DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 472 EC 161 811

AUTHOR Nevin, Ann; And Others
TITLE Administrative Implications of an Empirical Analysis of the Role of the Regular Classroom Teacher in Implementing IEPs.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-14, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Elementary Education; *Individualized Education Programs; *Mainstreaming; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The role of regular elementary class teachers in implementing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for mainstreamed special education students was examined in a three phase study (student records review, teacher survey, and followup interview). The approach, based on role theory, examined the statistical independence of ratings according to six mutually exclusive categories (program type, geography/population, grade level, skill level, experience, and training). Results indicated that regular class teachers were implementing a variety of modifications of their regular programs to accommodate the special needs but a minority of the modifications were actually written into the records, suggesting the existence of serious policy issues. The regular class teachers were clearly struggling to cope with increased demands related to serving special education students, had substantial discretion as to how they actually worked with students and specialists, and relied heavily on informal rather than formal processes to achieve progress. (Author/CL)

Administrative Implications of an Empirical Analysis of the Role of the Regular Classroom Teacher in Implementing IEPs

by

Ann Nevin, Ph.D., Associate Professor[1]
Special Education Programs
College of Education and Social Services
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont 05405

M.I. Semmel, Ph.D., Professor and Chair
and
Scott McCann, Post Graduate Researcher
Special Education Programs
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California 93105

American Educational Research Association
Division A: Educational Administration
Montreal, Canada
April 15, 1983

ABSTRACT

The educational administration implications of a study of regular class teacher's role in implementing individualized education programs (IEPs) are discussed. The study, based on role theory, included three phases (a student records review, a teacher survey and a follow up interview), and examined the statistical independence of ratings according to six mutually exclusive categories (program type, geography/population, grade level, skill level, experience, and training). Results indicated that regular class teachers were implementing a variety of modifications of their regular programs to accommodate the special needs but a minority of the modifications were actually written into the records raising serious policy issues related to serving special education students. The regular class teachers in this study were clearly struggling to cope with increased demands related to serving special education students, had substantial discretion as to how they actually worked with students and specialists, and relied heavily on informal rather than formal processes to achieve progress. As such, the teacher can be viewed as a policy maker, fulfilling the demands of federal and state legislation within the constraints of limited expertise, lack of time, and increased work loads.

The objective of the study was to analyze the role of the regular elementary classroom teacher in implementing individualized education programs (IEPs) for special education students placed in regular classrooms. The use of the IEP document by regular classroom teachers was considered a critical issue given the high degree of involvement, time, costs, and expertise involved in developing IEPs. In the face of deregulation movements, the mandate to provide appropriate educational programs in least restrictive environments (i.e., regular classrooms) can be achieved only if regular classroom teachers are capable of implementing such programs. Because this study focused on the disposition and use of the IEP once it was developed, the findings identified the actual functions served by the IEP in the education of exceptional children in regular classrooms.

The analytical scheme used in examining the implementation of the IEP by the regular classroom teacher was based on role theory. Three aspects of role were adapted for this study: prescribed or mandated role; subjective or perceived (idealized) role; and actual (enacted or observed) role. The prescribed role for the regular teacher was defined through a review of state and federal special educational legislation. The perceived and enacted roles of the regular teachers in the IEP process were defined through a thorough review of the literature. This study delineated the enacted and idealized roles, and analyzed existing relationships with variables identified through the literature review. A full description of this review is contained in the final report (Nevin, Semmel and McCann, 1981).

METHOD

As shown in Figure 1, the study was conducted in three phases: a student

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

IEP records review, a teacher survey, and follow-up teacher interviews. The

student IEP review phase followed procedures of a regularly scheduled triennial review of programs. One hundred IEPs were randomly selected from elementary school sites of a special education service region in its fifth year of implementing state and federal special education legislation. This enabled drawing an unbiased sample from rural and urban schools, from primary (K-3) and intermediate (4-6) grades, and from less restrictive (resource) programs and more restrictive (special class) programs. For each IEP, information was collected regarding regular class teacher involvement in referral, planning, reviewing, and implementing IEPs; extent of student participation in and modifications of regular programs; provisions for physical education; types of goals and objectives, placement changes and review actions; service coordination, and distribution of copies of the IEP.

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

The second phase of the study involved written responses to a comprehensive survey of the regular classroom teachers identified in the IEPs reviewed who were serving one or more special education students in their classrooms. As shown in Figure 2, the conceptual scheme for the development of the teachers' survey focused on 4 levels of involvement: awareness level, attitudes level, direct instructional level and the support services level. The survey included demographic data such as class size, number of students with IEPs, experience and skill level related to special education competencies required for certification as an elementary teacher. In addition, teachers noted the frequency and nature of interactions with support service personnel; work effort; frequency and nature of activities in teaching special education students; satisfaction with the progress of special education students; and frequency and satisfaction with time involved in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching activities and special education inservice training.

The third phase of the study involved personal interviews with a randomly selected subsample of the survey respondents in order to obtain a measure of the reliability and validity of written survey responses and to obtain additional information about teacher activities in implementing IEPs. Interviews also surfaced perceived barriers to effective IEP implementation in regular classrooms and recommended changes.

Thus, there were three sources of data: information collected from written IEPs; written responses to a comprehensive survey of teachers identified as serving special education students in their regular class; and personal interviews with a randomly selected subsample of survey respondents. As shown in Figure 3, the literature review yielded major findings related to the regular class teacher's role in implementing IEPs. Specific descriptive and correlational research questions were generated to address and identify the variables associated with (1) role specifications for regular classroom teachers, (2) IEP document characteristics, (3) implementer characteristics, (4) environmental characteristics, and (5) IEP student characteristics.

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

The statistical independence of respondents' ratings was tested by grouping responses into mutually exclusive categories for the following key variables (identified through the literature review): Program type (least restrictive vs. more restrictive); Geography/population (urban vs. rural); Grade level (primary, K-3, vs. intermediate, 4-6); Skill level (low, medium, high ratings on 11 special education competencies required for certification as an elementary teacher); Experience (reported years of experience in 5 of the 11 special education competencies vs. 6 or more); and Training (low, those teachers who responded "yes" to receiving training in 5 or fewer special education competencies required for certification as an elementary teacher, vs. high, those who responded "yes" to receiving training in 6 or more).

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the variety of areas in which handicapped students participated in regular programs ranging from recess with the highest percentage of participation

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

(81%) to math and language with the lowest participation (49%). Thus nearly 50% of the sample received instruction in the regular classroom in academic subjects such as reading and math. As shown in Table 2, this matched the most frequently named goals and objectives for special education students as noted on the IEPs. Thus it is clear that regular teachers appear to have some direct role in the pursuit of IEP goals.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

A majority of IEP records (61%) indicated that regular class teachers were implementing a wide variety of modifications of their regular programs to accommodate the special education needs of the special education students assigned to their classes. However, only 24% of these modifications were actually written into the IEP, raising serious policy issues related to serving special education students. Table 3 shows the types of modifications implemented by regular classroom teachers categorized as consequential modification, curriculum modification, or process modification. However, many of these are

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

common teaching techniques used with all students. This is consistent with teachers' statements that they do "nothing special" in educating their handicapped students. Thus it may be debatable whether these modifications belong on the IEP since most are part of regular programs. Furthermore, those IEPs which listed modifications of the regular programs suggest additional activities for regular teachers related to IEP implementation.

Despite these responsibilities, regular teachers were NOT highly involved in the formal IEP process. As shown in Table 4 the teacher survey findings

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

confirmed that regular class teacher involvement in the IEP process ranged from low involvement in some aspects of the formal processes (such as having a copy of the IEP, attending IEP planning meetings) to high involvement in other aspects representing the informal process (such as modifying the regular program, interacting with special education and support personnel, referring other students for testing and so on). However, although 74% of the survey respondents indicated they were assigned one or more special education students, only 23% indicated they had a copy of the IEP. This is especially critical in that teachers who had a copy of the IEP were more likely to refer to the IEP ($p<.05$) compared to those who only had access to a copy. Furthermore, teachers with greater experience with special education competencies were also more likely to refer to the document ($p<.05$). Most teachers used the IEP document infrequently - once or twice per year - whereas a few reported using the IEP once or twice a month. The most common uses were to review student progress, to discuss student progress with special educators and parents while the most uncommon use was to prepare lesson plans. Teachers who were more likely to refer to the IEP included 1) those who integrated students from resource program, 2) those with more special education experience, 3) those who had a personal copy of the IEP, 4) those who attended IEP meeting. However, most teachers said the IEP was somewhat helpful, but 20% said not at all helpful. Teachers who were more likely to report the IEP was helpful were 1) those who had a copy of the IEP, 2) those who literally used the IEP, and 3) those who reported they could teach special education skills.

Teachers reported interacting most frequently with special education teachers (90% interacted 1-2 days per week); special education resource specialists

(75% interacted 1-2 days per week); other regular class teachers (68%); and special education aides (57%). The least frequent interactions were reported for special education administrators, principals, program specialists, and regional special education instructional personnel. The nature of support was also reported. Providing special materials and ideas for teaching special education students was most frequently cited for program specialists; resource specialists were most frequently cited for providing direct instruction time; emotional support or stress reduction and inservice training in special education techniques. A measure of satisfaction with the support received was also obtained. Of those who reported their satisfaction, the highest degree of satisfaction was reported for the services provided by resource specialists and special class teacher.

Although regular teachers in this sample were not highly involved in formal IEP process, it is clear that they were actively involved in the education of handicapped students. Table 5 shows the types of activities in which they most frequently engaged, based on their ratings of 26 activities which were categorized as 8 diagnostic/prescriptive functions. Monitoring progress of

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

special education students in regular classes was most frequently cited. Direct Instruction, Assessment, Planning and Coordinating, Referring, Supervising were cited by 84% to 66% of the respondents. Due Process and Inservice Functions were cited by 29% and 21% of the respondents. Comparisons with ratings of ideal times to engage in each function indicated that most respondents were quite satisfied with the levels of activity for each diagnostic/prescriptive function. A majority felt they should spend more time observing special educators implement special education techniques to learn an educational practice which helps special education students in their regular classes. This finding was further supported by respondents' ratings of inservice training events: 67% of

respondents participated in at least one special education inservice event with consultation from the special educator cited by 62% of the respondents. This was rated by 99% as "somewhat to extremely" useful. Discussion with other regular class teachers who also had special education students was the next most frequently cited event: 53% reported they received it and 64% perceived it to be "somewhat to extremely" useful. Visitation to exemplary programs was cited by 86% as "most useful" although only 9% reported they had engaged in this type of inservice activity. Teachers made several recommendations for change. The most common suggestions included 1) giving teachers more time or opportunities to meet with special educators to discuss student program instructional technique, 2) receiving inservice training which allowed opportunities to observe exemplary programs and special education techniques as well as consultation with special educators, 3) receiving training in behavior management, diagnosis of learning problems, instructional procedures and consultation/planning, 4) being more informed about special services available in school and district, and 5) being more involved in the IEP process.

In summary, chi square analyses yielded significant relationships between teacher survey items and program type; geography/population, grade level, special education training, skill level, experience, and having a copy of the IEP. Teachers in more densely populated areas were more likely to report high levels of satisfaction with support. Teacher's knowledge of IEP students enrollment in their classes was associated with program type and skill level of the teacher. Teachers who reported that the IEP was helpful were more likely to have high skill levels for the special education competencies required for certification as an elementary teacher. Special education training in these competencies was correlated with accuracy in reporting modifications of regular programs. On the job experience related to special education competencies was significantly correlated with teacher's referring to the IEP, knowledge of the law, and use of special education inservice events. Attendance at IEP

meetings was significantly associated with program type, grade level, and special education skill level and training. Finally having a copy of the IEP was significantly associated with referring to the IEP.

DISCUSSION

It is clear that the regular class teachers in this study were struggling to cope with increased demands related to serving special education students. They had substantial discretion as to how they actually worked with the students and specialists and they relied on informal rather than formal processes to achieve educational progress.

Furthermore, the intent of the legislation in encouraging instructional opportunities for handicapped students with their nonhandicapped classmates appears to have been met. The majority of regular class teachers in this study appeared to assume responsiblity for the education of the special education students assigned to their classes. They appeared to be willing and able to modify the traditional curriculum to accommodate the unique needs and abilities of the students with IEPs.

These results may be interpreted in relation to the observations of Weatherley and Lipsky (1979) regarding the influence of "street level bureaucrats" on translating public policy into practice. In this study, the regular classroom teachers had substantial discretion in how they actually worked with the student as well as with the specialists involved with the student. Their daily routines included procedures for coping with the extra demands and pressures imposed by federal and state special education legislation. These routines were primarily outside the formal processes which special education professionals follow, relying more on informal relationships and processes.

The regular teachers' lack of involvement in the more formal aspects of the IEP process may be interpreted in several ways. First, there may be an

informal division of labor wherein such responsibility for educating handicapped students is perceived to lie with the special educators. Second, there may be a lack of knowledge of the intent and provisions of the federal and state laws regarding the raison d'etre for the formal IEP process. Third, regular teachers may be excluded from the formal process by the demands of their teaching assignment. Finally, administrative arrangements may exclude regular teachers from the process. Most likely, each of these conditions contributes to the observed pattern of low involvement in the formal IEP process.

The public policies related to serving special education students which were reflected in the teachers' operationalized daily routines included provision for instruction in the least restrictive environment (i.e., the regular classroom) and implementation of the IEP. These teachers voluntarily included a proportion of special education students who either did not need modifications of their regular education programs or for whom the teachers had a curriculum modification or special procedure which was effective for the student. In view of these results, the regular classroom teacher can be viewed as a policy maker, fulfilling the demands of the federal and state legislation within the constraints of limited expertise, lack of time, and increased work load.

Limitations of the Findings

The study focused on the role of regular elementary teachers in a system which has been, for the past five years, implementing the requirements of state and federal special education legislation which encourages integration of special education students in the regular classroom. Systems which have more recently begun to address legislative mandates may differ significantly.

One administrative difference between primary (K-3) and intermediate (4-6) teachers is the departmental approach often found at the intermediate level. However, few correlations were found for grade level. Therefore, grade level may not be a variable which significantly affects the teacher's role. However,

there may be other differences between regular elementary and secondary teachers' roles. Thus, only cautious generalization of the findings of this study to the role of secondary regular class teachers who implement IEPs may be warranted.

The random sampling process of this study yielded a distribution of IEPs for students with mild to severe handicaps. This particular random sample identified no regular class teachers involved in implementing IEPs for students with severe handicaps. Thus, it is not possible to determine to what extent teacher behaviors are similar or different when integrating students with severe handicaps.

The study focused on the perceptions and self report of elementary teachers' behaviors, activities, and interactions on behalf of special education students. The validity of these perceptions and self-reported behaviors was established through a content analysis of their students' IEPs and follow-up oral interviews. No attempt was made to obtain perceptions of the regular class teacher's role from administrators, special educators, parents or advocates of handicapped students, or the handicapped students themselves. Furthermore, the study essentially focused on process variables (such as instructional activities) and presage variables (such as training or experience). The study did not evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher's role in accomplishing student achievement.

The major findings of the study are described according to percent of respondents for each teacher survey item and each student IEP records review item. This information provided a simple descriptive analysis. It should be noted that approximately 25% of the chi square analyses yielded associations at $p \leq .05$ criterion level. However, the relatively large number of independent tests used increases the probability of Type I errors in the study. Hence, "significance" of any single test must be interpreted with the utmost caution pending replication in subsequent research.

Finally, the findings of the study must be considered in the context of rapidly changing social policies concerning the education of handicapped children. Although the mandates and regulations of P.L. 94-142 have been in effect since the mid 1970's, many school districts across the state and country are still struggling to bring their school services into compliance. Especially for school systems meeting challenges for accountability in the face of declining enrollments, increased staff professionalization and unionization, and shrinking resources, the indecision which arises from a movement to decrease funding for P.L. 94-142 initiatives adds still another challenge. Therefore, it is important that the research which documents the actual involvement of the regular class teachers' role in the day-to-day delivery of educational programs for handicapped students be interpreted accordingly.

Implications

The following management and supervisor implications of the study's findings are offered with the above caveats in mind.

In light of the findings, regular and special education administrators should critically review their respective and collective supervision procedures to ensure adequate recognition of the role of the regular classroom teacher in implementing individualized educational programs. Several results of this study indicate that a) some regular teachers are involved in both the formal and informal aspects of implementing IEPs, and many more are involved in only the informal aspects; b) some regular teachers are receiving satisfactory levels of resource support in order to implement IEPs, and c) most regular teachers are modifying their programs to accommodate the special needs and abilities of students with IEPs.

There appear to be several key variables which are under the control of administrators and which are correlated with the regular teacher's role in

implementing IEPs. Teachers must be made aware of the presence and characteristics of the special education students placed in their regular including these teachers in IEP meetings and/or providing them with a personal copy of the IEP for each child assigned to their classroom. While the logistics of having regular class teachers attend IEP meetings may present some difficulties, there is a value of having these teachers attend the meetings, given the observed relationship between attendance and increased awareness that special education students were placed in class, as well as implementation of IEPs, should override such difficulties. IEP meetings could be scheduled in the late afternoon, or substitute teachers or aides be utilized to allow regular class teachers to attend these meetings. Further, according to recent policy guidelines, regular teachers who do not attend IEP meetings for their special education students, should either meet with special educators to be informed about those students, or receive a copy of the IEP.

Similarly, logistical problems may surface in the provision of personal copies of IEPs to all regular teachers serving special children. However, the empirical data clearly suggest that teachers who have a personal copy of the IEP refer to it to discuss the program with the special educators and view it as helpful in providing educational services to the student. Provision of a copy to special educators or other personnel to which the regular teacher can refer was not found to be an adequate alternative.

Communication and coordination between regular and special educators is another area in which administrative changes might have a positive effect. The importance of the resource support and coordinative functions of special educators for effective implementation of IEPs was evident in all sources of data in this study, as well as in other studies (Safer, et al., 1979; Craig, et al., 1980). Administrators can take steps to facilitate communication and

coordination between regular and special educators such as scheduling opportunities to discuss student programming and progress, providing regular and special educators opportunities to observe their students in other classrooms (i.e., in special and regular classes respectively) and designating someone who consults with and trains regular class teachers who integrate special education students.

Teachers' knowledge of relevant legislation was found to be generally limited. More than half were aware of state special education legislation, but less than half were familiar with the special education competencies, and even fewer knew about federal special education legislation. However, knowledge of the laws was associated with knowledge of the state special education competencies, and knowledge of these competencies was related to participation in inservice training. Thus, inservice training for regular educators should address federal special education legislation as well as state laws in competency requirements.

Teachers' knowledge of the special education services available at their school sites also emerged as a significant factor in implementation. Generally, regular class teachers were not highly aware of the available special education services in their respective schools. They achieved an average accuracy of 56% in naming the special education services as to the specific academic or nonacademic activities which were provided. This is important in view of the fact that regular class teachers appeared to rely on special education personnel for the direction and substantive content related to the education of their special education students.

It is recommended that administrators help identify the administrative and educational practices which enhance the involvement of regular class teachers in implementing IEPs and the effectiveness of such implementation. A large

proportion of the teachers in this study noted the use of several "best practices" (e.g. Johnson and Johnson, 1978, Cooperative Learning TEchnique) in integrating their special education students. However, many of the regular class teachers in this study did not perceive their modifications of the regular program as special education. Yet, without those modifications, many students with IEPs might not have been accommodated in the regular classroom. These regular education practices should be identified to determine their value for mainstreaming special education students as well as for normal progress students for education in general.

The policy implications for administrators may be understood in relation to Weatherly and Lipsky's observations noted above regarding the practices of "street level bureacrats". Reported practices were clearly inconsistent with certain legal requirements. Most notable was the disparity between IEP contents and the actual individualized education program. Many IEPs lacked specification of the modifications of the regular classroom actually being implemented. All such special education and related services must be included in the IEP by law. Assuming that correspondence between policy and practice should be maximized, either the regulartions regarding IEP contents should be revised or related practices should be modified. Revision of regulations to correspond to these practices would involve removing the requirements for specification of modifications of the regular classroom. However, removal of the mandate might ultimately reduce the implementation of effective modifications currently specified in some IEPs.

Practice changes would involve either revising the IEP to match implementation activities or adjusting educational practices to conform with IEP specifications. Revising the IEP to include actual modifications may be appropriate. However, it would be extremely difficult and lengthy to specify these modifications in much detail. Similarly it might be counter-productive to limit needed

educational services to those listed in the IEP. Thus, certain discrepancies between policy and practice may be functional if not desirable in terms of fulfilling the intent of the modifications not included in the IEP meets the primary purpose of current special education legislation, i.e., providing an appropriate individualized educational program in the regular education program to the maximum extent possible.

Other practices and reported deviations from policy are not as equivocal in terms of fulfilling special education and IEP goals. While the IEP meeting may facilitate communication between parents and some school personnel such as the special education teacher or resource specialist, as suggested by the Office of Special Education (FR, 1981), this effect largely precludes regular class teachers given their low frequency attendance at IEP meetings. The implication for policy is to mandate the inclusion of regular class teachers in IEP meetings. However, considering the reported time constraints of regular teachers, this policy would be difficult to implement. An alternative policy would be to require periodic meetings between regular and special educators for teachers who cannot attend formal IEP meetings. This is highly consistent with practices reported in this study. Recent recommendations following this direction have been made by the Federal Office of Special Education (FR, 1981).

The management, monitoring, and compliance functions of the IEP suggested by the Office of Special Education seem to apply to a relatively small proportion of regular teachers, since few teachers actually received copies of the IEP for their handicapped students and even fewer used the IEP as a guide for provision of a copy of the IEP to all personnel responsible for implementing any part of the IEP remains a critical issues for policy makers. If modifications of the regular program are specified in the IEP, the regular teacher seems to have a clear role in implementation. However, if no such modifications are included in the document, the regular teacher's role in implementation is amorphous.

Perhaps the most critical finding of this study for special education policy is the determination that regular teachers play a large part in the education of most handicapped children. Current legislation defines the role of the regular educator primarily by omission. That is, special education policies say little regarding the activities of the regular educator in the IEP process. While this affords the regular teacher some valuable discretion in educating their handicapped students, it also results in highly variable treatment of these students, with unknown effects. Unless the role of the regular teacher is formally addressed in special and regular education policies, particularly IEP regulations, the goals and educational program for the handicapped child in the regular classroom will remain unspecified and therefore difficult to evaluate. Further, regular teachers will have to continue to educate the handicapped students in their classrooms without optimal support, recognition, and involvement until their role is addressed in educational policy.

One area worthy of further exploration from administrators is based on the apparent reciprocal nature of the regular and special education systems. Regular classroom teachers reported sending nonhandicapped students to special classes for reasons ranging from being tested as a possible IEP candidate, to receiving special education instruction, to being a tutor of handicapped students. This activity level was differentially related to the type of special classroom.

Finally, the policy implications of the finding that regular teachers sent non-handicapped students to special education classes deserves particular attention. The various reasons for this "reverse mainstreaming" trend have different implications for special education policy. Informal referral of regular education students to the special class for testing and/or instruction clearly contradicts current legislation. However, this practice attests to the daily exigencies of dealing with students in need of immediate assistance beyond

that which the regular teacher can provide either due to limited skills or environmental constraints. Further, the practice reflects a need to circumvent the formal special education process of referral, assessment, and IEP planning. This trend, including sending regular education students to special classes for non-academic activities, may also reflect an informal exchange system through which special and regular educators achieve optimal class compositions and size for particular activities. Reverse mainstreaming for participation in non-academic activities and for peer tutoring appear to fulfill the goal of maximizing the education of handicapped students with non-handicapped students as well as meeting the daily needs of regular and special educators. Clearly, a more flexible legislative policy, which more closely addresses the day to day needs and practices of regular and special educators at the school site level, may better fulfill the objectives of special and regular educators.

The discussion and implications of this study are made in the spirit of adding to the growing knowledge and data base which has documented the effectiveness of implementing IEPs. It is clear that neither litigation nor legislation ensures that educational practices will change as directed. Indeed, it has taken over 25 years of court action and, for some school systems, contingent withdrawal of federal funds, to implement the 1954 Brown vs. Board of Education desegregation decree. It is anticipated that it will not take such time or contingencies to implement P.L. 94-142. The degree of compliance to a law or regulation must be balanced with the extent of commitment to the intent of the law. Clearly P.L. 94-142 and corresponding state legislation have commanded the attention of public school personnel. Because an underlying intent of P.L. 94-142 is to ensure that handicapped and non-handicapped students have increased opportunities to learn together, the role of the regular class teacher in implementing IEPs has a special place in assuring the achievement of that intent.

REFERENCES

Blaschke, C. Case study of the implementation of P.L. 94-142. Washington, D.C.: Education Turnkey Systems, 1979.

California Master Plan for Special Education, Education Code - Part 30 - Special Education Programs. California State Department of Education, Sacramento, CA, 1981.

Craig, P., Miller, C., Wujek, M., and Herschberger, A. Independent evaluation of the California Master Plan for Special Education. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1980.

Crowell, A., and Rucker, C. Influence and regular education involvement on child study teams. In J.A.C. Vautour and C. Rucker (Eds.), Child study team training program: A book of readings. Austin, Texas: Special Education Association, 1977.

Danielson, L., Fenton, K., Morra, L., Morrissey, P., and Kennedy, M. Progress toward a free appropriate public education (A report to Congress on the implementation of P.L. 94-142: The education of all handicapped children act). Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, 1979.

Dickson, R., and Costa, C. A data base for implementation of the individualized education program. Los Angeles, CA: Presentation at American Educational Research Association, 1981. Education Code. 1980.

Federal Register, 45(121a), July 1980.

Federal Register, 46(12), January 1981.

Fenton, K., Yoshida, R., Maxwell, J., and Kaufman, M. Recognition of team goals: An essential step toward rational decision making. Exceptional Children, 1979, 638-644.

Gilliam, J., and Coleman, M. Who influences IEP committee decisions? Exceptional Children, 1981, 47, 642-645.

Goldstein, S., Strickland, B., Turnbull, A., and Currey, L. An observational analysis of the IEP conference. Exceptional Children, 1980, 278-286.

Hasazi, S. The consultant teacher. In J. Jordan (Ed.), Teacher, please don't close the door. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1975.

Helge, D. Problems in implementing comprehensive special education programming in rural areas. Exceptional Children, 1981, 47, 514-520.

Johnson, D., and Johnson, R. The cooperative learning mainstreaming project. University of Minnesota, Program Assistance Grant, Regular Education Inservice Training Grant Award. Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1978-present.

Johnson, R. Coordinate status consultation model. In C. Parker (Ed.), Psychological consultation: Helping teachers meet special needs. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1975.

Jordan, J. (Ed.) Exceptional students in secondary schools. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Knight, M., Meyers, H., Hasazi, S., Paolucci-Whitcomb, P., and Nevin, A. A four year evaluation of consulting teacher services. Behavior Disorders, 1981, 92-100.

Marver, J., and David, J. Three states' experiences with individualized education program requirements similar to P.L. 94-142. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health Education and Welfare, 1978. (Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA: Project 4537, Research Report EPRC23.)

Miller, T., and Sabatino, D. An evaluation of the teacher consultant model as an approach to mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 1978, 85-93.

Public Law 94-142, 94th Congress, S.6. November 29, 1975.

Redden, M., and Blackhurst, A. E. Mainstreaming competency specifications for elementary teachers. Exceptional Children, 1977, 615-617.

Safer, H., Kaufman, M., and Morrissey, G. Implementation of IEPs: New teacher roles and requisite support systems. In E. Meyen, G. Vergason, and R. Whelan (Eds.), Instructional planning for exceptional children. Denver: Love Publishing Co., 1979.

Semmel, D., and Morgan, W. Variables influencing educators' attitudes toward IEPs for handicapped children. Bloomington, IN: Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped, 1978.

Stearns, M., Greene, D., and David, J. Local implementation of P.L. 94-142: First year report of a longitudinal study. Menlo Park, CA: Education Research Center, SIR International, 1980.

Walker, H. The IEP as a vehicle for delivery of special education and related services to handicapped children. In Developing criteria for the evaluation of IEP provisions. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Education of the Handicapped, 1978.

Weatherley, R., and Lipsky, M. Street level bureaucrats and institutional innovation. Harvard Education Review, 1977, 47(2), 171-197.

Zinck, R.A. The development of a working paper for improving the efficiency of the individualized education program. Technical Report submitted to the Office of Special Education, California Department of Education, Stockton, CA: University of the Pacific, Bureau of Educational Research, 1980.

FOOTNOTE

[1]At the time of this study Dr. Nevin was a visiting professor at UCSB Graduate School of Education and was co-principal investigator of a research grant from the California State Department of Education, Office of Special Education, for the period December 15, 1980 to December 14, 1981. The findings and conclusions of the study are the sole responsibility of the investigators and do not imply the official position or endorsement of the California State Department of Education or the University of California, Santa Barbara.

Special thanks are extended to Muriel Exner, Maurine Ballard-Campbell, Larry Schram, Richard Windmiller, and Dorothy Semmel for their facilitation of our research efforts. We also recognize with appreciation the following program specialists for their assistance during the data collection process: Aime Parenteau, Howard Wilson, Jack Lieberman, Clara Lockridge, Verna Yader and Rennett Facioben. Becky Davis provided expert assistance as coder and Tim Kenney provided invaluable knowledge and expertise related to the statistical analyses. Special thanks go to Cathy Desio for her efforts in the final phase of report preparation. These people have made it possible to demonstrate a model for collaborative efforts between the University of California, Santa Barbara and the Santa Barbara County Special Education Services Region.

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

FIGURE 1

Data Collection Process in Analyzing Involvement of Regular Classroom Teachers in Implementing IEPs*

PHASE	SUBJECTS	DATA SETS
I	Pool of K-6 for Santa Barbara County compliance review (n=245)	1. Content analysis
	Analysis of random sample of IEPs (n=100)	2. Identification of service providers inc. regular class teachers
II	Survey of regular class teachers assigned to sampled IEP students (n=59)	3. Awareness of content of IEP
		4. Attitudes towards content of IEP
		5. Extent of instructional modifications
		6. Extent of use/participation in support services
III	Random sample of survey respondents for direct interviews/observations (n=16)	7. Direct observation/verification of items 3-6
		8. Additional information regarding variables impacting IEP implementation

*The data collection process for this IEP Research Project was coordinated with the regularly scheduled Triennial Compliance Review conducted by the Santa Barbara Special Education Services Region.

AWARENESS LEVEL

1. Are there students with IEPs enrolled in your classroom (Part I, B

SUMMARY OF MAJOR

Major Findings

Role of Regular Teacher: Planning

TABLE 1

RANK ORDER (HIGHEST TO LOWEST)
AREAS OF PARTICIPATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN REGULAR PROGRAM

RANK	SUBJECT	PERCENT OF IEPS (n=100)
1	Recess	81
2	Nutrition (Lunch)	77
3	Physical Education	63
4	Art	58
5	Music	57
6	Science and Art	55
7	Social Studies	51
8	Reading	50
9	Math	49
	Language	49

TABLE 2

RANK ORDER OF MOST TO LEAST FREQUENTLY CITED TYPES OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Rank Order	Goal/Objective	Percent IEPs (n=100)
1	Reading (decoding)	77
2	Math	55
3	Oral Language (syntax, expressive language articulation, phonics)	53
4	Spelling (encoding, word analysis, grammar)	31
5	Comprehension	26
	Writing (written language)	26
6	Auditory Memory (perceptual skills)	19
7	Study Habits (On task behavior, independent work skills, following directions)	11
8	Self concept	10
9	Motor coordination, tactile stimulation (adaptive P.E., fine motor)	10
10	Academic readiness	7
11	Handwriting	6
12	Self-help	5
	Basic competencies	5
13	Cooperative behavior	4
14	Imitation	3
15	Signing	2

TABLE 3

TYPES AND NUMBERS OF MODIFICATIONS OF THE REGULAR PROGRAM

NO MODIFICATIONS		39
CONSEQUENCE MODIFICATIONS		9
Daily Progress Reports	(4)	
Positive Reinforcement	(5)	
CURRICULUM MODIFICATIONS		31
Adapt Assignments	(18)	
Assign to Lower Grade	(5)	
Special Reading System	(1)	
Science and Art Curriculum	(7)	
PROCESS MODIFICATIONS		55
Cross Age Tutoring	(4)	
Flashcard Training	(1)	
Extra Time to Complete	(8)	
Stay after School for Help	(2)	
Special Educator Team-Teaches with Regular Class Teacher	(15)	
Appropriate Leveling/Grouping	(19)	
Cooperative Learning	(3)	
Precision Teaching	(3)	

NUMBER OF MODIFICATIONS	
None	39
Between 1 and 2	51
Between 3 and 5	10

TABLE 4

REGULAR TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN IEP PROCESS

	Percent (n=100)
Student with IEP Assigned to a Regular Teacher*	74.
Regular Teacher Modified Regular Program	61
Student with IEP Referred by a Regular Teacher	45
Regular Teacher Attended IEP Planning Meeting	34
Regular Teacher Attended IEP Review Meeting	19
Regular Teacher Had Copy of IEP	17

(*Note: Some teachers had more than one student whose IEPs were reviewed)

TABLE 5

RANK ORDER (HIGHEST TO LOWEST) OF PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS (n=51) ENGAGING IN DIAGNOSTIC/PRESCRIPTIVE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

RANK	FUNCTION	PERCENTAGE
1	Monitor/Evaluate Progress	94
2	Direct Instruction	84
3	Assessment	80
4	Planning/Coordinating	72
	Referral	72
5	Supervise	66
6	Due Process	29
7	Inservice	21