* and *receive specialized training in behavior management* ranked lowest at all three levels (See Tables 5, 6, and 7).

General education teachers were randomly selected and compared with SLD teachers in order to examine group differences on the extent to which accommodations are made for students with SLD. An independent sample *t*-test indicated no significant group differences ( $t=1.59$ ,  $p<.05$ ) in responses. (See Table 8). Separate *t*-tests conducted for individual items (Questions 55-89), however, indicated that there were significant differences on questions 68, 69, 86, 88, and 89: *adapt long range plans* ( $t=2.44$ ,  $P<.05$ ), *teach learning strategies* ( $t=2.55$ ,  $P<.05$ ), *provide achievement results* ( $t=2.36$ ,  $P<.05$ ), *receive specialized training in integration techniques and procedure* ( $t=3.33$ ,  $P<.05$ ), and *receive specialized training in behavior management* ( $t=2.34$ ,  $P<.05$ ).

(See Table 10). No group differences were found for questions 55-67, 70-85, and 87. (See Table 9)

#### How Student Outcomes are Being Evaluated

To determine how student outcomes were being evaluated, all respondents were asked to indicate whether specific outcome data were being collected systematically and summarized for 32 accommodations on an individual school or school system basis for students with specific learning disabilities. An examination of results across all three groups suggested that limited data are collected and summarized for students with SLD. *Number of referrals for special education services* ranked first, and *students' attitudes toward learning and school* ranked last. (See Table 10).

### Discussion

According to Hazazi, Johnston, Liggett, and Shattman (1994), Houck and Rogers (1994), and Whitworth (1994), the primary consideration in the implementation of integration is a formal, written plan. More than one-half of those responding to the survey indicated that a plan had not been adopted or that they could not judge. Moreover, although one-third of the building principals, more than one-third of the general education teachers, and one-half of the SLD teachers reported the absence of a document, the Special Education Supervisor reported such a document had been adopted and enclosed it with her completed survey instrument. (See Appendix E). Upon examining the document, it was determined that Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) was apparently the concept utilized by the school division in their special education policy. No references to integration procedures or to specific placements of students with Specific Learning Disabilities were made.

Of equal importance to a formal, written plan, Steinberg (1989) and Whitworth (1994) advocated a system-wide commitment from educators to change the educational process and the involvement of key stakeholders in the planning and implementation of integration efforts. The results of the current study indicated that these facilitative features are present only to some extent. More than one-half of those responding indicated that these features were either not

present, or they could not judge whether or not they were present.

According to numerous professionals (Kauffman et al., 1995; NJCLD, 1988; Pudlas, 1993; Skrtic, 1991; Steinberg, 1989; and Whitworth, 1994), teacher training in integration techniques and procedures is a second key element in the successful implementation of integration. Current survey results indicated that less than half of the school division's general education teachers are required to receive training in these techniques and procedures. Other critical accommodations such as teaching learning strategies, adapting regular materials, and providing achievement results were found to be severely limited.

Education professionals have overwhelmingly indicated that research is critical to educational reform (i.e., integration) (Davis & Maheady, 1991; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1993; Hallahan et al., 1988; Houck & Rogers, 1994; Keogh, 1988; McKinney et al., 1988; Pudlas, 1993; Schumaker & Deshler, 1988; & Steinberg, 1989). A majority of the respondents in the surveyed school division indicated that data critical to evaluation were not being systematically collected and summarized for students with SLD. In addition, a number of respondents indicated that a systematic process for evaluating outcomes was not present or that they could not judge whether or not this facilitative feature was present. Moreover, the Special Education Supervisor reported that no data for SLD



students were available. This presents a significant barrier to efforts to evaluate outcomes related to any educational change.

The results of this study indicated that although integration was occurring in the surveyed school division, no formal commitment existed to integrate students with Specific Learning Disabilities totally into general education classrooms. The division did, however, appear to be in compliance with some of the directives of IDEA-B (1992). Some students with SLD were being integrated into regular education classrooms, and resource rooms and itinerant special education services were being provided. Special education and behavior management training programs for general education teachers and modifications to regular education programs were being provided only to a limited extent. Moreover, regular education teachers were required to make strategic accommodations only to a limited extent for students with SLD.

A critical element to the successful implementation of students with SLD that appeared to be nonexistent in the surveyed school division was research which is necessary to evaluate the efficacy of any educational reforms. That a majority of educators responded that they could not judge whether or not data were collected and summarized on a system-wide basis indicated that the school division does little, if any, research on the progress of its students with SLD. The overriding factor with regard to the question of research,

however, was the response of the special education supervisor who indicated that no SLD-specific monitoring data were available.

Overall results of this research also indicated a serious failure to communicate special education policy and procedure in the school division. A number of respondents indicated that they could not judge or had no opinion with regard to integration, accommodations, and research.

Several limitations were apparent in this study. The population of this study was limited to participants employed by one rural county school division. In addition, subject bias must be considered in interpreting results which may not necessarily reflect actual behavior. Finally, the reliability and validity of the instrument have not been determined.

Because this research examined reported behavior, future research may include studies of actual behavior in general education classrooms where students with SLD have been integrated. In addition, studies in school divisions that are measuring progress for integrated students with SLD would reveal whether or not the procedure is effective.

## References

- Bordens, Kenneth S., & Abbott, Bruce B. (1988). *Research Design Methods: A process approach*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Bryan, T., Bay, M., & Donahue, M. (1994). Implications of the learning disabilities definitions for the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 23-28.
- Chow, P., & Winzer, M. M. (1992). Reliability and validity of a scale measuring attitudes toward mainstreaming. Educational and Psychological Measurement, Inc., 52 (1), 223-228.
- Clements, S. D. (1966). Minimal brain dysfunction in children. NINDS Monograph No. 3, Public Health Service Bulletin 1415, Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Davis, J. C., & Maheady, L. (1991). The regular education initiative: What do three groups of education professionals think? Teacher Education and Special Education, 14 (4), 211-220.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (1993). Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 364 046)

Gardner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students.

Harvard Educational Review, 57 (4), 367-390.

Hallahan, D. P., Kauffman, J. M., Lloyd, J. W., & McKinney, J. D. (1988). Introduction to the series: Questions about the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 3-5.

Hallahan, D. P., Keller, C. E., McKinney, J. D., Lloyd, J. W. & Bryan, T. (1988). Examining the research base of the regular education initiative: Efficacy studies and the adaptive learning environments model. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 29-35.

Hasazi, S. B., Johnston, A. P., Liggett, A. M., & Schattman, R. A. (1994). A qualitative policy study of the least restrictive environment provision of the individuals with disabilities education act. Exceptional Children, 60 (6), 491-507.

Houck, C. K., & Rogers, Catherine J. (1994). The special/general education integration initiative for students with specific learning disabilities: A "snapshot" of program change. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27 (7), 435-453.

Huefner, D. S. (1994). The mainstreaming cases: Tensions and trends for school administrators. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30 (1), 27-55.

Individuals with Disabilities Act, Part B. (1990). 10 U.S.C., 1411-1420.

IDEA-B Regulations. (1992) 34 C.F.R. Part 300.

Kauffman, J. M., Gerber, M. M., Semmel, M. I. (1988). Arguable assumptions underlying the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 6-11.

Kauffman, J. M., Willis, J., Baker, J., & Riedel, T. M. (1995). Inclusion of all students with emotional or behavioral disorders? Let's think again. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 542-546.

Keogh, B. K. (1988). Improving services for problem learners: Rethinking and restructuring. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 19-22.

Lilly, M. S. (1986). The relationship between general and special education: A new face on an old issue. Counterpoint, 6 (1), 10.

McKinney, J. D., & Hocutt, A. M. (1988). The need for policy analysis in evaluating the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 12-18.

National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. (1988). Inservice programs in learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 53-55.

Pudlas, K. A. (1993). Integration: Students and teachers at risk? B. C. Journal of Special Education, 17 (1), 55-61.

Reganick, K. A. (1993). Full inclusion: Analysis of a controversial issue. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Nova University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 145)

Reynolds, M. C., & Wang, M. C. (1983). Restructuring "special" school programs: A position paper. Policy Studies Review, 2 (1), 189-212.

Rodden-Nord, K., Shinn, M. R., & Good, R. H. (1992). Effects of classroom performance data on general education teacher's attitudes toward reintegrating students with learning disabilities. School Psychology Review, 21 (1), 138-154.

Sawyer, R. J., McLaughlin, M. J., & Winglee, M. (1994). Is integration of students with disabilities happening? An analysis of national data trends over time. Remedial and Special Education, 15 (4), 204-215.

Schumaker, J. B., & Deshler, D. D. (1988). Implementing the regular education initiative in secondary schools: A different ballgame. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 36-42.

Schumm, J. S., & Vaughn, S. (1991). Making adaptations for mainstreamed students: General classroom teachers' perspectives. Remedial and Special Education, 12 (4), 18-27.

Semmel, M. I., Abernathy, T. V., Butera, G., & Lesar, S. (1991). Teacher perceptions of the regular education initiative. Exceptional Children, 58 (1), 9-24.

Skrtic, T. M. (1991). The special education paradox: Equity as a way to excellence. Harvard Educational Review, 61 (2), 148-195.

Stainbach, S., & Stainbach, W. (1987B). Integration versus cooperation: A commentary on educating children with learning problems: a shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 54 (1), 66-68.

Steinberg, A. (1989). The mainstreaming debate. Harvard Educational Letter, 5 (2), Mar-Apr 1989 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 433)

Vacca, R. (1995). News from the law: The search continues for a definition of inclusion. Four Runner, 11 (2), 3-4.

Virginia Department of Education. (1994). Special Education Policy Manual, 10-11, 23.

Whitworth, J. (1994). The regular education initiative: A blueprint for success. Henderson, TN: Freed-Hardeman University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 327)

Appendix A

Permission Letter to School Division



Home Address

Date: February 28, 1996

To: \_\_\_\_\_

From: Catharine B. Kerr

I am working on a research project for my masters degree in Learning Disabilities. I am writing to request your permission to conduct a study in the \_\_\_\_\_ Schools on the current status of any program changes related to the Regular Education Initiative. As you know, this initiative is designed to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities (and other disabilities) spend in regular classrooms. The focus of this study is limited to students with specific learning disabilities. Administrative personnel, learning disability and regular education teachers, and guidance and health care personnel will be requested to participate in the study. An instrument has been developed which will take approximately twenty minutes to complete.

You may be assured that the name of the school division will not be used. The study will be done in complete anonymity. Coding will be used to enable comparison studies.

Thank you for considering this request for the \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ school division to participate in this study.

Appendix B

Permission from School Division to Conduct Research

Mrs. Cathy Kerr

Dear Mrs. Kerr:

Mainstreaming is a concept which is growing in usage as well as acceptance. It seems to help the special youngster who is mainstreamed, and it also seems to help the youngsters who receive the special youngster in their regular class if the special youngster is capable of accomplishing at least part of what is being taught in the *regular* classroom. These are personal feelings developed from watching students and talking to teachers. However, we have no study which would indicate that this is more than just a perception.

Not only do we give permission for you to conduct a study on the integration of specific learning disabled students into the general education classes, but we wish to give you whatever support is need. This is a study which we feel a need to have conducted.

Thank you for preparing to do this research.

Very truly yours,

Division Superintendent

Appendix C

Subject Letter of Request to Participate

Inter-Office Mail System

Date: February 28, 1996

To: Administration, Faculty, & Staff of \_\_\_\_\_

From: Catharine B. Kerr

I am writing to request your assistance with my graduate research project from which I seek to provide professionals working in the field with information on the current status of any program changes related to what has been called the special education/ regular education integration initiative (or integration) model. As you may know, this initiative is designed to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities (and other disabilities) spend in regular classrooms. The focus of this study is limited to students with specific learning disabilities. As part of this investigation, your perceptions are solicited via the enclosed survey.

As you will notice, the survey materials are coded; however, you may be assured that your responses will not be reported individually or linked with your school at any time. Your honest and straightforward opinions are needed, and I want you to feel completely comfortable in disclosing your views. You may also be assured that no particular position related to this issue is being promoted. Please return the completed survey within one week in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope.

Thank you for considering this request to participate in this study as a representative for other professionals in your position. I truly appreciate the time you will give to this effort. If you have any questions, or would like to have additional information about this research, please call me at \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_.

Encl: Survey Materials  
Return Envelope

Appendix D, D-1  
Research Instrument

Appendix D

PART I. Demographical Information

Respondent Information

Job Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of years in Current Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Certifications, Endorsements, or Liscensures Held (Identify those you hold):

\_\_\_\_ Early Education (NK-3)

\_\_\_\_ Elementary Education (3-6)

\_\_\_\_ Secondary Education (specify subject area(s) \_\_\_\_\_)

\_\_\_\_ Learning Disabilities

\_\_\_\_ School Psychologist

\_\_\_\_ Instructional and Supervisory Personnel

\_\_\_\_ School Principal

\_\_\_\_ School Nurse

\_\_\_\_ Other(s) (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Would you like a summary of the research findings?

\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_ No

Preferred mailing address:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE CONTINUE TO PART II

**PART II. Status of Special/Regular Education Integration**  
**Initiative for Students with Specific Learning**  
**Disabilities**

Your responses to this survey are requested to help in a status study of the special/regular education integration initiative for students with specific learning disabilities. Please circle your responses in the answer column. Be sure to match the item number with the number in the answer column.

- (1-3) To what extent do you think your school division is actively attempting to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in regular classrooms? Use the following scale to respond.

(A) Extensive Active Efforts      (B) Some Active Efforts      (C) No Active Effort

(X) No Opinion

1. At the elementary level
2. At the middle school level
3. At the high school level

1.	A	B	C	X
2.	A	B	C	X
3.	A	B	C	X

4. Has your school division adopted any guidelines, written philosophies, or policies which are specifically designed to increase the time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom? Use the following scale to respond.

(A) Yes      (B) No      (X) Can't Judge

4.	A	B	C	X
----	---	---	---	---

- (5-21) To what extent do you personally agree with the following statements regarding the special education/regular education integration initiative? Use the following scale to respond.

(A) Agree      (B) Tend to Agree      (C) Tend to Disagree      (D) Disagree      (X) No Opinion

5. The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities
6. Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.
7. Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model
8. Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.
9. The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.
10. Students with learning disabilities learn differently from their non-handicapped peers.
11. Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
12. Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
13. "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.
14. Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.
15. Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.
16. School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
17. Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
18. External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

5.	A	B	C	D	X
6.	A	B	C	D	X
7.	A	B	C	D	X
8.	A	B	C	D	X
9.	A	B	C	D	X
10.	A	B	C	D	X
11.	A	B	C	D	X
12.	A	B	C	D	X
13.	A	B	C	D	X
14.	A	B	C	D	X
15.	A	B	C	D	X
16.	A	B	C	D	X
17.	A	B	C	D	X
18.	A	B	C	D	X



Please continue using the following scale to respond.

(A) Yes                      (B) No                      (X) Can't Judge

19. Research findings document equal or superior outcome for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model. 19. A B C D X

20. The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel. 20. A B C D X

21. Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities. 21. A B C D X

(22-34) Based on your knowledge, please indicate which, if any, of the following data on students with specific learning disabilities and related administrative data are being systematically collected and summarized on a school- or system-wide basis. Use the following scale to respond.

(A) Data Being Collected for LD      (B) Data Being Collected (Not by Category)  
(C) Data Not Being Collected      (X) Can't Judge

22. standardized measures of academic achievement 22. A B C X

23. absenteeism 23. A B C X

24. grade retention 24. A B C X

25. dropout rates(s) 25. A B C X

26. rate of diplomas granted 26. A B C X

27. students' attitudes toward learning and school 27. A B C X

28. grades for each grading period 28. A B C X

29. students' satisfaction in school placement 29. A B C X

30. social acceptance within the regular education settings 30. A B C X

31. parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their student. 31. A B C X

32. number of referrals for special education services. 32. A B C X

33. the number of students with learning disabilities in each program delivery option each school year. 33. A B C X

34. educational costs in the delivery of special education services for students with specific learning disabilities. 34. A B C X

(35-51) To what extent do you believe the following statements serve as the basis for any current policy or programmatic changes within your school division to increase use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities? Use the following scale to respond.

(A) To a Great Extent      (B) To Some Extent      (C) To Only a Limited Extent  
(D) To No Extent      (X) No Opinion

35. The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities. 35. A B C D X

36. Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model is used. 36. A B C D X

37. Educational costs are reduced through use of the integration model. 37. A B C D X

38. The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model. 38. A B C D X

39. Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model. 39. A B C D X

40. Students with learning disabilities learn differently from their non-handicapped peers. 40. A B C D X

41. Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities. 41. A B C D X

42. Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities. 42. A B C D X

43. "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good. 43. A B C D X

Please continue using the following scale to respond.

- (A) To a Great Extent      (B) To Some Extent      (C) To Only a Limited Extent  
(D) To No Extent      (X) No Opinion

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 44. Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through the use of the integration model.                          | 44. A B C D X |
| 45. Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.                       | 45. A B C D X |
| 46. School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.     | 46. A B C D X |
| 47. Local parents have encouraged use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.                                    | 47. A B C D X |
| 48. External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.             | 48. A B C D X |
| 49. Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model. | 49. A B C D X |
| 50. The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities among special and regular education personnel.             | 50. A B C D X |
| 51. Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.   | 51. A B C D X |

(52-57) To what extent do you think the following factors are/have been present within your school division during efforts to increase the use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities? Use the following scale to respond.

- (A) Clearly Present      (B) Present to Some Extent  
(C) Not Present      (X) Can't Judge

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| 52. Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities? | 52. A B C X |
| 53. Establishment of realistic goals for integration.  | 53. A B C X |
| 54. Clear articulation of goals for integration.   | 54. A B C X |
| 55. Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.   | 55. A B C X |
| 56. Access to necessary resources and support for integration.   | 56. A B C X |
| 57. A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcome of the integration effort.   | 57. A B C X |

(58-89) To what extent are regular education teachers required to make these accommodations in their classrooms for students with specific learning disabilities. Use the following scale to respond.

- (A) To a Great Extent      (B) To Some Extent      (C) To Only a Limited Extent  
(D) To No Extent      (X) No Opinion

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 58. Respect Learning Disabled students as individuals with differences. | 58. A B C D X |
| 59. Establish a routine appropriate for learning disabled students.     | 59. A B C D X |
| 60. Adapt classroom management strategies.                              | 60. A B C D X |
| 61. Provide reinforcement and encouragement.                            | 61. A B C D X |
| 62. Establish personal relationships.                                   | 62. A B C D X |
| 63. Help students find ways to deal with feelings.                      | 63. A B C D X |
| 64. Communicate with students.  | 64. A B C D X |
| 65. Communicate with special education teachers.                        | 65. A B C D X |
| 66. Communicate with parents.   | 66. A B C D X |
| 67. Establish expectations.   | 67. A B C D X |
| 68. Adapt long-range plans.   | 68. A B C D X |

Please continue using the following scale to respond.

- (A) To a Great Extent      (B) To Some Extent      (C) To Only a Limited Extent  
(D) To No Extent      (X) No Opinion

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 69. Teach learning strategies.  | 69. A B C D X |
| 70. Adjust physical arrangement of the classroom.                         | 70. A B C D X |
| 71. Adapt regular materials.  | 71. A B C D X |
| 72. Use alternative materials.  | 72. A B C D X |
| 73. Monitor understanding of directions.                                  | 73. A B C D X |
| 74. Monitor understanding of concepts.                                    | 74. A B C D X |
| 75. Use computers.  | 75. A B C D X |
| 76. Provide individualized instruction.                                   | 76. A B C D X |
| 77. Pair with a classmate.  | 77. A B C D X |
| 78. Use small group activities  | 78. A B C D X |
| 79. Involve students in whole class activities.                           | 79. A B C D X |
| 80. Provide extra time.   | 80. A B C D X |
| 81. Adapt pacing of instruction.  | 81. A B C D X |
| 82. Keep records to monitor progress.                                     | 82. A B C D X |
| 83. Provide ongoing feedback.   | 83. A B C D X |
| 84. Adapt evaluations.  | 84. A B C D X |
| 85. Adapt scoring/grading criteria.                                       | 85. A B C D X |
| 86. Provide achievement results   | 86. A B C D X |
| 87. Implement scholastic monitoring procedures.                           | 87. A B C D X |
| 88. Receive specialized training in integration techniques and procedure. | 88. A B C D X |
| 89. Receive specialized training in behavior management.                  | 89. A B C D X |

Please return the survey material in the stamped self-addressed envelope. Thank you for your participation.

## Appendix D-1

**PART I. Demographical Information****Respondent Information**

Job Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of years in Current Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Certifications, Endorsements, or Liscensures Hold (Identify those you hold):

\_\_\_\_ Early Education (NK-3)

\_\_\_\_ Elementary Education (3-6)

\_\_\_\_ Secondary Education (specify subject area(s) \_\_\_\_\_)

\_\_\_\_ Learning Disabilities

\_\_\_\_ School Psychologist

\_\_\_\_ Instructional and Supervisory Personnel

\_\_\_\_ School Principal

\_\_\_\_ School Nurse

\_\_\_\_ Other(s) (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Facts About Your School**

Socioeconomic Characterization:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Total Number of Students: \_\_\_\_\_

Characterization/Racial/Ethnic/Composition:

\_\_\_\_\_

Number of General Classroom Teachers: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of LD Teachers: \_\_\_\_\_

Other Special Education Teachers:

\_\_\_\_\_

Other Non-Special Education Support Personnel in the School: (e.g., guidance, remedial teachers):

---

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: \_\_\_\_\_

In-School LD Program Placement Options:

---



---

Would you be willing to send a copy of any enabling guidelines, philosophies and/or policies designed to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular education program? (Please let us know if there is a charge for obtaining such documents).

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes (Copies of relevant documents are included with my response)

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes (Copies of relevant documents will be sent in a separate envelope)

\_\_\_\_\_ Please phone me at \_\_\_\_\_ to obtain copies of relevant documents.

\_\_\_\_\_ I am unable to provide copies of the relevant documents.

Would you like a summary of the research findings?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

Preferred mailing address:

---



---



---

PLEASE CONTINUE TO PART II

Appendix E

School Division Policy on Least Restrictive Environment

C. Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

The \_\_\_\_\_ County Public Schools shall establish and implement procedures which satisfy requirements as follows:

1. To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including those in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not disabled; and
2. Special class placement, separate schooling or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes, with the use of supplementary aids and services, cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

Tables



Table 1  
Survey of Subject Record

Respondent Group	Number Sent	Number Returned	% Returned
General Education Supervisor	1	1	100.00
Special Education Supervisor	1	1	100.00
Building Principals	8	3	37.50
School Psychologist	1	1	100.00
School Nurse	1	1	100.00
Guidance Counselors	6	3	50.00
General Education Teachers	107	44	41.12
Special Education Teachers	15	8	53.33
Overall	140	62	44.29

Table 2  
Overview Across Groups of Efforts to Increase Integration\*

Group	Extensive Efforts		Some Efforts		No Active Efforts		No Opinion		Missing Responses	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Elementary School	18	29.03	18	29.03	1	1.61	25	40.32		
Middle School	9	14.52	17	27.42	2	3.23	34	54.88		
Secondary School	10	16.13	17	27.42	3	4.84	32	51.62		
Overall	37	19.89	52	27.96	6	3.23	91	48.92		

\*Questions 1 through 3.

Table 3  
Reported Presence of Documents Designed to Increase Integration of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities\*

Group	N	Have Adopted		Have not Adopted		Can't Judge		Missing Responses n
		n	%	n	%	n	%	
General Education Supervisor	1					1	100.00	
Special Education Supervisor	1	1	100.00					
Building Principals	3	1	33.33	1	33.33	1	33.33	
Guidance Counselors	3			2	66.67	1	33.33	
School Psychologist	1					1	100.00	
School Nurse	1	1	100.00					
General Education Teachers: Elementary	20	9	47.37	2	10.52	8	42.10	1
General Education Teachers: Middle	11	4	36.36	7	63.64			
General Education Teachers: Secondary	13	1	7.09	5	38.46	7	53.85	
SLD Teachers	8			4	50.00	4	50.00	
Overall Across Groups	62	17	27.87	21	34.43	23	37.70	1

\*Questions 1 through 3

Table 4

Summary of Factors Present to Support Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with SLD\*

Attributes**	M***	Clearly present: (%)	Present to some extent (%)	Not present (%)	Can't Judge (%)	Missing Responses
Q55. Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	1.82	14.75	37.70	27.87	19.67	1
Q52. Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.	1.96	23.33	35.00	20.00	21.67	2
Q56. Access to necessary resources and support for integration.	2.17	11.67	43.33	25.00	20.00	2
Q54. Clear articulation of goals for integration.	2.27	11.48	36.07	32.79	19.67	1
Q57. A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	2.36	9.83	21.31	32.79	36.07	1
Q53. Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	2.70	11.48	44.26	21.31	23.00	1

Note. SLD = specific learning disorder; Q = question

\*Questions 52 through 57. \*\*Items appear in rank order based on the mean values corresponding with the reported presence of facilitative features associated with successful programmatic change.

\*\*\*Scale: 1 = Clearly Present, 2 = Present to Some Extent, 3 = Not Present

Table 5

Summary of the Extent to Which Elementary Regular Education Teachers are Required to Make Accommodations for Students with SLD\*

Accommodation**	To a great extent		To some extent		To a limited extent		To no extent		No Opinion	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Q58. Respect learning disabled students as individuals with differences.	20	66.67	8	26.67	1	3.33			1	3.33
Q61. Provide reinforcement and encouragement.	19	63.33	7	23.33	3	10.00			1	3.33
Q59. Establish a routine appropriate for learning disabled students.	16	53.33	10	33.33	3	10.00			1	3.33
Q80. Provide extra time.	16	53.33	10	33.33	3	10.00			1	3.33
Q60. Adapt classroom management strategies.	15	50.00	9	30.00	5	16.66			1	3.33
Q67. Establish expectations.	15	50.00	10	33.33	2	6.67	2	6.67	1	3.33
Q70. Adjust physical arrangement of the classroom.	15	50.00	8	26.67	5	16.66	1	3.33	1	3.33
Q75. Use Computers.	15	50.00	8	26.67	6	10.00			1	3.33
Q79. Involve students in whole class activities.	15	50.00	9	30.00	5	16.66			1	3.33
Q65. Communicate with special education teachers.	14	46.67	8	26.67	3	10.00	2	6.67	3	10.00
Q77. Pair with a classmate.	14	46.67	11	36.67	4	13.33			1	3.33
Q78. Use small group activities.	14	46.67	10	33.33	4	13.33			2	6.67
Q64. Communicate with students.	13	43.33	9	30.00	7	23.33			1	3.33
Q73. Monitor understanding of directions.	13	43.33	9	30.00	6	20.00	1	3.33	1	3.33
Q62. Establish personal relationships.	12	40.00	13	43.33	4	13.33			1	3.33
Q66. Communicate with parents.	12	40.00	12	40.00	5	16.66			1	3.33
Q76. Provide individualized instruction.	12	40.00	9	30.00	6	26.67			1	3.33
Q81. Adapt pacing of instruction.	12	40.00	10	33.33	7	23.33			1	3.33
Q69. Teach learning strategies.	11	36.67	10	33.33	5	16.66	2	6.67	2	6.67
Q74. Monitor understanding of concepts.	11	36.67	12	40.00	6	20.00			1	3.33

Table 5 (continued)

Accommodation	To a great extent		To some extent		To a limited extent		To no extent		No Opinion	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Q82. Keep records to monitor progress.	11	36.67	10	33.33	4	13.33	3	10.00	2	6.67
Q83. Provide ongoing feedback.	11	36.67	10	33.33	7	23.33	1	3.33	1	3.33
Q68. Adapt long-range plans.	10	33.33	8	26.67	5	16.66	4	13.33	3	10.00
Q72. Use alternative materials.	10	33.33	11	36.67	8	26.67			1	3.33
Q63. Help students find ways to deal with feelings.	9	30.00	15	50.00	5	16.66			1	3.33
Q71. Adapt regular materials.	9	30.00	11	36.67	9	30.00			1	3.33
Q84. Adapt evaluations.	8	26.67	10	33.33	8	26.67	3	10.00	1	3.33
Q86. Provide achievement results.	7	23.33	11	36.67	6	20.00	2	6.67	4	13.33
Q85. Adapt scoring/grading criteria.	6	20.00	13	43.33	6	20.00	2	6.87	3	10.00
Q87. Implement scholastic monitoring procedures.	4	13.33	9	30.00	9	30.00	2	6.67	6	20.00
Q88. Receive specialized training in integration techniques and procedure.	3	10.00	6	20.00	10	33.33	8	26.67	3	10.00
Q89. Receive specialized training in behavior management.	3	10.00	4	13.33	9	30.00	11	36.67	3	10.00

Note: SLD = specific learning disability; Q = question

\*Questions 55 through 89. Group consists of a general education supervisor, a special education supervisor, building principals, a school psychologist, a school nurse, guidance counselors, general education academic teachers, and SLD teachers. \*\*Items appear in rank order based on the number corresponding with the reported presence of accommodations.

Table 6

Summary of the Extent to Which Middle Regular Education Teachers are Required to Make Accommodations for Students with SLD\*

Accommodation**	To a great extent		To some extent		To a limited extent		To no extent		No Opinion	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Q58. Respect learning disabled students as individuals with differences.	11	68.75	2	12.50	3	18.75				
Q85. Adapt scoring/grading criteria.	10	62.50	2	12.50	2	12.50	2	12.50	2	12.50
Q61. Provide reinforcement and encouragement.	8	50.00	4	25.00	3	18.75			1	6.25
Q80. Provide extra time.	8	50.00	3	18.75	3	18.75	1	6.25	1	6.25
Q64. Communicate with students.	7	43.75	5	31.25	3	18.75			1	6.25
Q67. Establish expectations.	6	37.50	4	25.00	4	25.00	1	6.25	1	6.25
Q73. Monitor understanding of directions.	6	37.50	6	37.50	3	18.75			1	6.25
Q74. Monitor understanding of concepts.	6	37.50	7	43.75	2	12.50			1	6.25
Q84. Adapt evaluations.	6	37.50	3	18.75	6	37.50			1	6.25
Q59. Establish a routine appropriate for learning disabled students.	5	31.25	7	43.75	2	12.50	1	6.25	1	6.25
Q65. Communicate with special education teachers.	5	31.25	4	25.00	5	31.25			2	12.50
Q66. Communicate with parents.	5	31.25	6	37.50	3	18.75			2	12.50
Q79. Involve students in whole class activities.	5	31.25	7	43.75	2	12.50			2	12.50
Q82. Keep records to monitor progress.	5	31.25	5	31.25	4	25.00			2	12.50
Q60. Adapt classroom management strategies.	4	25.00	7	43.75	3	18.75	1	6.25	1	6.25
Q62. Establish personal relationships.	4	25.00	6	37.50	5	31.25			1	6.25
Q70. Adjust physical arrangement of the classroom.	4	25.00	6	37.50	3	18.75	2	12.50	1	6.25
Q72. Use alternative materials.	4	25.00	6	37.50	5	31.25			1	6.25
Q76. Provide individualized instruction.	4	25.00	6	37.50	5	31.25			1	6.25

Table 6 (continued)

Accommodation	To a great extent		To some extent		To a limited extent		To no extent		No Opinion	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Q81. Adapt pacing of instruction.	4	25.00	4	25.00	6	37.50			2	12.50
Q83. Provide ongoing feedback.	4	25.00	5	31.25	6	37.50			1	6.25
Q68. Adapt long range plans.	3	18.75	6	37.50	4	25.00	2	12.50	1	6.25
Q81. Adapt pacing of instruction.	3	18.75	8	50.00	3	18.75	1	6.25	1	6.25
Q78. Use small group activities.	3	18.75	6	37.50	6	37.50			1	6.25
Q86. Provide achievement results.	3	18.75	5	31.25	4	25.00	1	6.25	3	18.75
Q87. Implement scholastic monitoring procedures.	3	18.75	4	25.00	4	25.00			5	31.25
Q69. Teach learning strategies.	2	12.50	7	43.75	3	18.75	2	12.50	2	12.50
Q75. Use computers.	2	12.50	7	43.75	4	25.00	2	12.50	1	6.25
Q77. Pair with a classmate.	2	12.50	8	50.00	5	31.25			1	6.25
Q63. Help students find ways to deal with feelings.	1	6.25	7	43.75	4	25.00	2	12.50	2	12.50
Q88. Receive specialized training in integration techniques and procedure.			4	25.00	8	50.00	2	12.50	2	12.50
Q89. Receive specialized training in behavior management.			2	12.50	8	50.00	4	25.00	2	12.50

Note: SLD = specific learning disability; Q = question

\*Questions 55 through 89. Group consists of a general education supervisor, a special education supervisor, building principals, a school psychologist, a school nurse, guidance counselors, general education academic teachers, and SLD teachers. \*\*Items appear in rank order based on the number corresponding with the reported presence of accommodations.



Table 7  
Summary of the Extent to Which Secondary Regular Education Teachers are Required to Make Accommodations for Students with SLD\*

Accommodation**	To a great extent		To some extent		To a limited extent		To no extent		No Opinion	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Q80. Provide extra time	13	56.52	4	17.39	2	8.70	1	4.35	3	13.04
Q85. Communicate with special education teachers.	12	52.17	6	26.08	1	4.35	1	4.35	3	13.04
Q58. Respect learning disabled students as individuals with differences.	10	43.48	8	34.78	1	4.35	1	4.35	3	13.04
Q72. Use alternative materials.	10	43.48	4	17.39	5	21.74	2	8.70	2	8.70
Q75. Use computers.	10	43.48	9	39.13	1	4.35	1	4.35	2	8.70
Q59. Establish routine appropriate for learning disabled students.	9	39.13	9	39.13	3	13.04			2	8.70
Q61. Provide reinforcement and encouragement.	9	39.13	8	34.78	1	4.35	3	13.04	2	8.70
Q64. Communicate with students.	9	39.13	7	30.43	2	8.70	1	4.35	4	17.39
Q79. Involve students in whole class activities.	9	39.13	7	30.43	3	13.04	1	4.35	3	13.04
Q81. Adapt pacing of instruction.	9	39.13	7	30.43	3	13.04	2	8.70	2	8.70
Q60. Adapt classroom management strategies.	8	34.78	11	47.78	1	4.35	1	4.35	1	8.70
Q66. Communicate with parents.	8	34.78	9	39.13	2	8.70	1	4.35	3	13.04
Q67. Establish expectations.	8	34.78	9	39.13	2	8.70	2	8.70	2	8.70
Q73. Monitor understanding of directions.	8	34.78	9	39.13	3	13.04	1	4.35	2	8.70
Q74. Monitor understanding of concepts.	8	34.78	9	39.13	3	13.04	1	4.35	2	8.70
Q76. Provide individualized instruction.	8	34.78	11	47.82	2	8.70	1	4.35	1	4.35
Q83. Provide ongoing feedback.	8	34.78	9	39.13	3	13.04	1	4.35	1	8.70
Q84. Adapt evaluations.	8	34.78	7	30.43	4	17.39	2	8.70	2	8.70
Q85. Adapt scoring/grading criteria.	8	34.78	6	26.08	5	21.74	2	8.70	2	8.70
Q62. Establish personal relationships.	7	30.43	7	30.43	2	8.70	2	8.70	5	21.74

Table 7 (continued)

Accommodation	To a great extent		To some extent		To a limited extent		To no extent		No Opinion	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Q70. Adjust physical arrangement of the class.	7	30.43	7	30.43	6	26.08	2	8.70	1	4.35
Q82. Keep records to monitor progress.	7	30.43	7	30.43	4	17.39	1	4.35	4	17.39
Q71. Adapt regular materials.	6	26.08	6	26.08	6	26.08	2	8.70	3	13.04
Q86. Provide achievement results.	6	26.08	10	43.48	1	4.35	2	8.70	4	17.39
Q77. Pair with a classmate.	5	21.74	12	52.17	2	8.70	2	8.70	2	8.70
Q87. Implement scholastic monitoring procedures.	4	17.39	6	26.08	5	21.74	2	8.70	6	16.08
Q63. Help students find ways to deal with feelings.	3	13.04	8	34.78	4	17.39	1	4.35	7	30.43
Q68. Adapt long range plans.	3	13.04	10	43.48	3	13.04	2	8.70	5	21.74
Q69. Teach learning strategies.	3	13.04	8	34.78	4	17.39	2	8.70	6	26.08
Q78. Use small group activities.	2	8.70	14	60.87	4	17.39	1	4.35	2	8.70
Q88. Receive specialized training in integration techniques and procedure.	1	4.35	8	34.78	7	30.43	4	17.39	3	13.04
Q89. Receive specialized training in behavior management.	1	4.35	6	26.08	7	30.43	5	21.74	4	17.39

Note: SLD = specific learning disability; Q = question

\*Questions 55 through 89. Group consists of a general education supervisor, a special education supervisor, building principals, a school psychologist, a school nurse, guidance counselors, general education academic teachers, and SLD teachers. \*\*Items appear in rank order based on the number corresponding with the reported presence of accommodations.

Table 8  
Comparison of Regular Education Teachers and SLD Teachers on  
Accommodations by  $t$ -test\*

Variable	Number of cases	M**	SD	$t$
Regular Education	8	79.6250	29.277	-1.59
Special Education	8	97.8750	13.953	

\*Questions 55 through 89. Groups 1 is regular education teachers;  
Group 2 is SLD teachers. \*\*Scale: 1 = to a great extent, 2 = to some extent,  
3 = to a limited extent, 4 = to no extent.

Table 9  
Comparison by Item of Regular Education Teachers and SLD Teachers on  
Accommodations by  $t$ -test

Question	Group	n	M	SD	SE	t
56	RE Teachers	6	3.0000	1.069	0.376	0.89
	SLD Teachers	8	3.3750	0.518	0.183	
59	RE Teachers	8	3.0000	0.926	0.327	1.00
	SLD Teachers	8	3.3750	0.518	0.183	
60	RE Teachers	8	2.8750	1.126	0.398	1.14
	SLD Teachers	8	3.3750	0.518	0.183	
61	RE Teachers	8	2.6250	1.302	0.460	1.76
	SLD Teachers	8	3.5000	0.535	0.189	
62	RE Teachers	6	2.2500	1.035	0.366	2.03
	SLD Teachers	8	3.1250	0.641	0.227	
63	RE Teachers	8	2.1250	1.126	0.398	1.51
	SLD Teachers	8	2.8750	0.835	0.295	
64	RE Teachers	8	2.8750	1.126	0.398	1.42
	SLD Teachers	8	3.5000	0.535	0.169	
65	RE Teachers	8	2.8750	0.553	0.549	0.86
	SLD Teachers	8	3.3750	0.518	0.183	
66	RE Teachers	8	2.8750	1.126	0.398	0.00
	SLD Teachers	8	2.8750	1.246	0.441	
67	RE Teachers	8	2.5000	1.604	0.567	1.47
	SLD Teachers	8	3.3750	0.518	0.183	
66	RE Teachers	8	1.6250	1.061	0.375	2.44*
	SLD Teachers	8	2.8750	0.991	0.350	
69	RE Teachers	6	1.7500	1.165	0.412	2.55*
	SLD Teachers	6	3.0000	0.756	0.267	
70	RE Teachers	8	2.6250	1.506	0.532	0.82
	SLD Teachers	8	3.1250	0.835	0.295	
71	RE Teachers	8	2.3750	1.188	0.420	0.97
	SLD Teachers	8	2.8750	0.835	0.295	
72	RE Teachers	8	2.3750	1.188	0.420	1.57
	SLD Teachers	8	3.1250	0.641	0.227	
73	RE Teachers	8	2.8750	1.356	0.479	0.47
	SLD Teachers	8	3.1250	0.641	0.227	

Table 9, con't.

Question	Group	n	M	SD	SE	t
74	RE Teachers	8	3.0000	1.195	0.423	0.00
	SLD Teachers	8	3.0000	0.535	0.189	
75	RE Teachers	8	2.5000	1.604	0.567	0.80
	SLD Teachers	8	3.0000	0.756	0.267	
76	RE Teachers	8	2.3750	0.916	0.324	1.90
	SLD Teachers	8	3.1250	0.641	0.227	
77	RE Teachers	8	3.0000	1.069	0.378	0.28
	SLD Teachers	8	2.8750	0.641	0.227	
78	RE Teachers	8	2.6250	1.061	0.375	0.89
	SLD Teachers	8	3.0000	0.535	0.189	
79	RE Teachers	8	3.0000	1.195	0.423	0.26
	SLD Teachers	8	3.1250	0.641	0.227	
80	RE Teachers	8	3.3750	1.061	0.375	0.28
	SLD Teachers	8	3.2500	0.707	0.250	
81	RE Teachers	8	2.2500	1.165	0.412	1.86
	SLD Teachers	8	3.1250	0.641	0.227	
82	RE Teachers	8	2.3750	1.302	0.460	1.05
	SLD Teachers	8	3.0000	1.069	0.378	
83	RE Teachers	8	2.5000	1.069	0.378	1.00
	SLD Teachers	8	3.0000	0.926	0.327	
84	RE Teachers	8	2.3750	1.188	0.420	0.97
	SLD Teachers	8	2.8750	0.835	0.295	
85	RE Teachers	8	2.6250	1.302	0.460	0.70
	SLD Teachers	8	3.0000	0.756	0.267	
86	RE Teachers	8	1.8750	1.356	0.479	2.36*
	SLD Teachers	8	3.1250	0.641	0.227	
87	RE Teachers	8	2.0000	1.309	0.463	1.43
	SLD Teachers	8	2.7500	0.707	0.250	
88	RE Teachers	8	1.5000	0.535	0.189	3.33*
	SLD Teachers	8	2.3750	0.518	0.183	
89	RE Teachers	8	1.6250	0.744	0.263	2.34*
	SLD Teachers	8	2.3750	0.518	0.183	

Note: RE = regular education; SLD = specific learning disability

\*p &lt; .05

Table 10  
Report of Data Systematically Collected for Students with SLD\*

Survey Item**	Data available for LD		Data Available (no category)		Data unavailable		Can't judge		Missing responses n
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Q32. number of referrals for special education services	17	27.42	16	25.81	5	8.20	24	38.70	
Q33. number of students with specific learning disabilities within each delivery option each school year	15	24.59	9	14.75	5	8.20	32	52.46	1
Q22. Standardized measures of academic achievement	15	24.20	19	30.65	8	12.90	20	32.26	
Q28. Grades for each grading period	14	22.58	20	32.26	9	14.51	19	30.65	
Q24. Grade retention	10	16.13	25	40.32	7	11.29	20	32.26	
Q34. Educational costs in the delivery of special education services for students with specific learning disabilities.	9	15.00	6	10.00	5	8.33	40	66.67	2
Q23. Absenteeism	9	14.51	22	35.48	8	12.90	23	37.10	
Q31. Parental satisfaction with educational program for their SLD child.	8	13.11	8	13.11	9	14.75	36	59.01	1
Q26. Rate of diplomas granted	6	9.83	9	14.75	8	13.11	38	62.30	1
Q29. Students' satisfaction in school placement.	6	9.68	5	8.06	16	25.80	35	56.45	
Q30. Social acceptance within the regular education settings.	6	9.68	5	8.06	13	20.97	38	61.30	
Q25. Dropout rates.	5	8.20	18	29.50	10	16.39	28	45.90	1
Q27. Students' attitudes toward learning and school.	4	6.45	3	4.83	15	24.20	40	64.51	

Note. Q = question; SLD = specific learning disability

\*n = 62. \*\*Items are presented in rank order based on their availability for students with specific learning disabilities.

Biography of Author

Biography of Author

Catharine B. Kerr is currently teaching students with Learning Disabilities in a rural school division in Central Virginia. She received an undergraduate degree in Elementary Education and a Master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction in Learning Disabilities from Longwood College.