5/23/2014

Special Education at Haggerty School

A Snapshot of Current Practices and Recommendations for the Future

Marilyn Friend, Ph.D.

Contents

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to (a) summarize the findings of a snapshot of special education programs and services (with an emphasis on co-teaching and inclusive practices) at Haggerty School in the Cambridge Public School District and (b) make recommendations concerning how those programs and services could be refined in order to best reflect recent special education trends and expectations and thus potentially enrich outcomes for students with disabilities. Background data (e.g., website information, informal conversations) were gathered and formed the basis for designing the project, which incorporated these data, gathered in February and March, 2014:

1. A survey of staff members at Haggerty School, including general and special education teachers, administrators, related services professionals, and paraprofessionals

2. Focus groups with a sample of individuals from each staff category

3. Interviews with Dr. Greer and Dr. Campbell

4. Observations in a sample of Haggerty classrooms implementing inclusive practices

5. Review of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) written for students with disabilities receiving services at Haggerty School

Each data set was analyzed and reported separately, but the following themes were identified as characterizing Haggerty School's current inclusive practices:

- Inclusion is a passion and defines Haggerty School

    In every conversation, whether formal or informal, and in all accessed documentation, Haggerty School is described as inclusive.

- Understanding and implementation of key practices have become idiosyncratic

    A collective understanding of what inclusiveness looks like in day-to-day practice has become uncertain and is reflected in the provision of services, structures or co-teaching, and opinions about the settings in which students should appropriately be educated.

- The wealth of ideas, personnel, program options, and other resources, seasoned by a rich history and recent relatively rapid change, has contributed to inconsistencies and uncertainties

    The commitment to inclusiveness at Haggerty School is strong, but unclear is the universal understanding of what appropriate services include, agreement on the roles professionals should play, and the importance of consistency across grade levels and decision-making processes.

- Collaboration is recognized as a key to moving forward, but a necessity that may be easier to discuss than achieve

  Many comments were made about the importance of collaboration and the priority of nurturing collaboration. At the same time, hints of challenges were noted.

- The need for change is widely recognized, but as the saying goes, the devil may be in the details

  The changes needed are likely to be fairly significant and to require extensive discussion, agreement to reach consensus, and commitment to persist even when the conversations and planned changes in programs and services are challenging.

Based on the data gathered and the themes that emerged from it, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Implement beginning in summer 2014 a year of detailed strategic planning focused on creating an integrated model for inclusive practices at Haggerty School, with a goal of implementing Haggerty School Inclusive Practices 2.0 for the 2015-2016 school year.

2. As part of strategic planning, engage in ongoing and focused conversations to clearly articulate (a) what was particularly effective about the way that inclusive practices at Haggerty used to be; (b) what has changed regarding expectations for students, federal and state mandates, and local policies and practices that might make those practices now less effective; (c) strategies that other inclusive schools (preferably in MA) are employing in order to achieve strong positive outcomes for students with disabilities; (d) and clarification of the vocabulary used at Haggerty School (e.g., inclusion, co-teaching, RTI).

3. Provide professional development for all staff members regarding inclusive practices, co-teaching, collaboration, differentiation, and consultation.

4. Provide professional development for special educators and related service providers on contemporary expectations for the preparation of IEPs and other identified special education topics.

5. Develop a comprehensive service delivery plan that takes into account as many student, teacher, school, and district factors as possible.

6. Increase data collection and use at the classroom level, both permanent product and observational, for planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction for all students, but in particular those with disabilities.

7. DISTRICT: Design and implement a process for making inclusive practices an expectation in all Cambridge schools.

8. DISTRICT: Systematically review potentially problematic special education policies and procedures to ensure they reflect contemporary expectations and best practice.

The staff members at Haggerty School under Dr. Campbell's leadership have achieved success in creating an inclusive learning environment, but they also recognize that work remains to be done. Given the level of enthusiasm and commitment coupled with current knowledge, a strong willingness to learn more, and recognition of likely challenges, the goal of creating next-generation inclusive practices at Haggerty School certainly is attainable. And the beneficiaries of this effort, students with disabilities as well as other students, will as a result truly achieve their potential.

Special Education at Haggerty School

A Snapshot of Current Practices and Recommendations for the Future

*"Haggerty historically has been called the "inclusion school," and
for very good reason. There is a great number of caring, vested
individuals who genuinely care about the students and seek
to provide the best, most effective interventions and supports
for the students so that they can access the curriculum and
make effective progress."*

--statement made by a Haggerty School survey respondent

The purpose of this report is to (a) summarize the findings of a snapshot of special education programs and services (with an emphasis on co-teaching and inclusive practices) at Haggerty School in the Cambridge Public School District and (b) make recommendations concerning how those programs and services could be refined in order to best reflect recent special education trends and expectations and thus potentially enrich outcomes for students with disabilities. This report contains information gathered through phone and electronic communication and a two-day intensive visit to Haggerty School in February 2014. It is supplemented by additional information sought informally in the three months prior to and two months after the on-site data collection. In addition, it incorporates data from IEPs written for Haggerty students with disabilities. The snapshot is in large part informed by input from general and special education teachers, related services professionals, paraprofessionals, the school's principal, and a district administrator. The report is arranged in the following sections:

- Project description, including the history of Haggerty School, the current context, guiding questions for the snapshot, and project goals

- Procedures for gathering data determined to be critical in creating the snapshot

- Presentation of the results of the data collection and a brief discussion of the findings

- Recommendations about possible next steps for improving the educational outcomes for students with disabilities through program enhancements.

Definitions. As most professionals know, special education is a discipline replete with terms and acronyms that sometimes are used with precision and sometimes are mistakenly used

interchangeably. For the purpose of this project, acronyms are explained as they are introduced, but it is important to provide a brief clarification on the meaning of the following key terms:

1. *Inclusion.* Inclusion is a belief system or philosophy that exists primarily at the school level (rather than at the student, teacher, or classroom level) expressing a commitment that all students, including those who have disabilities or other special needs, are welcomed members of the learning community and that their needs are proactively addressed so that they can reach their true potential (e.g., Causton & Theoharis, 2013). Inclusion is not a reference to the setting in which students are taught (i.e., only general education). Professionals in inclusive schools (the preferred term to describe this belief system) are strongly committed to educating students with disabilities in general education settings, but they recognize that some students must receive segments of their education outside those settings (e.g., Hoppey & McLeskey, 2013). When such a need exists, it is clearly documented with appropriate data, and data are gathered frequently during instruction in a separate setting to ensure that the interventions provided there are having the impact of accelerating the student's learning rate. The goal is to reduce or eliminate the need for separate service as quickly as possible. Inclusive schools do not use phrases such as these: *inclusion class, inclusion teacher, inclusion student.*

2. *Co-teaching.* Co-teaching refers to a contemporary special education service delivery option, not articulated in federal law and still considered to be emerging, in which general educators and special educators contribute their unique expertise in a single classroom, for all or part of the school day, in order to accomplish dual purposes: (a) access to the general curriculum and its rigorous standards for all students, including those with disabilities; and (b) the embedded provision of specially designed instruction (SDI) for students with disabilities based on their individualized education programs (IEPs) (e.g., Friend, 2014; Solis, Vaughn, Swanson, & McCulley, 2012).

Limitations. In considering the information contained in this report, readers should keep in mind that a number of limitations exist:

1. The data included in this document generally comprise a single point-in-time glimpse of the beliefs and practices at Haggerty School during the winter of the 2013-2014 school year. As such, the data do not reflect trends or patterns prior to or after that time period. This limitation is particularly important to consider in that a number of recent changes have characterized the overall school structures and special education services at the school, and thus programs and practices are likely somewhat fluid rather than static, possibly even evolving since data collection.

2. A snapshot such as this captures a great deal of information about a school's programs and services, but it is likely to miss nuances of school culture and traditions and to overlook some relevant dimensions of the school's formal and informal policies and procedures. This limitation is especially pertinent in view of the fact that the primary focus of this report is co-teaching and inclusive practices. Specific attention was not paid

to other special education programs or procedures, although such services are mentioned when they were raised by participants or otherwise seem to influence current practices.

3. Unknown factors may have contributed to the results obtained. For example, although the surveys were designed to be completed by all personnel, these data were gathered electronically, and individuals who were unable or unwilling to participate by using this technology were excluded. It is not known whether those responding are significantly different from those who chose not to respond, nor whether respondents' perceptions are somehow biased in a particular way. Similarly, it cannot be known whether the perspectives expressed by staff members participating in focus groups or interviews are an accurate representation of all staff members' views.

4. Parent input was not sought as part of this project. This decision was based on the fact that parents are very active members of the Haggerty School community, and other efforts have been made to seek their input about the school's programs and services for students with disabilities. The time and resources available for data collection and analysis were thus focused on staff members' input.

5. This review of special education services, especially co-teaching and other inclusive practices, did not attempt to document teachers' specific instructional strategies in general education or specialized settings, nor did it directly examine student outcomes at the classroom level. Such data might have provided additional detail that could have been informative in making recommendations, but collecting this information was deemed of lesser importance, at least for the purpose of this project, than examining broader matters. However, quality of instruction—specifically the use of evidence-based strategies—has been found to significantly affect student outcomes (e.g., Brownell, Smith, Crockett, & Griffin, 2012), and thus this topic at some point merits further consideration.

6. Some of the data gathered as part of this project raise questions and concerns that go beyond the school level. Such district level topics are addressed briefly in this report and explored more fully in a subsequent report on special education programs and practices at the upper school and high school levels.

Project Description

In this section information is provided about the background for this project and the context in which it is situated. In addition, the questions guiding the work and the goals for it are outlined.

Haggerty School History and Current Context

Opened in 1915, Haggerty School has a long and rich history of effectively educating students and collaborating with parents and community members. In this report, given the focus on co-teaching and inclusive practices, what is most important to keep in mind is the school's relatively recent history. The current school building opened in 1995, and under the careful stewardship of Dr. Joe Petner, it became known as the *inclusion school* of the Cambridge Public Schools. The commitment during this period of the professionals, parents, and other staff members to inclusive education was perhaps best illustrated by Dan Habib's documentary about one Haggerty student and his experiences there, titled *Including Samuel.*

Haggerty School's reputation for inclusiveness was strengthened during Dr. Petner's many years of leadership and continues under the guidance of current principal Dr. Nancy Campbell. In fact, professionals at the school and district leaders note that it is common knowledge in the community that families with children with disabilities should endeavor to have their children enrolled at the school. Also noted is that the district's Family Resource Center shares information with parents about Haggerty School being the preferred school for students with exceptional needs. The professionals at Haggerty School are understandably proud of their commitment to inclusively educate all their students, including those with disabilities, and their diligent efforts to ensure that students are successful in reaching their true potential. The Haggerty School motto clearly describes the character of the school: *Everyone is different. Everyone belongs.*

As often happens, though, a number of educational changes have occurred over the past several years, some encompassing national trends and others reflecting local transformations. Both have affected professionals and students at Haggerty, creating a sense of dissonance about various aspects of inclusive practices. Those changes include the following:

1. Nationally, expectations for students with disabilities have been raised significantly, and it now is expected that nearly all students with disabilities will reach the same rigorous standards as their peers (Friend & Bursuck, 2015; Hang & Rabren, 2009) or will meet aligned, functionally based versions of those standards. Thus, inclusiveness has evolved from its early focus on participation, sometimes primarily for social reasons, to a requirement for attaining specific academic outcomes. A clear federal priority at this time is to significantly reduce the achievement gap between typical students and those with disabilities (McLeskey & Waldron, 2011).

2. The most recent MCAS data indicate that Haggerty School has achieved Level 1 status (performing better than 67 percent of schools in Massachusetts), which indicates that progress is being made toward reducing the achievement gap between typical learners and learners in other subgroups (e.g., students living in poverty, students whose first language is not English). However, significant gaps continue to exist between typical students and those with disabilities, especially in the area of English/language arts (as reported in the *Haggerty School Improvement Report,* 2012-2014).

3. The knowledge base and guidelines on co-teaching as a service delivery option for educating students with disabilities have grown significantly. Changes have included the importance of students being truly integrated into the culture and activities of the classroom rather than receiving significantly different instruction while seated in general education—but usually away from other students (e.g., Friend, 2013). Another change has been a rapidly increasing emphasis on the specific roles and responsibilities of each professional in co-taught classes (e.g., Walsh, 2012), including understanding of role reciprocity, that is, an emphasis on general educators participating in the delivery of specially designed instruction and the special educator participating in the delivery of the curriculum. A third change has been a rapidly increasing emphasis on the quality of instruction in co-taught classes and the effective delivery of specially designed instruction that is required for students with disabilities based on their IEPs (Friend, 2014; Silverman, Hazelwood, & Cronin, 2009).

4. Changes in Haggerty School leadership have led to a re-examination of existing practices, implementation of some new practices or alternative ways to implement existing practices, and recognition of a need to clarify the school's work. That is, questions have been raised related to all Haggerty staff members' understanding of educational inclusiveness in the second decade of the twenty-first century, options for operationalizing that understanding, the means of being accountable for the education of students with disabilities, the structures and procedures for providing special education, and so on. In addition, relatively new initiatives such as implementation of response to intervention (RTI) as a comprehensive approach to preventing unnecessary special education referrals may be affecting other programs and services.

5. Changes in district leadership have resulted in a new lens through which the clearly assiduous work of Haggerty professionals is being viewed. The result is a recognition that the marvelous programs that have characterized Haggerty School should be celebrated at the same time that professionals should consider whether they can be refined in order to be more efficient and effective.

6. Haggerty's reputation as a relentlessly inclusive school has contributed to its enrollment of students with disabilities being disproportionately high. That is, although the average percent of students with disabilities in the overall school-age population is 11-13 percent (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013), 17 percent in Massachusetts (Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2014), approximately 25 percent of all the students at Haggerty have disabilities identified through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA); in the fifth grade, approximately 50 percent of the students have such disabilities.

7. The staff members comprising Haggerty School have changed. Some of the professionals and paraprofessionals have been part of the school from the time Dr. Petner's original model for inclusive practices was clearly in place, and they have participated in all the changes that have occurred since then. Other staff members are relatively new, and they

have their own points of view on contemporary inclusive practices. Not surprisingly, the perspectives of these two groups can be somewhat disparate, leading to differences in opinions and preferences in educating students with disabilities.

These factors, combined with larger national trends related to education priorities, student achievement, and teacher accountability, have contributed to Haggerty School being at a crossroads. Questions have been raised concerning ways to refine the educational procedures and services at Haggerty School, to create with staff members a next-generation model of inclusive practices, and to ensure that all staff members universally understand and embrace such a model.

Based on the information just outlined as well as other general local factors beyond the scope of this project, Assistant Superintendent Dr. Victoria Greer contracted with Dr. Marilyn Friend to complete a snapshot of the current practices. The goal was established as making recommendations for next steps for Haggerty School professionals to consider in their mission to more successfully educate their students.

Guiding Questions

The following questions guided this project:

1. *What is the current status of special education programs and services at Haggerty School, especially those emphasizing co-teaching and other inclusive practices?*

    This question implies that key stakeholders' perceptions of what inclusion is should be assessed. The question also suggests that careful examination should occur of current school practices and documentation related to those practices.

2. *What present inclusive programs, services, and practices are effective and efficient and should be preserved? What inclusive programs, services, and practices are ineffective or inefficient and should be discontinued, revised, replaced, or adjusted?*

    This question indicates that input on the ideal should be obtained from informants. In addition, information from other studies of inclusion in urban school districts should be examined in order to formulate a response.

3. *What actions are recommended that build on the exceptionally strong foundation of Haggerty School's inclusive culture, but to grow to a next generation the programs and services implemented as integral to that culture?*

    This question represents the analysis of data gathered from the above questions. This question is the basis for making recommendations concerning refining inclusive

practices at Haggerty School.

Project Goals

Based on the history of Haggerty School, the current context, and the questions posed for this snapshot, the goals of this project included these:

1. To gather, analyze, and present in an accurate but succinct way data comprising a snapshot of the current status of inclusive schooling at Haggerty School.

2. To generate a set of recommendations that Haggerty School stakeholders could use to design and implement procedures, professional development, and other activities to update/clarify their understanding of inclusiveness; refine implementation of inclusive practices; and improve achievement and other outcomes for students, especially those who have disabilities.

3. To incorporate data from Haggerty School in an examination of inclusive practices, co-teaching, and other special education services across the Cambridge Public Schools with the intent of identifying, at the district level, particularly effective practices and those for which change should be considered.

It is anticipated that the results of this initiative will lead to an enhancement of co-teaching and related special education programs and services at Haggerty School. Based on the data gathered, its interpretation, and the resulting recommendations, possible actions include (a) a decision to seek consultation at the district and/or site level regarding program revisions; (b) the provision of professional development for appropriate audiences on topics determined to be priorities; (c) the creation of needed documents to clarify policies and procedures; (d) implementation of specific identified evidence-based practices; (e) coaching and feedback for teachers and administrators; (f) systematic problem solving related to issues that arise; and (g) similar activities. The ultimate goal of the project is to assist Haggerty School staff members to build their capacity to deliver, document, and sustain contemporary inclusive practices so as to improve academic and other outcomes for students with disabilities.

Data Sources

In order to offer informed conclusions about the current status of inclusive practices at Haggerty School, data were gathered from the following sources:

Background Information

- The websites of Haggerty School as well as the Cambridge Public Schools, including the most recent report on the district's performance on the MCAS

- The 2012-2014 *Haggerty School Improvement Plan*

- Two informal telephone conversations with Dr. Victoria Greer, intended to provide an orientation to the school district as well as the history of Haggerty School

- One informal telephone conversation with principal Dr. Nancy Campbell, intended to provide insights into the current status of inclusive practices and co-teaching at Haggerty School

Primary Data

The data just outlined provided background information and helped to establish a context for the gathering of these primary data:

- A survey of staff members at Haggerty School, including general and special education teachers, administrators, related services professionals, and paraprofessionals

- Focus groups with a sample of individuals from each staff category

- Interviews with Dr. Greer and Dr. Campbell

- Observations in a sample of Haggerty classrooms implementing inclusive practices

- Review of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) written for students with disabilities receiving services at Haggerty School

In addition to these data collected specifically for this report, the author's more than 30 years of experience in assisting districts in implementing inclusive practices, her ongoing review of professional literature related to this topic, and her extensive record of scholarship in the field of special education contributed to the instrumentation, procedures followed, interpretation of results, and recommendations made.

Procedure

This section of the report includes information related to the development of the project's instrumentation, protocols, and templates; the procedures followed in gathering data; and the strategies employed for data analysis.

Development of Instrumentation

Survey

The following steps were taken in order to develop an appropriate survey designed to gauge Haggerty staff members' perceptions related to the status of inclusive practices and co-teaching, including areas of strength, areas of need, and ideas for program revisions:

- Electronic, face-to-face, and telephone communications (noted earlier) were completed in order to orient Dr. Friend to the priorities for the Haggerty School snapshot.

- Key documents, including data regarding student outcomes, the school's improvement plan, the school and district website, and other items were reviewed to further inform data needs for the project.

- Dr. Friend reviewed recent relevant professional literature to glean topics that should be included in the planned survey instrument.

- Existing surveys of inclusive practices that have been published in the professional literature or employed by Dr. Friend in past work with other school districts were reviewed.

- Based on the just-articulated strategies, items that seemed relevant to the project at hand were compiled as a first draft of questions for the Haggerty inclusive practices survey.

- Drs. Greer and Campbell reviewed the draft and made recommendations regarding items to add, delete, and change. The survey was revised accordingly.

- Because of the small population participating in the survey and the risk of individual identification, the only demographic item added to the survey queried role.

- In the final version of the survey, 16 items were included (with one item for general comments), grouped into these topic areas: students, staff members, programs and services, and other supports and perceptions. The items were worded so that participants responded on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree, with two items using reverse scaling). In addition, an option was added to each question for respondents to write additional comments as they wished. The resulting survey instrument is included in Appendix A.

- It was decided that the most efficient way to gather survey data would be electronically. The survey was loaded by a research assistant into *Qualtrics*, a well-

known, user-friendly survey platform well-suited to the collection and simple analysis of data from this type of survey project.

Protocol Development for Focus Group and Individual Interviews

The following steps were completed in order to develop a set of questions appropriate to the focus group sessions conducted with Haggerty School teachers, specialists, and other staff members, as well as the individual interviews conducted with Drs. Greer and Campbell.

- Dr. Friend reviewed current professional literature on the characteristics of well-designed focus groups and how to carry them out successfully.

- Topics addressed were identified based on preliminary conversations with school and district administrators, literature related to inclusive practices, a review of information about Haggerty School from its website, and consultant experience in conducting such focus groups with many professional role groups.

- Questions were developed so that they would foster elaborated responses from participants and thus reveal rich and detailed information about Haggerty School special education programs and services, particularly co-teaching and inclusive practices. However, the questions were designed to serve as a guide for the focus groups and interviews; no intent existed to ask each question in exactly the written format. In addition, prompts were added in case participant responses required clarification or elaboration.

- Dr. Friend created the final version of the focus group and interview questions. These protocols are included in Appendix B.

Other Data Collection Tools

In addition to the survey instrument and interview protocol, the following items were utilized in gathering data for this snapshot.

Classroom Observation Protocol

To capture key dimensions of teachers and students in their classrooms, Dr. Friend used an observation template that had been developed for other projects. This protocol, created using the iPad application Note Master, was modified slightly to be appropriate for this project. It included options for recording data related to the classroom physical environment; the materials, equipment, and supplies being used; the implementation of co-teaching; general instructional plans and strategies; classroom and behavior management; and an outline of the lesson observed. A copy of this template is included in Appendix C.

IEP Summary Template

In order to discern patterns in the information contained in the IEPs reviewed for this project, a summary sheet was developed. This sheet was designed specifically for this initiative, and it included information spanning many components of the IEP, from the nature of the disability(ies) identified, to the present level of performance and other data, to the student's goals and objectives/benchmarks, to required accommodations/modifications and other supplementary aids and services, to services (including amount of time, provider, and location, and related information). A copy of this template is included in Appendix D.

Data Collection and Analysis

The following procedures were employed to gather the data for this snapshot:

Survey

Special education teachers, general education teachers, site administrators, related service personnel, and paraprofessionals received an e-mail on February 13, 2014 with an invitation to complete the electronic survey and were provided with the link for doing so (the link was arranged by Dr. Friend and distributed by Dr. Campbell). The survey was open for responses until March 14, 2014. This length of time was allowed to take into account the week potentially lost to winter break as well as the decision to send a reminder and extend the response window in order to have a higher number of participants. After the period concluded, survey data were downloaded and aggregated. A total of 37 individuals substantively completed the survey, with multiple respondents from each of the identified staff member groups.

After the survey was closed, the data from the quantitative items were analyzed so that trends in responses could be identified. Because of the nature of this project and the small sample size, for the first round of analysis Dr. Friend and her research assistant generated only basic descriptive data. For example, responses were not examined based on roles or other factors, nor were analyses run to compute statistically significant differences in responses between groups. These data are included in Appendix E. A second analysis did disaggregate the data by roles, and in the results section instances are noted in which clear differences were found. However, those data are not appended to this report in order to preserve confidentiality.

Qualitative responses from the survey were aggregated and reviewed using accepted practices for the analysis of such data. Dr. Friend and her research assistant independently and repeatedly reviewed these data in order to identify common themes. They then analyzed each other's results, noting areas of consistency, areas of difference, and possible omissions. A single set of larger themes—communicating the deeper information sought in this type of project—was articulated based on this work, and these themes, illustrated with respondent quotations, are included in the results section of this report.

Focus Groups and Interviews

Drs. Greer and Campbell managed the scheduling for the focus groups and interviews. They kept in mind the request to include a sample of individuals from each of the stake-holding groups at the school and representing a variety of perspectives. These data collection activities were completed at Haggerty School on February 13 and 14, 2014, during Dr. Friend's. The three focus groups and two interviews were based on the developed protocols, conducted in a comfortable and quiet setting, and audio-recorded using the iPad application called Super Note. Each interview or focus group lasted approximately one hour.

Focus group and interview data subsequently were downloaded and sent to a transcriptionist so that a print copy of the participant input could be produced. Dr. Friend and her research assistant applied a procedure similar to that used for the qualitative survey data to derive themes for this data set. In the results section of this report, these themes are outlined, with direct quotations illustrating them. Transcripts are not appended out of concern for confidentiality.

Classroom Observation Data

The schedule for classroom observations was arranged by Dr. Campbell. Dr. Friend observed in a total of seven classrooms, spanning grades K-4 (grade 5 students and teachers were on a field trip during the visit). Each observation lasted approximately 30 minutes. During each observation period, Dr. Friend used the prepared template, recording information about the environment, teachers and students, co-teaching, and the overall instructional approach.

After the site visit, the observational data were exported to Word files. These data were then tabulated, and the resulting summaries were reviewed to identify patterns of classroom activities and other dimensions of the delivery of educational services to students with disabilities. A summary of key patterns identified through this analysis is found in the results section.

Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)

Dr. Friend was provided with copies of IEPs for 15 Haggerty students. During the approximately four weeks after the site visit, these IEPs were read multiple times to gain an impression of their contents. A summary template was then completed for each of these documents, and the templates were further analyzed in order to make statements about the information they contained. Patterns in the preparation of IEPs were thus identified and are reported in the next section.

Results and Discussion

In this section, results of the data collection are presented. In order to enhance clarity concerning the source for the results being described, each of the four primary data sets—survey responses, focus groups and interviews, classroom observations, and IEP information—is presented separately. The final part of this section, however, notes themes spanning all the data sets identified as significant.

Survey: Perceptions of Haggerty School Special Education Programs and Services

Demographic Information

The roles of the individuals responding to the survey are presented in Table 1. It should be noted that not every respondent completed each item in the survey. The number of responses for each item in the survey ranged from 30 and 34.

Table 1

Role	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
General education teacher	12	32
Special education teacher	6	16
Paraprofessional	9	24
Related services professional	4	11
Other	6	16
TOTAL	**37**	**100**

Quantitative Data

Table 2 is a summary of the responses of all participants to the survey items, reported with means and standard deviations. The following items seem particularly relevant within the context of the overall responses or based on the responses of particular role groups:

Table 2

Item	$\bar{X}$(SD)
FOCUS ON STUDENTS	
1. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School meet the academic needs of students with disabilities.	3.62 (.89)
2. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School meet the social/behavioral needs of students with disabilities.	3.41 (.98)
3. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School interfere with the academic achievement of students who do not have disabilities.*	1.91 (.59)
4. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School interfere with the social/behavioral development of students who do not have disabilities.*	1.91 (.82)
FOCUS ON STAFF MEMBERS	
5. General educators are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.	2.90 (.75)
6. Special educators are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.	3.00 (.82)
7. Paraprofessionals are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.	3.13 (.81)
8. Related services staff members are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.	3.13 (.72)
FOCUS ON PROGRAMS AND SERVICES	
9. Co-teaching is effective in accomplishing the joint goals of curriculum access and the provision of special education services.	3.17 (1.21)
10. RTI is functioning in a way that provides intensive early intervention to possibly prevent the needs for special education services.	3.19 (.75)
11. We need to make changes in our programs and services to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.	3.71 (.82)

FOCUS ON OTHER SUPPORTS AND PERCEPTIONS	
12. Dr. Campbell is supportive of our special education programs and services.	4.35 (1.02)
13. The district is supportive of our special education programs and practices.	3.23 (.88)
14. Parents are satisfied with special education services at Haggerty School.	3.77 (.56)
15. Our school is characterized by a strong collaborative culture.	3.52 (1.03)
16. What other comments would you like to make about the past, present, or future of RTI, special education, related services, and inclusive practices at Haggerty School?	NA

*Denotes items for which a lower score indicates a more positive response.

- Strong agreement exists that Haggerty's programs and services are meeting the academic needs of students with disabilities.

- Strong agreement also exists that the special education programs and services do not interfere with other students' academic achievement.

- Responses related to behavior/social development were generally positive but much more mixed. That is, respondents indicated programs and services met the behavior needs of students with disabilities and did not interfere with the behavior needs of other students, but more variation in responses occurred, including some disagreement.

- Across all responses, special education teachers tend to be the most positive, with general education teachers and other staff groups being somewhat more varied in their responses. For example, only special educators were unanimous in agreeing that programs and services are meeting the academic needs of students with disabilities. Similarly, while all groups agreed that special education programs were not interfering with other students' academic needs, the special education teachers most strongly held this perception. This pattern is consistent with other reported studies of educators' perceptions of inclusive practices.

- Responses related to staff members' satisfaction with special education programs and services tended to be mixed for all role groups, and responses were clearly clustered fairly equally across *agree*, *neutral*, and *disagree*, with few responses at either of the extremes.   This pattern was particularly noticeable when respondents were considering their own roles: That is, when a role group addressed its own

satisfaction, responses included a clear range. When addressing others' role satisfaction, the most common response was neutral/uncertain.

- Responses related to co-teaching, response to intervention (RTI), and the need to change programs and services appeared related. The mean agreement for both services was approximately neutral, and the need for change was firmly positive. Interestingly, no general educator strongly agreed that co-teaching was effective while no special education teacher strongly disagreed with that statement. Approximately half of all respondents were neutral or uncertain regarding the effectiveness of RTI.

- The item receiving the most positive response concerned Dr. Campbell's support for special education programs and services, with 84 percent of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement. District support was not perceived in this way; 39 percent of respondents were neutral or undecided, while 42 percent agreed and 19 percent disagreed.

- The second highest response concerned parent satisfaction with special education services. A total of 77 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that parents are satisfied.

- Collaboration was perceived as a strength of Haggerty School by all respondents, but especially by special education teachers (80 percent) and paraprofessionals (100 percent).

Qualitative Data

Although quantitative data are valuable for capturing an overview of respondents' perceptions, elaborated comments related to each of the queried topics provide depth and additional meaning to the recorded perceptions. The following themes are those most discussed by participants, but it should be noted that multiple comments were made related to every survey item. One or more sample quotes (verbatim except for spelling corrections) are included related to each of these themes in order to illustrate the overall character of the responses.

Services are high quality, but sometimes they are insufficient to meet all student needs

Respondents expressed concerns about unmet needs for some students. These concerns centered on inconsistency in some services, the dilemma of meeting social/behavioral needs, and challenges educating students with especially intensive or complex needs.

- *Some students are given the supports they need, but others are not.*

- *Not enough support for students in this area [social/behavioral]. Services are not consistent.*

- *It seems as if kids miss a lot of core instruction with the pulling in and out of the classroom*

- *Things still feel unbalanced between classes and grade levels, and I'm not always sure that all students are getting what they need.*

Teachers and other staff members have strong commitment and work ethic, but expectations sometimes are difficult to meet.

Many comments were made about how hard all teachers and others work to meet the needs of their students.   However, an equal or greater number of comments were made about the practicality of professionals' workloads.

- *It is evident that teachers care about students and want to do their best to support them.*

- *I think that the special educators work very hard with what they have.*

- *As a sped staff person's caseload gets bigger, the services for each student on her caseload get a little watered down.*

- *Some classes have too many children with needs so typically developing students do not always get their needs met.*

- *Some paraprofessionals at Haggerty have shared that they do not receive a job description, nor do they understand the criteria or expectations of their work.*

- *I get the sense that the related service providers feel very overwhelmed with their caseloads, especially speech services.*

Inclusion has a positive impact on students without disabilities

Teachers clearly recognize that inclusiveness positively influences all students.

- *Inclusion greatly enhances the learning of all students. Universal design, differentiated learning, and the valuing of all people benefit all.*

- *Haggerty historically has been called the "inclusive school" - and for good reason. There is a great deal of caring, vested individuals who genuinely care about the students and seek to provide the best, most effective interventions and supports for the students so that they can access the curriculum and make effective progress.*

- *I feel that by providing the majority of special ed services within the gen ed setting, during gen ed lessons, students are able to make more academic growth than with a pull-out model.*

Co-teaching is desired, but it needs refinement and consistency

Teachers made more comments about co-teaching than any other topic. Interestingly, there appears to be a sort of love-hate relationship with it. This may be partly because of school history and the change in the model over time. It also could be that as new staff members have been added, conceptualizations of and expectations for co-teaching have become disparate.

- *The current [co-teaching] model feels very fragmented and disjointed. I hope the future includes adequate support for each classroom with staff assigned to individual classrooms where they will form attachments and feel committed to the children they work with.*

- *Push-in services are not always helpful if the provider spends very limited time as part of the classroom community...he/she does not always understand classroom climate, curriculum, dynamics, etc.*

- *...many of the staff members have different definitions of what effective co-teaching means and therefore, do not have tools to measure the success of the model.*

Collaboration is improving, but additional work is needed

Comments related to collaboration were written in response to many of the survey statements. Collectively, these statements indicate that collaboration is valued, that it is a priority, but that some problems exist with collaboration as part of school culture, including issues related to power and participation.

- *Over the last couple of years, Nancy has had a priority to build a more collaborative staff.*

- *I think we have started a good track [record] of being collaborative within our grade level teams.*

- *There is a very clear hierarchy at Haggerty. Power is given to some and not to others. This leads to distrust and disrespect among staff. Some voices are heard; others are not...*

- *Changes need to stem from joint effort and collaboration between general education and special education and not simply be interpreted and implemented.*

- *Sometimes, I get the impression that general education teachers seek solutions from the special education staff/programs but do not want to have a role in implementing of those solutions within their classrooms and their instructional practice (...it's their problem now).*

Professional development is a pressing need

Respondents noted that a barrier to refining special education programs and services at Haggerty School is a lack of professional development on key topics. This theme seemed relevant to most of the role groups at the school.

- *I am disappointed in the lack of professional development around writing IEPs that have goals that are measurable and the use of data collection...*

- *[Paraprofessionals] need PD in how to do their jobs, as do the special ed staff, as they need to learn how to work with paras...*

- *Part of the weaknesses in the co-teaching model at the Haggerty is that no one has truly been trained or educated about how to effectively implement it.*

- *All staff need access to more PD in how to collaborate well...*

It's time for change

In a broad range of items within the survey, respondents indicated that, even though it might be challenging, it is time to makes changes so as to improve outcomes for students.

- *I look forward to working together to make sure that we remain a truly inclusive school and that we have the best staffing and practices to make it work!*

- *We have made great strides over the past two years, but there is still work to be done.*

- *I believe that the staff needs help and support around: What does it mean to effectively co-teach, what are the roles and responsibilities of the general education teachers and special education students..., how to collaborate with special education teachers, and what does consultation on a student's IEP mean when you are a general education teacher.*

- *This year seems to be an exceptionally hard year. At times it feels like we are trying to bite off more than we can chew.*

- *Whatever we do, we need to be consistent and on the same page. I think the desire and the intent is there, but we're all over the place right now.*

Focus Groups and Interviews: Staff Members' Perceptions of the Past, Present, and Future

Information gleaned from focus groups and interviews were consistent with the perceptions reported through the survey. However, additional examples, further clarification, and a deeper understanding of the accomplishments and concerns that characterize Haggerty School were found in these data. It also should be noted that participants were eager to share thoughts and ideas during these sessions. They were supremely professional in their conversations, and they distinguished themselves by their willingness to discuss topics that might be considered a bit sensitive or that might reflect that some issues exist at Haggerty School regarding special education programs. The following is a summary of the data, including verbatim quotations.

We're inclusive...but do we share meaning?

The most consistent characteristic of Haggerty School is the belief in inclusion. This topic was raised many times across the role groups participating. At the same time, comments could be characterized as "We believe in inclusion, but…," followed by an explanation or example of what was interfering with model practice. Barriers mentioned included overall understandings, general educators' knowledge for incorporating specialized instruction into general education curriculum, meeting the needs of some students, and disparate views of what inclusion looks like in day-to-day practice. These statements are illustrative:

- *What I think is working well is I think that the general ed and the sp ed staff have a belief that everybody, that every child belongs to all of us, and I think when you start with that mindset it makes it easier for all the children to be included.*

- *I think inclusion is really supported here and it's done well and it's understood and when it isn't understood and problems occur, people step back and say, "Why is that happening and how can we fix it?" as opposed to just legislating whatever the policy is. And I think that's why it works so well here. There's a lot of individual attention.*

- *I don't think we have a common understanding, we haven't come and talked about what inclusion means.*

- *We have different definitions in our school, even though we all say we believe in an inclusive model, we've very different definitions of what that means. I don't think it's very clear what it looks like... some of us believe really strongly that kids should have access to grade level, we feel like they should be able to get to grade level materials. Whether it's modified or not. And there are other teachers that feel very strongly against that... Because I think it's a wording thing though, like I think some people feel that, general educators feel like that child doesn't access that grade level curriculum in*

some way they are then held accountable for it if they fail. And there's not anything to do with that. What I'm trying to say is, it's just such vastly different definitions...

We are overwhelmed

In many ways, Haggerty staff members expressed a feeling of being overwhelmed. Their comments concerned the needs of students, recent curricular revisions, the changes in programs and services for students with disabilities and other special needs, and the sense that the array of changes does not comprise an integrated educational model. The participants mentioned recent changes in the general reading/language arts program, reading instruction for students identified as having disabilities, the new math curriculum, and response to intervention as areas causing stress.

- *[Before] there was one special educator and one general educator in the classroom all day. For five classrooms and of course that is the most seamless way of providing care or services for students... that was the most beneficial to the students. But when this year we're trying to figure out how to provide those levels of services not being in the classrooms as much and not necessarily being as integrated into the gen ed day it feels very different... It's hard to feel like you're doing a really good job at anything when you feel like you're being pulled in all different directions.*

- *I'm planning day by day because the curriculum is new... And having to take the prep time to plan for the lesson, it's impossible to catch up.*

- *The saddest part of the tragedy for me is that in all of these changes we have our inclusive students, and we have our students in the achievement gap who continue to fail, because as you keep changing the survey level of teaching only the kids that can barely stay afloat, stay afloat, and everybody else continues to drown...*

- *Two years ago they implemented brand new reading and writing units of study with no training beyond the coach, and some of the coaches it was new to them as well and under the district. My point is it feels like it's been building and this year it's kind of hit a wall with the release that there's going to be a new math curriculum that would be three brand new curriculums*

  ... The science standards are changing, too.

  ... And RtI, response to intervention practices that we've been putting in place throughout this school

  ...I'm overwhelmed by the thought of how much we need to get trained.

- *There's been a roll out of a new kindergarten curriculum that's supposed to be play based, project based, come out of the interests of the classroom and really hitting all the*

standard by creating these projects around interests that the kids have come up with. Combined with the ELA people saying we're raising our benchmark in kindergarten with much less repetitive text where you have to have a lot more sight words, plus the kind of assessments that we're doing at the end of kindergarten... So it's this big massive shift in terms of what we're expecting them to know. And it just seems extraordinary to me.

We've revised our service models, but they may not adequately meet student needs

Many statements were made concerning the services being offered to students, planning time, and what is perceived as best practice. Opinions varied, especially on the latter topic. What generally was noted, however, was a need to articulate, clarify, and apply consistently. One example concerned response to intervention; participants had a discussion about whether it was fully and appropriately implemented, whether it was addressing social/emotional as well as academic needs, and whether it was adequate for supporting students from diverse linguistic backgrounds.

- *Co-teaching started where there was a special ed and gen ed teacher in the classroom together all day long. So services were all provided within the classroom for all of the kids. I wasn't trained in co-teaching and even though there were promises of that happening over the next couple of years it didn't happen. So we've kind of, we've read books on co-teaching and kind of muddled through it... For the kids, I think it's a little bit more of a mixed bag.*

- *There' definitely not a systematic way in which service delivery minutes are decided in this school. How much is this, how much is that, how much should that kid diagnosed with LD get?*

- *So there's all kinds of push in and I find that not dependable because people don't show up and they get pulled for other things and it just makes the room to me feel chaotic, quite a bit of the time. So it's not a comfortable way to teach this year.*

School structures should be modified for effectiveness and efficiency

Each role group discussed school structures that facilitate or impede inclusive practices. The primary topic in this domain concerned planning time, including the amount scheduled, its use, consistency across grade levels, and paraprofessional participation in it.

- *Many of us stay after school in order to do what we really consider to be grade level planning with our co-teacher, teacher across the hall, coach, because you can't do it during the course of the day, you're mandated to go to these other meetings.*

- *Common planning time still feels highly effective to me. We've picked something that we're diving into... And it's different, but it feels still highly effective.*

- *With the personalities, we can't change these things, but I think setting norms and the expectations is the biggest thing in the school and just make it clear that this is the expectation for this. It's going to be different, it's going to be new, it's going to be hard, we're all in it together and we just have to keep going.*

- *I think we do a lot of things well. But I think that how we organize it could be better.*

There is a human factor...students, teachers, and others

Participants discussed several topics that can best be grouped as relating to people. Most of these comments concerned students, extending beyond students with disabilities to those with other special needs. Paraeducators also were addressed, particularly the need for role clarification. Other people-related matters seemed to concern inconsistency in the services provided by some specialists, particularly itinerant staff.

- *I think a clarification on what the role of a paraeducator is [needed]. I think just listening to us talk we all have very different roles.*

- *I was just thinking...the role changes from day to day and even from minute to minute. A lot of us have been confused whether I'm supposed to be doing this or whether the sp ed co-teacher is doing this, or who should I sit with, who should she sit with when she's in the room. And we don't have any time to talk about it.*

- *I've got a couple kids now with emotional needs and I have no clue what to do.*

- *We have kids right now that have pretty severe trauma, and there are so many outbursts behaviors and internal, going internal on themselves, and there's only so much I can do and respond to her, and how do I respond to her, and how do I respond to the behaviors, and I cannot even really get her counseling because she's not on an IEP. So how do you give her the support she needs and the strategies she needs to be successful?*

- *And I think we have kids in the school, too, where they've been here for 5 years, and we've known about their challenges for five years and nothing really moves beyond a few meetings and a couple of phone calls*

- [concerning itinerant specialists] *...Specialists that whiz in and whiz out and attend a meeting and you're left like, why bother, is the way I've been feeling, I'll just deal with it myself. Because when you reach out, it's empty.*

- *Most general educators are very receptive to opening their classrooms up to anybody that comes in and there are some that less receptive and that tend to get more defensive about doing that, about handing over any responsibility or sharing any of the responsibilities.*

The need for professional development is high and spans staff groups and topics

Consistent with survey data, focus group and interview participants repeatedly mentioned the need for professional development. Topics include those related to special education (e.g., IEP writing) but also broader topics such as RTI, instruction in the new math curriculum, and others.

- *There was no training at all, so the teachers have not received any professional development around effective collaboration and co-teaching.*

- *And I haven't, I'd say been offered in 6 or 7 years quality professional development...I haven't gotten updates in any kind of testing. I don't feel like I was ever really trained to be honest with you.*

- [in a discussion of all the changes occurring, including RTI and curriculum] *We need much more training...*

Additional comments on qualitative data

In this type of summary, it is not possible to call attention to every topic addressed by participants in the focus groups or interviews. For example, a small amount of conversation occurred related to the junior kindergarten program, but because it will no longer exist next year discussion of it was omitted here. Similarly, a few comments were made about parents, reflecting the same sentiments as expressed in the survey; they were deemed limited enough to exclude.   Other topics mentioned in just a few comments concerned how staff members generally get along, the role of community agencies, OSS meeting priorities and time use, the need for a dense staff level, diversity, and other student services (e.g., Section 504 plans).

Classroom Observations: Haggerty School Staff Members in Action

Observing in classrooms provides a glimpse into the day-to-day lives of educators and their students. The following are items noted from the data gathered during the seven 30-minute observations:

- Instruction undoubtedly was carefully planned. Teachers had materials and supplies ready for students as instruction began, several had directions displayed on their interactive whiteboards, and others directed students to what clearly were pre-assigned groups.

- The notion of inclusiveness was displayed in most classrooms through student self-drawings and banners, posters, and slogans that celebrated diversity and indicated that each student was unique but welcomed.

- Class sizes in general ranged from 15-20 students present (rosters were not reviewed to determine whether students were absent).

- Perhaps the most striking characteristic of the classrooms was the number of adults present. A total of five of the seven classes had three adults present, one class had four adults, and one class had five adults. Although only three of the classrooms included a general education teacher and a special education teacher, at least three additional classrooms included at least one licensed professional in addition to the general education teacher (e.g., an interventionist, a math coach). In some classrooms, adults worked with groups of students who rotated from adult to adult; in others, students were assigned to a group for the period of the observation. In yet other classrooms, the adults circulated among students, providing assistance to those asking questions or demonstrating confusion.

- The number of adults working with students remained apparent even when groups were created and distributed around the classroom or to different locations in the school. In two classrooms, seven students were being taught by two teachers; in another seven students were being taught by three educators.

- In at least four of the classrooms, an additional professional entered the classroom to take one or more students to another location for additional services (e.g., speech/language therapy).

- Technology was noted in several of the classrooms. In one class, the special educator typed the story created by a student with a disability. One classroom had an FM system. However, just one microphone was being utilized so that the general educator's voice was amplified but the special educator's was not.

- Student attention, understanding, and behavior in the classrooms varied somewhat. Most students were on-task much or all of the time, engaged in the planned activities or listening to teacher instruction. In at least two classrooms, one or more students were observed to be off-task for several minutes. Even with adult reminders and the presence of more than one educator, these students continued to be off-task.

- Evidence of the delivery of specially designed instruction (SDI) raised a number of questions. One pattern suggested that SDI was not necessarily being delivered: In some of the observed classrooms, all students were completing the same work, and the activities of the general and special educators did not seem differentiated. Accommodations may have been provided (e.g., the example above of the special

educator typing the story), but it was not apparent that instruction incorporated strategies or techniques specifically intended to achieve the goals on students' IEPs. A second pattern seemed to be the special educator (or an assistant) working with students with disabilities on tasks or activities that were not related to what other students were doing (e.g., counting money while other students were working on problem solving). How the students receiving such alternate instruction keep pace with the general curriculum was not clear. This observation is made with some reservation because it is possible that special educators were providing SDI that was not readily apparent to a one-time observer.

IEPs: The Documentation for Special Education Services

IEPs were reviewed in order to provide information along a dimension not easily obtained through surveys, discussions with professionals, or observation. The detail in the IEPs comprised evidence that extensive time is spent developing each of these documents and that staff members take extraordinary care in considering the needs of students. However, examination of the sample of IEPs highlighted several patterns and raised a number of questions. The following are the most central findings related to these documents:

Eligibility Categories

Of the 15 IEPs reviewed, eight noted that students were determined eligible in multiple categories. Although this option certainly exists, what drew attention was how characteristics related to one disability were then used as evidence of additional disabilities. For example, two students determined eligible as having autism were also identified as eligible because of emotional impairments and health impairments, with a characteristic such as being overwhelmed by sensory stimuli being the indication of adding those two categories, even though a characteristic of autism is such a response. It is unclear whether state or local formal or informal policy favors this strategy. A question posed is what purpose is served by frequently determining a student to be eligible in multiple categories; this raised questions about creating complexities for goal writing, service delivery, and accountability.

Another item noted related to categories concerned developmental delays. This disability category, an option for children ages 3-9, seems to be applied even when the requirement of a negative impact on educational performance might be questioned. In the description of the present level of educational performance, four of the five students with this disability label were characterized as being near or above average in their achievement; concerns related to areas such as staying focused and motor skills. For one student, the only service noted on the IEP was occupational therapy (once per week), which, although allowed under Massachusetts law, might be questioned as necessary given evidence of the student's overall functioning.

Present Level of Educational Performance (PLEP)

Descriptions of students' present levels of educational performance ranged from carefully crafted statements that included extensive data from multiple sources through general statements made on the basis of teachers' and other professionals' judgments about "good progress" or "continued concerns," for example. The standard for the field of education is that the PLEP should include data. General achievement data often are incorporated, but the goal of this section of the IEP is to establish the foundation and justification for the goals that are written, and so data specific to the student and gathered individually generally are needed. None of the IEPs reviewed met this requirement in all the areas in which goals were written and services were specified on the service delivery grid.

Another item noted about the PLEP section of the IEPs concerns the relationship between information contained there and the goals written for the student. For example, one IEP noted that a student experienced a high level of anxiety that negatively affected functioning in the classroom. However, no goals addressed this area. For another student, a hearing loss was identified as being significant, but services from the specialist in this area were written as one hour per month. For one student, the primary disability was an emotional impairment, but no data related to this domain were included.

Supplementary Aids and Services

The number of accommodations included on students' IEPs ranged from 3 (N=1) to 33 (N=1), with the large majority of the IEPs incorporating 15-20 accommodations. It was noted that some of the designated "accommodations" might be considered classroom strategies expected for any student and perhaps not necessary to list on an IEP. For example, hands-on learning, having students correct errors, and using visual cues to enhance learning are recommended for all students, but these items were specified on IEPs as accommodations. In some cases, accommodations spelled out in this section were also included as part of goals and benchmarks/objectives.

IEP Goals and Benchmarks/Objectives

The IEPs include a section in which goals are termed measurable, but the concept of measurable seems open to many interpretations. Examples of goals and concerns related to them include these:

- *Student will improve sensory processing and fine motor skills for increased success and independence in school-based activities 4/5 opportunities.*

    What would be the measures used to record progress toward this goal? How would the overall number of opportunities for demonstrating these skills be documented?

- *Student will improve communication skills so that written, oral, and social-pragmatic language are organized so that student may participate in language based activities throughout his school day as measured by data collection, observation, teacher report, and criterion referenced assessment.*

  What is a valid measure of improved communication skills? What are the data to be gathered as an indication of progress toward reaching this goal?

- *Student will improve at least a one-year improvement in her reading skills as measured by formal and/or informal assessments. Student will accomplish this by receiving SDI given by a special educator in a small group setting.*

  What are the skills to be learned? How does a one-year improvement define what the student is to learn? What is the purpose of specifying setting for the goal, which typically is not determined until all other IEP components have been prepared?

- *Student will improve the content and form of his language, while also improving specific aspects of speech, by addressing the objectives below.*

  What is the measurable goal? What is the justification for a goal being to achieve a set of objectives?

- S*tudent will participate in the XX grade curriculum with increased independence, following all teacher and classroom directions and demonstrate age appropriate behaviors as assessed by his daily behavior plan with 70% effectiveness.*

  What is a measure of increased independence? What is 70 percent effectiveness in age-appropriate behaviors?

Overall, IEPs seem to illustrate various schools of thought on how to appropriately prepare these essential documents, approaches that probably represent a span of years and changing expectations. The primary concern is for clarification of state and local current requirements for IEP preparation (e.g., standards based) and consistent adherence to those requirements.

Service Delivery Grid

Students' IEPs generally reflect a significant number of direct and indirect services by several professionals, provided in multiple locations. In some cases, the relationship between the PLEP and the services outlined did not seem to match. For example, one student whose achievement was reported as above average in all areas received seven 45-minute sessions of academic strategy instruction divided between the general and special education settings, speech/language therapy twice per week, consultation each week in both those areas, and extended school year services.   Another student whose scores indicated a reading level just below what would be expected in the grade level received eight 45-minute sessions of academic

strategies divided between co-teaching and separate settings, speech therapy three times/week (both settings), and ESY. Collectively, it appeared that students received extensive services even when noted needs were mild. This also raised a question--which could not be answered based on the data collected for this project--about IEPs being written based on the planned schedule, available services, or program conventions rather than specific student assessed needs.

When services are noted on the IEPs, providers are directly accountable for the delivery of those services. This point is raised regarding the fact that all 15 IEPs included one or more consultation sessions per week between special service providers and general education teachers. It is unclear whether these sessions occur, how they are documented, or what is accomplished through them.

A relationship did generally exist between the number of goals/objectives/benchmarks and the amount of service to be provided. That is, students with more goals tended to receive more minutes of services. At the same time, some services seemed fragmented. For example, one student received consultation from four different professionals each week (15-20 minutes for each), five 10-minutes sessions of academic strategies each week, 20 minutes/week of academic strategies in a separate setting, 30 minutes/week of speech services in a separate location, 30 minutes/week of occupational therapy in the general education setting, and two 30-minute counseling sessions/week in a separate setting. This type of service delivery raises questions related to effectiveness and efficiency along with those related to logistics and documentation for accountability.

Extended School Year (ESY)

A total of 11 of the 15 IEPs reviewed included the provision of extended school year (ESY) services in one or more areas. Massachusetts law specifies that ESY is justified when a student has demonstrated significant regression during the summer or clearly is likely to experience such regression. However, the IEPs did not provide data to support the need for this service, one that in many locales tends to be reserved for students with very significant intellectual or behavior-related disabilities. It raises questions related to the decision-making process for ESY as well as the need for evidence related to its need and the impact of its provision.

Other Items of Note Related to IEPs

Across all IEPs reviewed, several patterns were noted that merit mention:

- Variability is a word that characterizes the IEPs as a whole. Some IEPs included specific data; others did not. Some IEPs demonstrated a clear connection among PLEP, goals and benchmarks/objectives, and the services offered; others did not. Some IEPs included all information in a clear and concise form; others had potentially key bits of information missing or incomplete (for example, three IEPs did not specify the home language). Some IEPs made direct reference to current Massachusetts curricular goals; others made no reference to these standards.

- The IEPs seem to have quite a bit of redundancy, with information included in two or three places, sometimes verbatim. Part of this may be related to MA-required IEP verbiage, but this might be an area to explore in terms of streamlining IEP preparation.

- It was sometimes difficult to determine the exact nature of the meeting reported on the IEP. Some IEP documents were labeled as IEP amendments, but they appeared to be annual reviews. One was called an annual review but appeared to be a re-evaluation.

Themes Across All Data Types

Each type of data contributed to the snapshot of programs and services at Haggerty School, particularly those focused on co-teaching and inclusive practices. Some ideas were raised in several different ways and by many participants. Others were primarily evident in a single data set. In examining all the data, formal and informal, and reflecting on all the related information accessed in creating this snapshot, these larger themes emerged:

Inclusion is a passion and defines Haggerty School

In every conversation, whether formal or informal, and in all accessed documentation, Haggerty School is described as inclusive. Staff members are proud of their reputation for successfully serving students with disabilities, and they fully accept that the school district and community rely on their knowledge and compassion in designing effective programs for these students.

Understanding and implementation of key practices have become idiosyncratic

At the same time that inclusiveness is wholly accepted as a foundation of Haggerty School's services, a collective understanding of what inclusiveness looks like in day-to-day practice has become uncertain.   This theme is reflected in many ways. Some teachers express that students should not leave classrooms for services that now sometimes are delivered that way; others comment that some students need more than what can be provided in the general education classroom. Yet others discuss inclusion but comment that some students belong in other schools and programs. This theme continues with the service of co-teaching, with some staff members noting that this option is in place only when teachers are partnered for the entire school day and others recognizing the value of alternative co-teaching program structures.

The wealth of ideas, personnel, program options, and other resources, seasoned by a rich history and recent relatively rapid change, has contributed to inconsistencies and uncertainties

In some ways, reviewing all the data and reflecting on the evolution of Haggerty School is reminiscent of a beautiful home that has undergone remodeling numerous times. It began with a clear structure, carefully designed options, and universal understanding. But as time has gone

by, various additions were put in place, other options were dropped, federal and state mandates had to be tacked on...and suddenly a beautiful home has lost its simple elegance. It is still a fine home, but the various parts and pieces are not as well integrated as before. At Haggerty, the commitment to inclusiveness remains strong, but the loss is in understanding of what appropriate services include, agreement on the roles professionals should play, and the importance of consistency across grade levels and decision-making processes. Occasionally in remodeling, the good "bones" of a home are preserved, but some of the existing structure has to be redesigned to restore elegance. That notion also seems to apply directly to Haggerty School.

Collaboration is recognized as a key to moving forward, but a necessity that may be easier to discuss than achieve

Research clearly suggests that collaboration is a foundational characteristic of inclusive schools (e.g., Huberman, Navo, & Parrish, 2012). Further, a significant body of literature has identified the core knowledge and skills that contribute to such a culture (Friend & Cook, 2013). At Haggerty School, many comments were made about the importance of collaboration and the priority of nurturing it. At the same time, hints of challenges were noted: For example, some staff members expressed concern that only some staff member groups are influential and that they hold significant power in the school. Others noted that some staff members are not as supportive of inclusive practices as others, preferring that students leave classrooms for services instead of trying, to the maximum extent, to keep students with typical peers. As with other topics addressed in this snapshot, shared understanding may be a core issue to address.

The need for change is widely recognized, but as the saying goes, the devil may be in the details

Many respondents explicitly mentioned that change is needed. However, the changes needed are likely to be fairly significant and to require extensive discussion, agreement to reach consensus, and commitment to persist even when the conversations and planned changes in programs and services are challenging. The complexity of the collaboration that will lead to lasting improvements in services often is creating the time, environment, and structures to foster reflective interactions that directly tackle difficult topics and then ensuring that all staff members understand and pledge to support the revisions planned. Haggerty School staff members' participation in this snapshot strongly suggest that they can accomplish this goal, but it is not one reached quickly or easily.

Recommendations

Haggerty is a school with heart. In gathering information for this snapshot, many ideas were shared, all with a clear intent of providing the best education possible to students with disabilities. Participants demonstrated extraordinary professionalism, a willingness to raise

potentially difficult topics, and enthusiasm for contributing to this first step of shaping the future for Haggerty School.

Based on the information about the school reviewed as part of this project and the data collected as described in preceding sections of this report, the following are recommendations regarding next steps in inclusive practices at Haggerty School:

1. Implement beginning in summer 2014 a year of focused strategic planning focused on creating an integrated model for inclusive practices at Haggerty School, with a goal of implementing *Haggerty School Inclusive Practices 2.0* for the 2015-2016 school year.

   Despite the temptation to quickly identify possible strategies and implement them during the next school year, it is recommended that only essential changes be made. This recommendation is based on the fact that the past well-intentioned changes have led to a sense of disjointedness in programs and services and doing so again likely would have the same effect. The time taken to proceed with careful deliberation will have benefit for students and staff members alike. Among the challenging topics to be addressed through this planning are these: coming to a new shared understanding of Haggerty School's inclusive practices, resolving perceptions of uneven power and unclear communication, clarifying roles and responsibilities for all staff members, building structures and schedules that are efficient and effective, and better matching staffing to special education instructional needs. The resulting plan is likely to require two to three years to fully implement, and it should be complementary to and incorporated as part of larger strategic planning processes. The items noted below should become part of this plan.

2. As part of strategic planning, engage in ongoing and focused conversations to clearly articulate (a) what was particularly effective about the way that inclusive practices at Haggerty used to be; (b) what has changed regarding expectations for students, federal and state mandates, and local policies and practices that might make those practices now less effective; (c) strategies that other inclusive schools (preferably in MA) are employing in order to achieve strong positive outcomes for students with disabilities; (d) and clarification of the vocabulary used at Haggerty School (e.g., inclusion, co-teaching, RTI).

   It seems important that Haggerty School staff members come to respect the fine history of inclusion at the school while recognizing that many factors currently influencing education call for fully committing to alternative structures for programs and services. This strategy would facilitate the construction of a new, shared understanding of both the *what* and the *why* of inclusive practices and co-teaching in their most contemporary forms.

3. Provide professional development for all staff members regarding inclusive practices, co-teaching, collaboration, differentiation, and consultation.

Professional development emerged in this snapshot as a compelling need. Based on the data gathered, it is recommended that a matrix be constructed of topics, their priority to staff members, formats for providing professional development on them (e.g., face-to-face, book study, electronic learning), and appropriate participants. Shared understanding based on high quality professional development will lead to stronger programs and practices and improved student outcomes.

4. Provide professional development for special educators and related service providers on contemporary expectations for the preparation of IEPs and other identified special education topics.

The OSS staff members' care for students is remarkable, but by their own voice and through other data sources, their practices could improve with better technical knowledge and skills. For example, topics for IEP writing should include the inclusion of appropriate data in the PLEP section as well as emerging expectations such as the alignment of IEP goals (and objectives/benchmarks) with the Common Core State Standards (Massachusetts Frameworks). An additional topic is the importance of deliberately designing student services in a way that fosters independence rather than dependence. Yet another topic is the social and behavior domain, including strategies for responding to students with significant challenges in these areas.

5. Develop a comprehensive service delivery plan that takes into account as many student, teacher, school, and district factors as possible.

One priority for services at Haggerty School is a re-design of the service delivery structure. Consultation, co-teaching, and services in separate settings for students with disabilities should be available and utilized based on student needs in a way that is consistent across grade levels. In addition, conversations should occur and decisions made regarding the number of adults instructionally appropriate in any single classroom at any single time; need for consistency in how such services are captured on IEPs and communicated to parents; and the necessity of preparing the IEP and then identifying services (rather than the inadvertent reverse of that process, or knowing what services are generally available and writing the IEP to match them).

Although response to intervention is not a special education offering, it often becomes integral to services available in a school. It is recommended that the RTI work at Haggerty School be extended to explicitly encompass a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) model, one that specifically addresses both academic and social/behavioral needs (e.g., Verill & Rinaldi, 2011). Given the frequent mention during data collection of students with behavioral issues, this adjustment to the problem solving process would enable staff members to better address whole-student functioning.

6. Increase data collection and use at the classroom level, both permanent product and observational, for planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction for all students, but in

particular those with disabilities.

This item is included primarily because of the very noticeable need for better data use on IEPs, but it also is mentioned because no classroom data collection was observed across the seven observations, even though the number of adults present in classrooms certainly made such activity possible. It was noted that teachers and others sometimes comment on concerns about student behaviors or functioning, but their comments seemed to be based on perceptions rather than data, especially observational data. Data are important as a means for establishing baselines for interventions, enabling staff members to judge the effectiveness of those interventions; data also should be used for grouping students, making decisions about re-teaching, and determining how to accelerate student learning. Data likewise should be the basis for consultative conversations (common on the IEPs reviewed) and for adjusting students' levels of support.

7. DISTRICT: Design and implement a process for making inclusive practices an expectation in all Cambridge schools.

The quality of Haggerty School staff members' efforts in educating students with disabilities has opportunities and drawbacks. Parents know that their children will be welcomed at Haggerty and that staff members will do everything possible to nurture their development. However, the result of Haggerty's reputation is that it has so many students with disabilities and other special needs enrolled that it likely interferes with the pacing of curriculum, the management of student behaviors, and academic and other outcomes that could be accomplished for students with disabilities as well as for those who are typical learners. In addition, other schools may perceive that they have less obligation to meet the needs of students with disabilities. This influences school culture, denies other students and teachers the opportunity of learning about diversity, and undermines the very concept of inclusiveness. Further, the argument that the current model enables appropriate concentration of resources at Haggerty School is the same argument that was used 30 years ago to preserve separate special education schools, an argument ultimately found to be invalid.

8. DISTRICT: Systematically review potentially problematic special education policies and procedures to ensure they reflect contemporary expectations and best practice.

Many school districts are finding that the special education procedures in place for the past decade or more must be revised in order to align them with current expectations. One example is clarifications of expectations for the preparation of IEPs, an item included above for Haggerty staff members but probably appropriate for professionals throughout the district. Because IEPs are the documents central to the effective delivery of special education services and thus the outcomes student achieve, it is essential that they be written to reflect contemporary expectations, including data-based present level of performance, measurable goals and objectives/benchmarks that are aligned with

standards, and so on.

A second example related to this recommendation concerns a topic mentioned by several participants but not directly observed, that is, the roles and responsibilities of the school psychologist. Specifically, it was mentioned by participants that a school psychologist serves as the local education agency (LEA) representative at IEP meetings and is responsible for all the tasks related to those meetings. Comments were shared about the workload for these professionals. What is striking is that this assignment of responsibility, although common two decades ago, is very rare today, largely because it prevents these professionals from offering other services. For example, psychologists could help in addressing behavior and social/emotional needs, mentioned frequently by participants in this project, if the LEA responsibility was otherwise assigned. For clarification, this role often is assumed by a school administrator or an assigned special education coordinator.

Conclusion

Sustaining inclusive schooling is a challenge that requires constant attention to innumerable factors. Not only must the unique characteristics of students and their families be considered, but those characteristics must be held in the context of overall school culture and related programs and services; staff member knowledge and skills; and federal, state, and local law, policy, and expectations. The staff members at Haggerty School under Dr. Campbell's leadership have achieved success in creating an inclusive learning environment, but they also recognize that work remains to be done. Given the level of enthusiasm and commitment coupled with current knowledge, a strong willingness to learn more, and recognition of likely challenges, the goal of creating next-generation inclusive practices at Haggerty School certainly is attainable. And the beneficiaries of this effort, students with disabilities as well as other students, will as a result truly achieve their potential.

References

Brownell, M. T., Smith, S. J., Crockett, J. B., & Griffin, C. C. (2012). *Inclusive instruction: Evidence-based practices for teaching students with disabilities.* New York, NY: Guilford.

Friend, M. (2013). Inclusive practices. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (pp. 1144–1147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Friend, M. (2014). *Co-teach! A handbook for creating and sustaining effective classroom partnerships in inclusive schools* (2nd edition). Greensboro, NC: Marilyn Friend, Inc.

Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. (2015). *Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers* (7th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Pearson.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2013). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (7th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Causton, J., & Theoharis, G. (2013). Inclusive schooling: Are we there yet? *School Administrator, 70*(2), 19–25.

Hang, Q., & Rabren, K. (2009). An examination of co-teaching: Perspectives and efficacy indicators. *Remedial and Special Education, 30*, 259–268.

Hoppey, D., & McLeskey, J. (2013). A case study of principal leadership in an effective inclusive school. *Journal of Special Education, 46*, 245–256.

Huberman, M., Navo, M., & Parrish, T. (2012). Effective practices in high performing districts serving students in special education. *Journal of Special Education Leadership, 25*(2), 59–71.

McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. L. (2011). Educational programs for elementary students with learning disabilities: Can they be both effective and inclusive? *Learning Disabilities: Research & Practice, 26*, 48–57.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Digest of education statistics, 2012 (Chapter 2)* (NCES 2014-015). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Silverman, S. K., Hazelwood, C., & Cronin, P. (2009). *Universal education: Principles and practices for advancing achievement of students with disabilities.* Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children. Retrieved from http://education.ohio.gov/GD/DocumentManagement/DocumentDownload.aspx?DocumentID=73339

Solis, M., Vaughn, S., Swanson, E., & McCulley, L. (2012). Collaborative models of instruction: The empirical foundations of inclusion and co-teaching. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*, 498–510.

Verill, O H., & Rinaldi, C. (2011, May). *Research brief: Multi-tier system of supports (MTSS)*. Waltham, MA: Urban Special Education Leadership Collaborative. Retrieved from https://www.urbancollaborative.org/sites/urbancollaborative.org/files/mtss_brief_final .modified_1.pdf

Walsh, J. M. (2012). Co-teaching as a school system strategy for continuous improvement. *Preventing School Failure, 56*(1), 29–36.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

Survey about Special Education Programs and Services at Haggerty School

INTRODUCTION

In order to have the most accurate snapshot of current special education programs and services at Haggerty School, you are being asked to take a few minutes to respond to this survey. There are 16 items, but each item is followed by a box so that you can make comments related to the topic. If everyone provides input, the information will be the most detailed and instructive, and everyone's best thinking will contribute to shaping next steps for educating students with disabilities.

THANK-YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION!

CONSENT

By clicking on the "Proceed to Survey" button, you are indicating that you are agreeing to participate in this survey and have your input included in the aggregated results. No individual identifying information is being gathered.

> Proceed to Survey

Current Role:

- ⦾ General education teacher
- ⦾ Special education teacher
- ⦾ Paraprofessional
- ⦾ Related services professional
- ⦾ Other

> Back   Next

Survey Questions

FOCUS ON STUDENTS:

1. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School meet the academic needs of students with disabilities.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 1

2. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School meet the social/behavioral needs of students with disabilities.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 2

3. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School interfere with the academic achievement of students who do not have disabilities.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 3

4. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School interfere with the social/behavioral development of students who do not have disabilities.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 4

Back   Next

FOCUS ON STAFF MEMBERS:

5. General educators are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.

strongly disagree	disagree	neutral/undecided	agree	strongly agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	⦿

Comments regarding the topic of Item 5

6. Special educators are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.

strongly disagree	disagree	neutral/undecided	agree	strongly agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	⦿

Comments regarding the topic of Item 6

7. Paraprofessionals are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 7

8. Related services staff members are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 8

Back | Next

FOCUS ON PROGRAMS AND SERVICES:

9. Co-teaching is effective in accomplishing the joint goals of curriculum access and the provision of special education services.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 9

10. RTI is functioning in a way that provides intensive early intervention to possibly prevent the needs for special education services.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 10

11. We need to make changes in our programs and services to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

     C   C   C   C   ⦿

Comments regarding the topic of Item 11

[text box]

Back   Next

FOCUS ON OTHER SUPPORTS AND PERCEPTIONS:

12. Dr. Campbell is supportive of our special education programs and services.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

     C   C   C   C   ⦿

Comments regarding the topic of Item 12

[text box]

13. The district is supportive of our special education programs and practices.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 13

14. Parents are satisfied with special education services at Haggerty School.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Comments regarding the topic of Item 14

15. Our school is characterized by a strong collaborative culture.

strongly disagree   disagree   neutral/undecided   agree   strongly agree

Other Comments:

16. What other comments would you like to make about the past, present, or future of RTI, special education, related services, and inclusive practices at Haggerty School?

Back | Next

We thank you for your time spent taking this survey.
Your response has been recorded.

Appendix B: Focus Group and Interview Protocols

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR FOCUS GROUPS

Introduction:

- o   Who am I?

- o   Why am I here?

- o   What do I already know? (Stress long positive history of inclusiveness in this school)

- o   What is the purpose of this focus group?

- o   Who are you? (Who is in the group?)

- o   Note: Stress this is a snapshot, a contribution to the thinking about shaping the strong foundation into its next level; also address anonymity, need to record the conversation, use of the results

1.   How would you characterize the beliefs among staff members in this school regarding the inclusive education of students with disabilities? Your beliefs? Others? What is the range?

2.   When you think about inclusive practices in this school compared to what you now about inclusive practices in other places you have taught or others you know about, what are the similarities/dissimilarities? Advantages/disadvantages?

3.   How is the current structure working (for example, distribution of special education staff, service models, support from the district, professional development)? Positives? Problems? For problems, what could be done to alleviate them?

4.   One piece of data available to everyone is that SWD are not improving at the expected rate in terms of academic achievement. To what do you attribute this information? What are your ideas about steps that could be taken to improve these students' learning?

5. I understand that you are implementing RTI at your school. What happens in your RTI process? How effective is it? On what do you base your perception? What might strengthen RTI at Haggerty?

6. Many researchers have reported that collaboration is a key to effective in inclusive schooling, and yet collaboration can be complex and challenging. In what ways is collaboration effective/successful at Haggerty? What are current challenges to collaboration? Within your school? School to district? Other?

7. Co-teaching was introduced at Haggerty as a vehicle for supporting students with disabilities in general education classes. How well does it accomplish that purpose? What happens if a student with a disability needs services in another setting? If co-teaching is a primary model, how are students' IEPs written to ensure that their unique needs are being met?

8. In inclusive schools, one challenge often faced is addressing students' IEP goals in the context of the general education classroom. How does that occur? What are examples of specially designed instruction occurring in co-taught classes to meet students' needs? How effective are these interventions? What data are kept related to students' learning in general education settings? How are these data used for planning instruction?

9. Related services are an integral part of students' education. How are those services (for example, OT/PT/SLT) delivered at Haggerty? How are they integrated with other instruction as well as the inclusive practices and co-teaching structures?

10. What are parents' views of the programs and services at Haggerty? If you were asked to predict what they would like to see to improve them, what do you think they would say? What would they say to keep? To eliminate? To change?

11. What else would help me to understand Haggerty School, whether its past, its present, or it future? What do you think it would take to help Haggerty evolve from the school it is today to the one that would be called visionary in the future?

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS

- **Introduction:**

  o Introductions—personal history in district

  o Who am I?

  o Why am I here?

  o What do I already know?

  o What is the purpose of this interview?

  o Note: Context is that change is already underway. This is a contribution to the change process, especially the programs and services portion. Not intended in any way to address the organizational/staffing dimension of student services.

1. What are the strengths/accomplishments of Haggerty School/CPS in terms of educating students with disabilities?

2. What are the liabilities/challenges of Haggerty School/CPS in terms of educating students with disabilities?

3. Achievement scores of students with disabilities seem to be an area in which improvement has not been as steady as hoped. What might it take to change this?

4. From what I've learned, CPS is engaged in a number of initiatives that affect teachers and students. How are perspective and needs of students with disabilities and their teachers and related staff incorporated in to planning, professional development, implementation, and evaluation of these initiatives?

5. The school website says Haggerty is inclusive. What does that mean from your leadership perspective? How would you characterize the beliefs among staff members in your school/in the district regarding special education in general? The inclusive education of students with disabilities? What is the range?

   For someone with history: How did the district evolve to the current system?

   For all: How are decisions made about the setting in which students with disabilities are

educated?

6. How effective is the current set of programs and services (for example, distribution of special education staff, service models, support from the district to schools, professional development)? Positives? Problems? For problems, what could be done to alleviate them?

7. Many researchers have reported that collaboration is a key to effective in inclusive schooling, and yet collaboration can be complex and challenging. In what ways is collaboration effective/successful at Haggerty School, at the district team level? What are current challenges to collaboration? Within school? School to district? District? District to school?

8. PRINICIPAL ONLY: Co-teaching is a vehicle for supporting students with disabilities in general education classes. How well does it accomplish that purpose? What happens if a student with a disability needs services in another setting? If co-teaching is a primary model, how are students' IEPs written to ensure that their unique needs are being met?

9. PRINCIPAL ONLY: What are your expectations for teachers to use data to make instructional decisions regarding students with disabilities?

10. What are parents' views of the programs and services at Haggerty/CPS? If you were asked to predict what they would like to see to improve them, what do you think they would say? What would they say to keep? To eliminate? To change?

11. What else would help me to understand special education programs and services Haggerty/CPS, whether its past, its present, or it future? What do you think it would take to help Haggerty evolve from the school it is today to the one that would be called visionary in the future?

12. FOR DISTRICT ONLY: How is professional development prioritized at the district level and delivered to teachers and other staff? What proportion of professional development focuses on students with disabilities and other learners with special needs?

13. FOR DISTRICT ONLY: What is your view of the Haggerty history and current situation? How does this affect outcomes for students with disabilities? Is the arrangement ok? In

need of change?

14. FOR DISTRICT ONLY: What accountability systems are in place regarding principals' roles in setting expectations at school sites for effective special education programs and services? Gathering data regarding them? Fostering change to improve outcomes and reduce the gap?

Appendix C: Template for Classroom Observations

Observation Instrument

Demographics

1. Date :
2. Time :
3. Teachers:
4. Principal:
5. Grade level:
6. Subject or course:
7. Lesson objective:
8. Total number of students:
9. Total number of SWD:
10. Other adults in classroom:

Furniture

1. ___ Desks in rows/aisles
2. ___ Desks in small groups
3. ___ Desks in alternative arrangement (e.g., u-shape)
4. ___ Tables instead of desks
5. ___ SWD distributed throughout classroom
6. ___ Furniture/equipment arranged for co- teaching:
7. ___ Other furniture comments:

Classroom Equipment in Use

1. ___ Teacher computer
2. ___ Student computer(s) or tablet devices
3. ___ Television
4. ___ Smart board/media projector
5. ___ Overhead projector or document camera
6. ___ Whiteboard/chalkboard
7. ___ Timer used-any type. Purpose:
8. ___ Other equipment Specify:

Materials

1. __ Lesson plans available incorporating co-teaching
2. __ Worksheet(s)
3. __ Textbooks used
4. __ Student notebooks/paper and pencil
5. __ Other books used (e.g., novels, storybooks, primary sources)
6. __ Instructional/adaptive technology in use:
7. __ Manipulatives used-several/all students:
8. __ Examples of differentiated materials. Specify:
9. __ Evidence of materials for specially designed instruction. Specify:
10. __ Other materials:

Displays

1. __ Student work
2. __ Class rules/expectations
3. __ Schedule
4. __ Objectives for today:
5. __ Instructional prompts (e.g., word wall, math formulae):
6. __ Motivational items (e.g., posters, banners):
7. __ Other:
8. __ Other:

Co-Teaching Approach(es)

1. __ 1 teach, 1 observe
2. __ Station teaching
3. __ Parallel teaching
4. __ Alternative teaching
5. __ Teaming
6. __ 1 teach, 1 assist
7. __ No co-teaching
8. __ Approach seems intentional, to meet goal of instruction
9. __ Instructional intensity greater than that of a 1-teacher class

Teaching and Engagement

1. ___ Instructional pace is brisk
2. ___ Transitions minimize time loss
3. ___ Instruction is clearly organized
4. ___ PBS system is implemented
5. ___ Choral responding:
6. ___ Use of action, raps, dances to facilitate learning
7. ___ Use of visuals to aid instruction
8. ___ Use of manipulatives:
9. ___ Evidence of instructional differentiation:
10. ___ Data collection. Specify:
11. ___ Other teaching techniques Specify:

Evidence of Specially Designed Instruction, Accommodations, Modifications

Examples:

Teacher Interactions and Participation

1. ___ Solo taught class
2. ___ GET leads most instruction
3. ___ SET leads most instruction
4. ___ Instructional roles are equitable
5. ___ Instructional talk is approximately equal
6. ___ Teachers interact with each other to facilitate instruction
7. ___ Behavior management/classroom management is shared
8. ___ Indicators of parity. Examples:
9. ___ Other

Notes

Lesson outline and items of note

Appendix D: Template for IEP Reviews

IEP DATA SUMMARY

Name No.	Gender M F	Grade	Age

Disability   AU   CI   DD   EI   HI   II   NI   PI   SI   SLD

Meeting type IN RE AR AM	ESY _____	Assmt Partn 1 2 3

PLEP (and results)

	OTHER ASSMT DATA

- Intellectual Ability

- Achievement

- Social/Emotional/Behavioral

- Speech/language

- OT/PT

- Anecdotal

- Screening

- Other

Academic Areas Affected   ELA   H/SS   MA   SCI/TECH   OTH

| Other Needs   APE BR EXCURR SOC/EMOT AT COMM LEP TRAVTR BEH

DHH NONACAD VOC MOTOR OTH_____ |
|---|

SDI   CONT METH PERFCRIT

No. of Accommodations/Type   0   1-5   6-10   10-15   16-20   >20

Notes/Comments:

IEP Goals				
Area	No. of Bmks./Objs.	Relevance of B/O to Goals 3=High 2=Med 1=Low	Relevance of B/O to State Standards (CCSS) 3=High 2=Med 1=Low	Notes
Reading				
Spelling				
Writing				
Math				
Sp/Lang				
Fine Motor				
Gross Motor				
Other				

Service Delivery Grid					
Service Type	Areas/Amount				
	Acad Str	Sp/Lang	OT	PT	OTH
Consultation					
General Education					
Other Locations					

Appendix E: Aggregated Quantitative Survey Results

Report

Current Role:

#	Answer		Response	%
1	General education teacher		12	32%
2	Special education teacher		6	16%
3	Paraprofessional		9	24%
4	Related services professional		4	11%
5	Other		6	16%
	Total		37	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	2.62
Variance	2.13
Standard Deviation	1.46
Total Responses	37

1. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School meet the academic needs of students with disabilities.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		1	3%
2	disagree		3	9%
3	neutral/undecided		7	21%
4	agree		20	59%
5	strongly agree		3	9%
	Total		34	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	3.62
Variance	0.79
Standard Deviation	0.89
Total Responses	34

2. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School meet the social/behavioral needs of students with disabilities.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		1	3%
2	disagree		5	16%
3	neutral/undecided		9	28%
4	agree		14	44%
5	strongly agree		3	9%
	Total		32	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	3.41
Variance	0.96
Standard Deviation	0.98
Total Responses	32

3. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School interfere with the academic achievement of students who do not have disabilities.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		7	22%
2	disagree		21	66%
3	neutral/undecided		4	13%
4	agree		0	0%
5	strongly agree		0	0%
	Total		32	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	3
Mean	1.91
Variance	0.35
Standard Deviation	0.59
Total Responses	32

4. Special education programs/services at Haggerty School interfere with the social/behavioral development of students who do not have disabilities.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		10	31%
2	disagree		17	53%
3	neutral/undecided		3	9%
4	agree		2	6%
5	strongly agree		0	0%
	Total		32	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	4
Mean	1.91
Variance	0.67
Standard Deviation	0.82
Total Responses	32

5. General educators are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		0	0%
2	disagree		10	32%
3	neutral/undecided		14	45%
4	agree		7	23%
5	strongly agree		0	0%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	4
Mean	2.90
Variance	0.56
Standard Deviation	0.75
Total Responses	31

6. Special educators are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		1	3%
2	disagree		7	23%
3	neutral/undecided		14	45%
4	agree		9	29%
5	strongly agree		0	0%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	4
Mean	3.00
Variance	0.67
Standard Deviation	0.82
Total Responses	31

7. Paraprofessionals are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		1	3%
2	disagree		4	13%
3	neutral/undecided		17	55%
4	agree		8	26%
5	strongly agree		1	3%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	3.13
Variance	0.65
Standard Deviation	0.81
Total Responses	31

8. Related services staff members are satisfied with special education programs and services at Haggerty School.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		0	0%
2	disagree		5	16%
3	neutral/undecided		18	58%
4	agree		7	23%
5	strongly agree		1	3%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	5
Mean	3.13
Variance	0.52
Standard Deviation	0.72
Total Responses	31

9. Co-teaching is effective in accomplishing the joint goals of curriculum access and the provision of special education services.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		4	13%
2	disagree		3	10%
3	neutral/undecided		11	37%
4	agree		8	27%
5	strongly agree		4	13%
	Total		30	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	3.17
Variance	1.45
Standard Deviation	1.21
Total Responses	30

10. RTI is functioning in a way that provides intensive early intervention to possibly prevent the needs for special education services.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		1	3%
2	disagree		3	10%
3	neutral/undecided		16	52%
4	agree		11	35%
5	strongly agree		0	0%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	4
Mean	3.19
Variance	0.56
Standard Deviation	0.75
Total Responses	31

11. We need to make changes in our programs and services to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		0	0%
2	disagree		2	6%
3	neutral/undecided		10	32%
4	agree		14	45%
5	strongly agree		5	16%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	5
Mean	3.71
Variance	0.68
Standard Deviation	0.82
Total Responses	31

12. Dr. Campbell is supportive of our special education programs and services.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		1	3%
2	disagree		1	3%
3	neutral/undecided		3	10%
4	agree		7	23%
5	strongly agree		19	61%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	4.35
Variance	1.04
Standard Deviation	1.02
Total Responses	31

13. The district is supportive of our special education programs and practices.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		1	3%
2	disagree		5	16%
3	neutral/undecided		12	39%
4	agree		12	39%
5	strongly agree		1	3%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	3.23
Variance	0.78
Standard Deviation	0.88
Total Responses	31

14. Parents are satisfied with special education services at Haggerty School.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		0	0%
2	disagree		1	3%
3	neutral/undecided		6	19%
4	agree		23	74%
5	strongly agree		1	3%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	2
Max Value	5
Mean	3.77
Variance	0.31
Standard Deviation	0.56
Total Responses	31

15. Our school is characterized by a strong collaborative culture.

#	Answer		Response	%
1	strongly disagree		2	6%
2	disagree		3	10%
3	neutral/undecided		6	19%
4	agree		17	55%
5	strongly agree		3	10%
	Total		31	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	3.52
Variance	1.06
Standard Deviation	1.03
Total Responses	31