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ABSTRACT

Frontier Local School District, a small rural district in southeastern Ohio, has recently implemented inclusion for the students with special needs. Inclusion is a concept which views children with disabilities as true full-time participants and members of their schools and classrooms. The inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum is one of the most discussed topics in public education today. This qualitative study considered the issue from the perspectives of teachers. A questionnaire was used to gather qualitative information from active participants in the program concerning the process and its effectiveness. The information gathered from the study will assist those involved in creating successful inclusive classrooms in the future.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“I saw the angel in the marble and carved until I set him free.” (Michelangelo, n.d.)

Today, for some children with special needs, The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is the chisel that sets them free. This act guarantees children with disabilities a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. Since its passage into law in 1997, students with special needs are more frequently being integrated into the regular education classroom. Support services are being brought to the child rather than the child moving to the services. According to the US Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics report, The Condition of Education 2005 (2005), approximately 50% or more students with disabilities spend 80% or more of their day in general education classrooms.

Tardif and Wiener (2004) found that these placements generally include providing students with in-class support for certain subjects, withdrawing students for special education support in resource rooms, and integrating students in the general education classroom with two teachers. With the use of inclusion classes in public schools becoming more common, the need exists to explore teacher attitudes about the process. For this reason, this researcher will develop a qualitative survey which will include questions about inclusion and teacher preparedness. Being able to identify key factors in successful inclusion process will enable administrators and educators to set up useful and effective classrooms for all students.
**Purpose Statement**

Frontier School District is embarking on a new era in the education of students with special needs. Inclusion is being implemented for the first time to our students. The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the inclusion process at the school. As an intervention specialist, this researcher was concerned about teacher views of the implementation of inclusion and its effectiveness.

**Central Question**

How was inclusion in Frontier Local viewed by teachers?

**Sub questions**

How have intervention specialists been trained?

How have general education teachers been trained?

How has inclusion in Frontier Local School benefited students with special needs?

**Limitations**

This study was limited by the size of the population to be surveyed as well as the number of questionnaire responses received from the participants. The participants were limited to Frontier Local teachers. Frontier Schools are located in the small Appalachian towns of New Matamoras, Newport, and Dart, in the southeastern part of Ohio, with little diversity in population.
Definitions

ACCOMMODATIONS - supports or services provided to help students access the general curriculum and demonstrate learning

ADAPTATIONS - any procedure intended to meet an educational situation with respect to individual differences in ability or purpose

ANNUAL GOAL - a statement in a student's Individual Education Program (IEP) that describes what a child with a disability can reasonably be expected to accomplish within a 12-month period in the student's special education program. There should be a direct relationship between the annual goals and the present levels of educational performance

GENERAL CURRICULUM - the standards and benchmarks adopted by a Local Education Agency (LEA) or schools within the LEA that applies to ALL children. It is applicable to children with disabilities as well as non-disabled children and related to the content of the curriculum and not to the setting in which it is used. It is the basis of planning instruction for all students

INCLUSION - commitment to educate each child, to the maximum extent appropriate and possible in the general education classroom. It involves bringing support services to the child rather than the child moving to the services

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PLAN (IEP) - a written statement for a child with a disability that is developed, reviewed, and revised

INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES - specially designed instruction and accommodations provided by instructional personnel to eligible individuals

LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT - to the maximum extent appropriate, children
with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not disabled

MAINSTREAMING - the placement of students with special needs in one or more general education classrooms

MODIFICATIONS - changes made to the content and performance expectations for students

PRESENT LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE - an evaluation and a summary statement which describes the student's current achievement in the areas of need

RELATED SERVICES - developmental, corrective, and other services required to assist an individual with a disability to benefit from special education

SUPPLEMENTARY AIDS AND SERVICES - services provided in order for an eligible individual to be served in the general education classroom, which may include intensive short-term specially designed instruction; educational interpreters; readers for individuals with visual impairments; special education assistant; special education assistants for individual with physical disabilities for assistance in and about school, and for transportation; materials; and specialized or modified instructionally related equipment for use in the school

SUPPORT SERVICES - specially designed instruction and activities which augment, supplement, or support the educational program of eligible individuals
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Decades have passed, and the most appropriate educational environment for students with disabilities continues to be an issue of intense debate in our public school systems. Freeman and Alkin (2000) report, “While some continue to argue for the advantages of maintaining segregated special education settings, there is increasing recognition of the long-term social and academic cost of segregation as well as the benefits of full inclusion for all students.”

Inclusion is a concept which views children with disabilities as true full-time participants and members of their neighborhood schools and communities. The inclusion philosophy proposes that there not be a range of placements but rather all students be educated with their peers in the same physical location. Inclusionists espouse that inclusive schools are based on the belief that the world is an inclusive community with people who vary not only in terms of disabilities but in race, gender, and religious background. (Mercer 1997)

Pisha and Stahl (2005) state that the “NCLB legislation of 2002 raised standards and expectations for all students, including those with disabilities, for both participation and progress in the general curriculum”. According to Knight (1999), “With inclusion, students come to the regular classroom with all the specialized services they require. Every child has unique learning needs requiring an education a program implemented to
take into account the wide diversity of their characteristics and needs”. In fact, the special education standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) require professional education programs to prepare all future teachers to contribute to the education of exceptional learners (Turner, 2003). The need for teachers that are prepared to teach these children with special needs in an inclusive setting, therefore, has become a significant issue.

One of the most prevalent factors identified in research as being a key to teacher acceptance of inclusion-based practices is that of pre-service training. In a study by Kamens, Loprete, and Slostad (2000), general education teachers reported that, “Teacher education programs are not providing adequate instruction to general educators for success in inclusive classrooms”. Sadler (2005) reports that “Pre-service teachers have expressed concerns regarding a lack of confidence in teaching students who are mainstreamed, which is largely based on inadequate experience, developing strategies for teaching students with special needs in teacher education programs”. Teachers emphasized the need for additional preparation in six areas; behavioral concerns conflict resolution and social skills; identification of student with special needs, adaptation of curriculum and materials; adaptation of instructional strategies; legal regulations and individual education programs; and co-teaching, teaming and collaboration (Kamens, Loprete, & Slostand, 2000). It has been found that teachers’ confidence levels are raised when exposed to training techniques that address inclusion in the classroom (Destefano, Shriner, & Lloyd, 2001).

A legitimate concern exists today, as to whether or not teachers are developing the skills necessary to adapt classroom exercises and testing materials to adequately assess
and incorporate these individuals (Elliott, McKeivitt, & Kettler, 2002). A more aggressive approach is necessary to preparing the new general education teacher in addition to arming them with more information regarding how to include the special needs child in the classroom (Snyder, 1999). Teacher education programs have traditionally assigned responsibilities for preparing pre-service teachers to work with student with special needs to special education programs, creating a divide between general education and special education (Frattura & Topinka, 2006). However, today, the role of the general education teacher has demanded an increased understanding of students with special needs.

Many advocate for the merging of special education with regular education programs in our colleges. In this system, general and special educators would benefit from participating together in experiences directly relating to instruction of a heterogeneous classroom. The merging process would also provide for common field experiences and would increase skills for collaboration, teaming and teaching strategies for diverse classrooms. Brodsky (2001) reports, “The present system, which typically offers one introductory course during pre-service training, has fallen out of favor with some”.

Notably, pre-service training is ideal, however the fact remains that thousands of experienced general education teachers, in our public schools, are left to educate children with little or no training. In fact, a study by Forlin (1995) of teachers reported, “That the most experienced educators had the lowest level of acceptance for inclusion”. Many have been teaching for decades and any pre-service training in special education was virtually non-existent. Due to no fault of their own, many are failing to meet the needs of these exceptional children.
To combat this some advocate for training programs that help create positive attitudes about inclusion within the school setting. Leyser and Tappendorf (2001) report, “Teacher attitudes can be the fulcrum determining the ultimate success or failure of an inclusion program”. Many studies have been conducted to determine what makes teachers differ in their willingness to work with special needs students. The willingness of a teacher tended to be influenced by several factors, including classroom procedure concerns and the number of different disabilities present. Similarly, Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) found that teacher willingness is more influenced by procedural classroom challenges than by concerns of working with the special student. They also found that the willingness of teachers to work with special needs students in an inclusion setting varied with the severity of the disability. The level and nature of support that teachers receive is another influential factor that determines the attitudes of teachers. Teachers are generally fearful of inclusion because of their lack of knowledge or fear of little support. Stainback and Stainback (1992) stated that a team of people should be provided to the general classroom teacher for additional assistance. Some educators have had little experience in adapting curriculum to meet the diversity of needs in an inclusion classroom. For appropriate learning experiences for all students of different ability levels to occur in the classroom, regular education teachers will need assistance from administrators, special educators, parents, classmates, occupational and physical therapists, and school psychologists. Additional time needs to be allocated for collaboration support, discussions, and planning which are all very realistic needs (Scruggs and Mastropieri, 1996).
According to Farlow (1996), “Teachers can use existing supports and adapt the curriculum to assist instruction. Teachers can allow peers to facilitate learning whenever possible. They can also structure classroom activities to make peer support available. Priming students to be successful participants in inclusive classrooms, giving students valued roles, and utilizing existing expertise, will all facilitate inclusion without drawing heavily on outside resources”. In addition to inviting support from peers and adult helpers, teachers can adjust curriculum and instruction to ensure that all students have successful educational experiences. This can be accomplished by using independent prompts, varying amounts of work required of students, adjusting information delivery, allowing students to express information in varied ways, and presenting alternative activities (Farlow, 1996).

Responsible inclusion demands appropriate resources, teachers willing to participate in the inclusive process, and consideration of student and family needs. Supportive administrators are also critical to the successful teaching of students in inclusive settings. Merely placing students with disabilities in a general education classroom with other students does not mean the inclusion will follow. In fact, inclusion in some instances may be more like exclusion because the student’s needs are not being met and appropriate services not provided in the regular classroom. The labels will not disappear by simply placing students in regular classes.

Including students with special education needs in the regular classroom continues to be controversial. Many educators do not accept that a student who cannot do the work would attend classes with other students. Educators disagree about many issues, including the benefits for special education students and for nondisabled students, teacher
workload and preparation, and distribution of financial resources. Nonetheless, current laws continue to favor inclusion over exclusion for students with special education needs. If we believe that our students must learn to live in a pluralistic society and that students with disabilities should receive the support of a community network of friends and professional social service workers, than inclusion deserves the extra effort and energy required of all of us (Farlow, 1996). Just ask the children.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Classrooms of diverse populations are becoming more common in today’s public schools. Students with exceptionalities are often placed with their peers in the general education setting. This researcher has designed a study that examined the attitudes and opinions of teachers involved with the inclusion process in Frontier Local School District.

Study Design

This study was conducted using purposeful qualitative sampling. Teachers at Frontier Local were surveyed to gain insight into the advantages and disadvantages of inclusion at their schools, as well as their personal thoughts and opinions of how the process was implemented. Information gained through this study may be beneficial to teachers and administrators in the district in developing more successful classrooms for all students in the future.

Participants

The participants of this study were the teachers in the Frontier Local School District that are directly involved with the inclusion process. Qualifications of these teachers varied from certifications in kindergarten through 12th-grade, special education, and the arts. The study included teachers at Lawrence Elementary, Newport Elementary, New Matamoras Elementary, Frontier Middle School, and Frontier High School. This
researcher also chose a gatekeeper with in-depth knowledge of special education in Frontier Local School District.

**Procedure**

The researcher gained permission from Superintendent Troy Thacker of Frontier Local Schools and the principals of all buildings in the district. Appendix 1 shows a copy of the letter used to gain that permission from the superintendent. Verbal permission, from the building principals, was asked once the written permission was granted from the superintendent. The principals of all schools were given copies of the questionnaires. The snowball method of distribution was used to hand out copies to all teachers. The participants were able to respond in an anonymous manner and return the questionnaires to this researcher using the intra-school mail system. Upon receipt of the questionnaires this researcher coded the responses for possible themes.

**Instrumentation**

A qualitative instrument in the form of a survey was developed with emphasis on the opinions and attitudes of teachers involved in the inclusion process. This researcher gathered both open-ended and closed-ended responses from general education teachers, teachers of the arts, and special educators. Open ended questions lead this researcher to better understand the existing central phenomenon, with themes emerging.

**Ethical Issues**

Due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions, this researcher clearly conveyed to the participants that their responses will be kept anonymous. Names, positions, and buildings of employment were not determined so it is be impossible to single them out.
Therefore, participants were encouraged to respond openly and honestly about their perception of the inclusion process.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore inclusion in the Frontier Local School District. In order to investigate this topic, questionnaires were distributed to teachers within the school district. 61 surveys were distributed and 22 surveys were returned for a response rate of 36%. Of those returned 48% taught at the high school and 52% taught at one of the 3 elementary schools or the middle school. 20% were Intervention Specialists, 5% were Art, Music or Physical Education Teachers, 65% were General Educators, and 10% held other duties. 21% had been teachers for 0-11 years and 79% had taught longer than 10 years. 26% had been teachers in the district for 1-10 years and 74% had taught in Frontier Local for more that 10 years.

*Frontier Local Teachers felt they had received inadequate training to implement inclusion effectively.*

When asked, 70% of teachers responding felt they had received inadequate pre-service training.

*I received no training about inclusion in my college education.*

*Inclusion was not taught.*

*Yes, but the “real world” is not an ideal college classroom.*

70% of the teachers had no training in inclusion since graduating from college and beginning their teaching careers.
The district has offered no suggestions for inclusion opportunities (classes) and I have been unable to find any that don’t require money.

I haven’t taken any yet.

I have not taken any yet, I didn’t know that Frontier was taking this route or I may have been more inclined to educate myself a little more.

According to 82% of those responding to the survey, the district had not provided adequate teacher training in the inclusion process.

No training has been offered – ZERO!

Not a single training session and yet we’re supposed to implement this ...come on!

100% of the responding teachers believed that Professional Development within our district, in regards to inclusion, would be beneficial.

Regular Education teachers don’t understand how inclusion works.

Not only would it be beneficial, it’s almost imperative if we are to make this work with ANY degree of proficiency.

Students’ needs are not being met.

Of the teachers surveyed, only 43% felt that the inclusion program was fulfilling the needs of the Special Education students.

I feel that teachers are working hard to meet the needs of students. I’m not sure how much our inclusion program is doing (we are understaffed).

I don’t think we have enough staff to do it properly.

IEPs are not being followed.

There are students who would benefit from life skills, employment skills, etc.

64% of teachers felt the inclusion program actually hindered instruction for General Education students.
It slows me down at times.

64% of those teachers surveyed felt that the needs of Special Education students could be better meet in a pull out program.

Especially in Math and Language Arts.

If inclusion were done correctly it could be better than pull-out.

This varies with the degree of the disability. Low level, CD children often need a different curriculum than the LD students.

Teachers of the Frontier Local School District believed that more collaboration would be beneficial.

92% of the teachers surveyed believed a more collaborative relationship between the Special Education instructors and the General Education instructors would be beneficial.

Not to say that we don’t collaborate now, but who could be against more collaboration.

When??

There is always room for improvement.

Special Education teachers are beneficial in the classroom.

91% of the teachers stated that the Special Education instructor worked well with both the General Education students and the Special Needs students.

Works well, although he/she focuses mostly on the students with special needs.

Without them Special Needs students sometimes feel lost.

95% of the surveyed teaches believed the Special Education teachers were beneficial in the classroom.

They are utilized well.
Not utilizing them is my fault. (General Education teacher)

Could be if used properly.
Somewhat helpful.

*Teachers have incorporated changes into their daily teaching routines to meet the needs of diverse learners and their varied learning styles.*

- Peer tutoring.
- Flexible group work.
- More hands on teaching.
- Use of many teaching styles.
- Visual work has increased and lectures have decreased.
- More individualized instruction.
- Scaffolding.
- Adapted or modified tests and assignments.
- Explain more often, using simpler terms.
- Extended time on assignments.
- Cooperative learning.
- I read more to them.
- Reader service.
- More lessons written on the board.

Any student who is struggling with their work needs extra help. It doesn’t matter if they are a General Education or Special Education student. I help the students one-on-one.

Anything that helps them.

*Teacher observations include both positive and negative outcomes from inclusion.*
Positive

They are getting instruction in OGT and OAT goals.

Many have raised expectations.

I have seen several Special Education students experiencing the joy of performing at concerts and for nursing homes.

They have added positively to class discussions.

Depending on the level of needs, it has been good for them not to feel singled out.

Confidence in subject material.

There are a few Special Education students who are really excelling.

Students will benefit in any situation, I believe, that instruction is given, and if the teacher does his/her best to show patience and understanding of individuals in the classroom.

I believe all of my students are passing my class.

With 17 on IEPs, all participate in class discussions.

They get to hear a variety of different material.

In some subjects, Special Education students worked harder and achieved more than in a pull-out.

Special Education students contribute more overall effort at times.

Special Education students have less of a gap between them and Regular Education students.

They have a stronger feeling of camaraderie.

The students can learn too; just at a different pace and in a different way.

They bring a challenge to the classroom.

Happiness when they get it.

Diversity - These challenges help us educators become better/stronger teachers.
Negative

Special Education students can more easily “slide through the cracks”.

Some have developed behavior problems, probably to mask their sometimes feeling unable to do the work.

Frustration on the face of a student who isn’t grasping the idea at all.

Special Education students don’t take advantage of the modifications made to class/homework and therefore do nothing.

Having the Special Education students in the room without the additional help of a special education teacher.

I am not a big fan of pulling kids out of classroom to do bookwork assignments and homework assignments. Tests and quizzes, I understand, but not for class work and homework.

One class I have 17 students out of 22 with an IEP. I feel that is too many in one class.
I see confusion and frustration from Special Education.

They are not getting serviced the way they should be.

Students do not get the individual help they need.

They can not do grade level work.

Unrealistic to have a classroom of more than 15 and expect all individualized instruction.

Upper level kids lose because all attention is given to lower level.

In math and Language Arts, some Special Education kids completely quit.

More bullying.

Teacher attitude towards students with lower achievement.

Not always to their benefit. Jealousy, for a lack of better word, that someone doesn’t have to do this.

Sometimes it’s hard to have enough time or materials to adapt to their needs.
Many suggestions for improving program, however one suggestion that stood out immensely was the need for more staff and opportunity for teacher training.

More staff preparation.

More staff or realignment of class grouping to have the Special Education teacher in the room.

Additional training on how to implement inclusion.

We would probably need more Special Education teachers to be really effective. There should be a Special Education teacher with every subject taught, that does not happen because we are understaffed.

We need more teachers.

Since we are limited in staff, I feel we should group the Special Education students together. More staff is needed and offer the same curriculum but team teach it

Pull out or Special Education teacher in room.

More staff is needed to make it work.

Training must happen for all of us. We don’t expect students to perform well of OAT/OGT without training, how can teachers be expected to perform without any training?

In-service BEFORE inclusion begins.

Aides and teachers trained and expected to provide real service to students.

Smaller staff to student ratio.

Being thrown into “the fire” without any input makes for a “burned out” staff!
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Summary

Inclusion is becoming the norm not the exception. All over the United States, many children with special needs are experiencing general education classrooms for the first time. Their successes and failures in the classroom are not only directly related to their efforts, but also interconnected with the teachers’ attitudes about inclusion.

This researcher was not surprised by the responses received from the teachers of the Frontier Local School District. Frustration is evident as the teachers discuss their feelings of inadequacy because of a lack of training. It would be difficult to find a business, sports team, band, or any other organized group that could proficiently perform new duties without first being properly trained.

When asked about meeting the needs of students, the majority felt that the needs were going unfulfilled. Not only were the children with special needs being slighted, so were the general education students. This researcher agrees with the teachers’ opinions that this is a direct result of insufficient staff. With only 42 minutes to review, set objectives, teach or re-teach, and assess progress, teachers are often overwhelmed with the added responsibility of now including students with special needs. This is of particular concern when no intervention specialist is present in the classroom.

The majority of teachers felt that the intervention specialist’s role was vital to the success of inclusion. Yet, nearly all teachers voiced the need to increase collaboration
between the intervention specialists and the general education teachers. Time will, however, play a factor as planning periods vary throughout the day.

Numerous changes in teaching methods have been a direct result of including students with special needs. Teachers listed peer tutoring, flexible grouping, hands on teaching, use of many teaching styles, scaffolding, and cooperative grouping as examples of changes appearing in the classrooms. While they may or not be aware of it, most of these changes are examples of research based strategies that assist all students in learning.

Teachers listed both positive and negative responses to the inclusion of the students with special needs. Confidence in subject matter, special education students excelling, receiving increased instruction in OGT and OAT material, and an increased amount of effort are all examples of positive outcomes. On the negative side, however, observations such as Special Education students more easily “sliding through the cracks”, behavior problems, and frustration were discussed.

As with any subject, opinions for improvement were numerous. By far, however, staffing and training issues were the first priority concern of these teachers. This researcher believes that the teachers of the district are willing and eager to gain instruction in this important area. So many children are now depending on them and they do not want to disappoint them.

**Future Implications**

The researcher found that although teachers were willing to implement inclusion, the results clearly state that a high majority of teachers felt inadequate to deliver instruction properly to students with special needs. Every teacher responding to the survey believed
that professional development was needed for all teachers to begin feeling equipped for the challenges associated with inclusion.

This researcher believes that it is crucial for Frontier Local School District to offer teacher training for all teachers involved in the inclusion process. After receiving initial training, continued professional development seems appropriate for continued growth within the teaching staff.

In conclusion, data from other school districts may prove beneficial to Frontier Local teachers. This school district is not a forerunner in the area of inclusion and learning from those that are pioneers could greatly decrease the transition time and increase the proficiency of the school district’s program.
APPENDIX

Appendix A. Letter to Superintendent to gain permission for research

March 11, 2009

Mr. Troy Thacker, Superintendent
Frontier Local School District
44870 SR7
New Matamoras, Ohio 45767

Dear Mr. Thacker,

I am writing this letter to ask for your permission to perform a study necessary to complete my thesis for my Master's Degree at Marietta College. The study is regarding the inclusion process in Frontier Local Schools. By obtaining views from those most involved, our teachers, I hope to gain insight into the success and failures of the program. All teachers in the district will be invited to participate in this anonymous survey.

Attached you find a copy of the qualitative study I plan to use to collect my information. Responses will be returned to me through the school’s mail system. No cost is associated with this project. The results will be available for view in May, 2009. I will be happy to discuss my findings with you at that time if you desire.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Respectfully,

Valerie McPeek
Intervention Specialist
Frontier Middle School

Valerie McPeek has obtained permission to perform a qualitative study into the Inclusion Process in Frontier Local Schools.

_____________________________________
Troy Thacker, Superintendent of Frontier Local Schools

_____________________________________
Date
Teachers of the Frontier Local School District,

In a couple of months, I plan to be graduating from Marietta College with a Master’s Degree in Education. Before that, however, I need to complete the final two chapters of my thesis. As an intervention specialist, I have chosen to explore inclusion in the Frontier Local School District. I am asking for your assistance in the final stages of my research.

By completing the attached survey, you will help me develop thoughts, ideas, and themes about our inclusion programs in Frontier Local. I believe our teachers’ opinions are vital if we hope to improve the success of this program. Individual surveys will be kept confidential but the final, compiled results will be available in my paper if anyone would like to view them.

Please return the completed survey in the attached envelope, by March 27, 2009, using our school mail system. Thank you so much, I know your time is valuable. If you have any questions, you may contact me at the middle school at 865-3473, ext. 2115.

Respectfully,

Valerie McPeek
Intervention Specialist
Frontier Middle School
Appendix C. Teacher Questionnaire

1. I understand the concept of inclusion.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2. I received adequate instruction during my teacher training courses in college to implement inclusion effectively in the classroom.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3. I have chosen to increase my knowledge of inclusion by taking additional classes or attending workshops or seminars devoted strictly to the inclusion process.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4. General classes that I’ve taken for certification renewal have included instruction for teaching students with disabilities in the general education classroom setting.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

5. I believe that the special education teachers in our building have received adequate training for implementing inclusion.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6. I feel that the administration has received adequate training pertaining to the implementation of the inclusion program at my school.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
7. Our district has provided adequate opportunity for teacher training in the inclusion process.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

8. I believe professional development within our district, concerning the inclusion process, would be beneficial for all teachers.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

9. Teacher input was valued and highly considered when implementing inclusion at our school.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

10. The inclusion program at my school is meeting the needs of the special education students involved.
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

11. The inclusion program at my school is hindering my instruction for the general education students.
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

12. I adapt or modify tests and assignments for students with those having special needs.
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree
13. The special education teacher adapts and or modifies tests and assignments for students with special needs.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

14. I believe a more collaborative relationship between the special education teacher and the general education teacher would be beneficial for instruction.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

15. The special education teacher could be better utilized in my classroom.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

16. The special education teacher is very beneficial to my students and me.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

17. The special education teacher works well with both general education students and those with special needs.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

18. I feel that the needs of most special education students could be better met in a pull-out program.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
19. I am satisfied having the special needs children in my room.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

20. Having students with special needs in the classroom has enhanced our classroom environment.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Please indicate if/how you’ve adapted your instruction in your classroom to meet the needs of both general education students and those with special needs.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

From your observation, please indicate positive outcomes that have emerged from the inclusion of students with special needs in your classroom.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

From your observation, please indicate negative outcomes from including students with special needs in your classroom.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Please list and/or describe any suggestions revolving around the inclusion program in your school.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

I have been a teacher for the following number of years.
  o 1st year
  o 2 – 5 years
  o 6 – 10 years
  o 11 – 20 years
  o Above 20 years

I am
  o A Special Education Teacher
  o An Art, Music, PE Teacher
  o A General Education Teacher
  o Other (specify only if you wish) _________________________

I have been in the district for
  o 1st year
  o 2 – 5 years
  o 6 – 10 years
  o 10 – 20 years
  o Above 20 years

Thanks again for completing this anonymous survey.

Valerie McPeek  
Frontier Middle School
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