

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 745

EC 301 552

AUTHOR Christmas, Oren L.
 TITLE The 1992 Michigan Non-Mandated Aide Pilot Project.
 INSTITUTION Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing. Bureau of Information Management.
 SPONS AGENCY Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing. Special Education Services.
 PUB DATE 92
 NOTE 33p.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Mainstreaming; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Staff Role; Teacher Aides; Teacher Attitudes

IDENTIFIERS Michigan

ABSTRACT

An evaluation was conducted of a Michigan pilot project that sought to expand the activities of aides concerning promotion of least restrictive environment for students with disabilities. The evaluation consisted of a historical summary of the project, on-site observations, and analysis of follow-up evaluation instruments submitted by 49 general education teachers, 33 special education teachers, and 21 pilot project aides. Results are reported by means of 32 tables which present such data as: individuals responsible for initiating the project; individuals responsible for monitoring the project; topical areas of training for aides; information resources utilized by aides; building team meeting participants; educational level of aides; topical areas of teacher training; information resources utilized by general education teachers; age distribution of teachers; number of special education students per class period; educational level of special education teachers; and aides' and teachers' perceptions toward inclusion and its impact on students. The on-site observations indicated that special education students seem integrated and accepted, the aides responded to students' needs as they arose, and inservice training for the aides would have been beneficial. An appendix presents the two attitudinal scales used and the results of the analysis. (DB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The 1992 Michigan Non-Mandated Aide Pilot Project

by

Oren L. Christmas
Education Research Consultant
Information, Research & Evaluation Services
Bureau of Information Management
Michigan Department of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Beck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This study was supported by the Michigan Department of Education, Special Education Services through federal funds derived from P.L.94-142. Any opinions expressed in this study do not reflect the positions or policies of the Michigan Department of Education and no endorsement is inferred.

ED350745

EC 2/15/52

MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Dorothy Beardmore, President Rochester
Dr. Gumecindo Salas, Vice President East Lansing
Barbara Dumouchelle, Secretary Grosse Ile
Marilyn F. Lundy, Treasurer Detroit
Cherry H. Jacobus, NASBE Delegate Grand Rapids
Dick DeVos Grand Rapids
Barbara Roberts Mason Lansing
Annetta Miller Huntington Woods

Ex Officio Members

John Engler
Governor

Robert E. Schiller
Superintendent of Public Instruction

THE MICHIGAN NON-MANDATED AIDE PILOT PROJECT 1992

During the 1991-92 school year the Michigan Department of Education, Special Education Services began a pilot project to develop new concepts pertaining to the expansion of existing least restrictive environment (LRE) criteria for nonmandated aides.

The intent of this pilot project was to provide funds for use by school districts toward least restrictive environment special education aides. The pilot project sites consisted of twenty-two self-selected school buildings that met the criteria set forth by Special Education Services.

The project length was to be from January 1992 until the end of the school year. During late spring the department conducted an evaluation of these pilot projects.

The evaluation of this pilot project was conducted using a modified triangulation technique. The data sources for the triangulation consisted of a historical summary of the project, on-site observations, and a follow-up evaluation instrument. The evaluation instruments were developed based upon a review of literature and input from the Special Education Service staff and this researcher. A panel of experts established the content validity of the instruments prior to use. Following are the results of these questionnaires and the on-site visits. It should be noted that the results reported are based upon population data.

Historical Data

The historical data consisted of background information pertaining to the origination, planning and implementation, and the conducting of the project. A questionnaire was sent to the participating schools at the beginning of the project period to obtain this information through close-ended and open-ended questions. A total of twenty-two pilot projects responded to the initial questionnaire.

The number of team members participating in the pilot project ranged from 5 to 18 with a mean of 10 ($sd=3.6$), a mode of 8 and median of 9. Of the fifteen pilot project sites responding to this question, all indicated that the project started in the fall of 1991. Listed in Table 1 are the responses indicating who originally forwarded the idea for the pilot project. The majority of the respondents indicated that the special education administration and special education teacher initiated the idea.

TABLE 1

Individuals Responsible for
the Unmandated Aide Pilot Project Idea

<u>Individual</u>	<u>Frequency*</u>
Special Education Administration	11
Special Education Teacher	8
General Education Administration	4
Parents	2
General Education Teacher	1
* Multiple responses present	

Table 2 displays those who were responsible for the initiation of the project. This major responsibility rested with the general education administrators, special education administrators and special education teachers.

TABLE 2

Individuals Responsible for
Initiating the Unmandated Aide Pilot Project

<u>Individual</u>	<u>Frequency*</u>
Special Education Administration	12
General Education Administration	12
Special Education Teacher	11
General Education Teacher	5
Parents	1
Aide	1
* Multiple responses present	

The administrators in conjunction with the teachers were the ones who determined which building(s)/programs were to get the aide (See Table 3).

TABLE 3

Individuals Responsible for
Assigning the Location of the Aide

<u>Individual</u>	<u>Frequency*</u>
Special Education Administration	13
General Education Administration	12
Special Education Teacher	9
General Education Teacher	6
Parents	2
MDE	1

* Multiple responses present

The monitoring of the overall project was the responsibility of the administrators and the teachers (Reference Table 4).

TABLE 4

Individuals Responsible for
Monitoring the Overall Project

<u>Individual</u>	<u>Frequency*</u>
General Education Administration	12
Special Education Administration	11
Special Education Teacher	9
General Education Teacher	8
Aide	3
Parents	1
School Psychologist	1

* Multiple responses present

When asked who was responsible for supervising the aide, the majority of the respondents indicated either the special education teacher, general education administrator, or the general education teacher (See Table 5).

TABLE 5

Individuals Responsible for Supervising the Aide

<u>Individual</u>	<u>Frequency*</u>
Special Education Teacher	13
General Education Administration	11
General Education Teacher	10
Special Education Administration	4

* Multiple responses present

When asked about the role of the local school board and the parents/guardians, seven of the 16 responding indicated that the local school board approved the projects and that the parents were involved with the Individualized Educational Planning Committee meeting.

Overall, the respondents indicated that the aide would spend the majority of their time in the general education classroom (56%), about one-fourth of their time in a categorical room, nine percent of their time in a resource room, and the same amount of time (9%) doing other tasks.

On-Site Observations

Special Education Services assigned various special education consultants to conduct on-site visitations of the pilot projects. An observation procedures sheet was developed, reviewed by a panel of experts, and disseminated to the visiting consultants. The timing of the visitations was designed to occur half-way through the project period. All visitations occurred within a one-week period of time.

The salient observations made by the consultants were:

- * the aides responded to the students' needs as they arose
- * the aides communicated with teachers and vice-versa
- * special education students seem integrated and accepted
- * parent feedback of project was beneficial
- * the pilot project has met or exceeded the team members expectations
- * the aide was sometimes used as an instructional aide rather than an inclusion aide
- * there was a need for more planning time on the part of the teachers and the aide
- * inservice training for the aide would have been beneficial

FINAL EVALUATION

AIDES PERSPECTIVE

Twenty-one of the twenty-two pilot project aides responded to the final evaluation questionnaires.

Five (24%) of the aides received some training pertaining to being an inclusive education aide. Listed in Table 6 are the topical areas of the training. The majority of the training was of a general nature or dealing with discipline. Those aides receiving training indicated that this training was somewhat useful (min=1, midpoint=4, max=7, mean=5.2, mdn=5, mo=5).

Topic	f*
General	3
Discipline	3
Higher Order Thinking Skills	2
Curriculum Matrixing	1
Counseling Skills	1
Impact on local programs	1
*multiple response question	

The average number of class periods that the aide works with special education students in general education classrooms is 4 (mdn=5, mo=7). The minimum number of special education students that they work with is 2.5 (mdn=2, mo=1) and the maximum number is 6 (mdn=5, mo=2). On the average, the aide indicated that they worked with ten special education students during a typical day (mdn=8, mo=3).

Aides indicated that they often handled special education discipline problems. When asked about how they spent their time, the aides indicated that the majority was spent working with special education students. Table 7 contains the average time allocation for various activities.

TABLE 7

Time Allocations of Inclusive Education Aides

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mod</u>	<u>Mo</u>
Working with special education students	65	70	75
Working with general education students	18	10	10
Creating special education learning materials	4	3	0
Handling paperwork (e.g., grading paper, taking roll)	6	6	10
Support activities (e.g., making copies, typing, filing)	10	9	5

Note: Items do not add to 100% due to multiple response

Sixteen of the twenty-one aides pull special education students out of the classroom to work with them. When asked whom they go to for assistance or answers, the aides indicated a diverse group of individuals. The majority responded they contacted either the general education or special education teacher. Listed in Table 8 are all the individuals who the aides go to for help.

TABLE 8

Individual Information Resources Utilized by Aides

<u>Individual</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
Classroom/General Education Teacher	19	91
Resource/Special Education Teacher	17	81
Administrator	8	38
Psychologist	2	10
Curriculum/Special Ed. Director	2	10
Speech/Occupational Therapist	2	10
Paraprofessional/Aide	1	5
Parent	1	5
Inclusion Consultant	1	5
Counselor	1	5
Social Worker	1	5

A little less than half (10) indicated that they were a part of a building team. These teams met at varying times as displayed in Table 9. All of the aides thought the number of times their team met was often enough.

TABLE 9

Frequency of Building Team Meetings

Weekly	5
Biweekly	1
Monthly	2
Bimonthly	1
Quarterly	1

The aides indicated that a variety of individuals attended these team meetings. The meeting generally had the teachers, aides and administrators present. Listed in Table 10 are all the various individuals that attend the building team meetings.

TABLE 10

Building Team Meeting Participants

<u>Individual</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
Resource/Special Education Teacher	12	57
Classroom/General Education Teacher	10	48
Paraprofessional/Aide	6	29
Building Principal	5	24
Psychologist	3	14
Speech Teacher/Therapist	2	10
Social Worker	2	10
Media Specialist/Librarian	2	10
Administrator	2	10
ISD Inclusion consultant	1	5
Counselor	1	5
Community Members	1	5
Teacher Consultant	1	5

The age distribution of the aides is depicted in Table 11. The majority of the aides were in their thirties or forties and had either a high school diploma or its equivalent (Table 12).

TABLE 11

Age Distribution of Aides

<u>Group</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
< 21	-	
21-30	5	24
31-40	6	29
41-50	8	38
> 50	2	10

TABLE 12

Educational Level of Aides

<u>Degree</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
GED Diploma	2	10
High School Diploma	12	57
AA Degree	3	14
BA/BS Degree	4	19

The experience of the aides ranged from one year to 20 with a mean of 6, median of 4.5 and a mode of 1. Their experience was mostly in elementary settings (See Table 13).

TABLE 13

Experience of Aides by Grade Level

<u>Grade</u>	<u>f*</u>	<u>%</u>
Kindergarten	10	48
First	9	43
Second	10	48
Third	8	38
Fourth	8	38
Fifth	8	38
Sixth	11	52
Seventh	10	48
Eighth	9	43
Ninth	7	33
Tenth	5	24
Eleventh	4	19
Twelfth	4	19
Post-Secondary	1	5

*multiple response

About half (10) of the aides were hired while eleven were reassigned to be an inclusive aide. The aides indicated they were hired anywhere from the current year to five years previous. A breakdown of the hiring dates are given in Table 14.

TABLE 14

Dates of Hiring

<u>Year</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
1986	1	5
1989	2	10
1990	1	5
1991	14	67
1992	3	14
<u>Month</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
August	5	24
September	4	19
October	5	24
November	4	19
December	1	5
January	2	10

In addition to these questions, a semantic differential scale was constructed to measure the aides' perceptions toward inclusion and the impact of inclusion on students. Factor analysis identified two factors however the loadings and eigenvalue for the second factor were low (1.55) compared to factor number 1 (14.0). It was therefore decided that there was one (evaluative) dimension to the scale. Displayed in Table 15 are the descriptive statistics for the aides by semantic differential scale. All of the measures of central tendency are well above the midpoint value of 72. This indicates that the aides assigned positive values to the idea of inclusion and that the impact on both general education and special education students was positive.

TABLE 15

Aides Response to Evaluative Semantic Differential Scale*

<u>Scale Item</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>Modn</u>	<u>Md</u>
Inclusion	103	110	103
Impact of Inclusion on Special Education Students	104	108	53
Impact of Inclusion of General Education Students	95	102	85

*Scale values could range from 18 to 126. Midpoint equals 72.

Closely related to these scale measures was the aides responses to various questions about the inclusion program. Listed in Appendix A is a listing of the attitudinal questions and the aides responses. The aides were in agreement with the teachers that the inclusion project was worthwhile, that they would participate in it again, that it was a benefit to all involved and that it was implemented without additional staff. The aides tended to meet informally with others about the inclusion program, they relied on the aide and the project was supported by those directly involved but tended not to be supported by other teachers in the building. The respondents indicated that they did not receive prior training and that site visits to other inclusive programs and inservice training would be beneficial.

FINAL EVALUATION

TEACHERS PERSPECTIVE

General education and special education teachers were targeted to receive these evaluation instruments. Forty nine (63.6%) general education teachers and thirty three (75%) special education teachers responded to the questionnaires.

GENERAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Seven (14%) of the general education teachers received some training prior to participating in the inclusion program while 42 (86%) did not receive any training. Listed in Table 16 are the topical areas of the training. The majority of the training was of a general nature or dealing with classroom management. Those teachers receiving training indicated that this training was useful (min=1, midpoint=4, max=7, mean=4.6, mdn=6, mo=6).

<u>Topical Areas of Training</u>	
<u>Topic</u>	<u>f</u>
General	5
Academic	2
Management	2
Curriculum Matrixing	2
Collaborative Teaming	2
Counseling Skills	1
Physical Needs	1
Behavior	1

Listed in Table 17 are the average and median number of general education and special education students that the teachers have per class period. Overall, there were approximately 22 general education students and three special education students per class.

TABLE 17

Class Period	General Education		Special Education	
	\bar{X}	mdn	\bar{X}	mdn
1	21	22	3	3
2	22	23	3	3
3	23	23	3	3
4	22	22	4	3
5	22	22	3	2
6	22	22	3	3
7	21	22	3	3

The general education teachers indicated that they often handled the special education student discipline problems. Eleven (22%) of the teachers indicated they pulled special education students out of the classroom to work with them. When asked whom they go to for assistance or answers, the general education teachers indicated the resource/special education teacher. Listed in Table 18 are all the individuals who the general education teachers go to for help.

TABLE 18

Individual Information Resources
Utilized by General Education Teachers

<u>Individual</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
Classroom/General Education Teacher	19	18
Resource/Special Education Teacher	32	65
Administrator	11	22
Teacher Consultant	9	18
Paraprofessional/Aide	4	8
Speech/Occupational Therapist	3	6
ISD Inclusion Consultant	3	6
Parent	3	6
Physical Therapist	2	4
Social Worker	2	4
Student Aide	1	2
Psychologist	1	2

Three quarters of the teachers indicated that they were part of a building team. These teams met at varying times as displayed in Table 19. One half of the teachers thought the number of times their team met was often enough.

TABLE 19

Frequency of Building Team Meetings

	f	%
Daily	3	8
Weekly	4	10
Biweekly	2	5
Monthly	11	31
Bimonthly	3	8
Biannual	1	3
Yearly	1	3
As Needed	6	16
Never	6	16

The teachers indicated that a variety of individuals attended these team meetings. The meetings generally had the teachers and administrators present. Listed in Table 20 are all the various individuals that attended the building team meetings.

TABLE 20

Building Team Meeting Participants

<u>Individual</u>	f	%
Resource/Special Education Teacher	28	57
Classroom/General Education Teacher	30	61
Paraprofessional/Aide	14	29
Building Principal	9	18
Speech Teacher/Therapist	7	14
Parent	4	8
Teacher Consultant	4	8
Curriculum/Special Education Director	2	4
Physical Therapist	2	4
Occupational Therapist	1	2
Social Worker	1	2
Counselor	1	2
Psychologist	1	2

The distribution of the teachers' age is depicted in Table 21. The majority of the teachers were in their forties and had a Masters degree (Table 22).

TABLE 21

Age Distribution of Teachers

<u>Group</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
< 21	-	-
21-30	2	4
31-40	12	26
41-50	25	53
> 50	8	17

TABLE 22

Educational Level of Teachers

<u>Degree</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
BA/BS Degree	17	35
MA/MS Degree	31	65

The experience of the teachers ranged from two years to 32 with a mean and median of 18, and a mode of 17. A listing of the grades taught are displayed in Table 23. The majority of the teachers taught in a K-8 environment.

TABLE 23

Experience of Teachers by Grade Level

<u>Grade</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
Kindergarten	27	55
First	18	37
Second	19	39
Third	22	45
Fourth	17	35
Fifth	13	27
Sixth	11	22
Seventh	16	33
Eighth	17	35
Ninth	12	25
Tenth	10	20
Eleventh	9	18
Twelfth	9	18

The subject areas that the general education teachers taught in these grades included math, reading, history, social studies, science, visual arts, English, and vocational skills.

SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Twelve (36%) of the special education teachers received some training prior to participating in the inclusion program while 21 (64%) did not receive any training. Listed in Table 24 are the topical areas of the training. The majority of the training was of a general nature. Those teachers receiving training indicated that this training was useful (min=1, midpoint=4, max=7, mean=5.2, mdn=5, mo=5).

TABLE 24

Topical Areas of Training

<u>Topic</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
General	7	58
Collaborative Teaming	5	42
Impact of inclusion locally	2	17
Curriculum Matrixing	2	17
Counseling Skills	1	8
Legal Aspects	1	8
Behavior	1	8
Higher Order Thinking Skills	1	8
Management	1	8

Listed in Table 25 are the average and median number of general education and special education students that the teachers have per class period. Overall, there were approximately 11 general education students and six special education students per class.

TABLE 25

Number of Special Education Students Per Class Period

Class Period	General Education		Special Education	
	\bar{X}	mdn	\bar{X}	mdn
1	18	10	6	5
2	9	10	6	5
3	8	7	6	6
4	10	9	6	5
5	8	6	6	5
6	12	10	7	6
7	14	18	7	6

The special education teachers indicated that they often handled the special education student discipline problems. Twenty five (76%) of the teachers indicated they pulled special education students out of the classroom to work with them. When asked whom they go to for assistance or answers, the special education teachers indicated the resource teacher, general education teacher or the building principal. Listed in Table 26 are all the individuals who the special education teachers go to for help.

TABLE 26

Individual Information Resources Utilized by Special Education Teachers

<u>Individual</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
Resource/Special Education Teacher	18	55
Building Principal	12	36
Social Worker	7	21
Classroom/General Education Teacher	6	18
Teacher Consultant	5	15
Paraprofessional/Aide	3	9
Speech/Occupational Therapist	3	9
ISD Inclusion Consultant	3	9
Parent	3	9
Student Aide	1	3
Psychiatrist	1	3

Ninety seven percent (32) of the special education teachers indicated that they felt they were part of a building team. These teams met at varying times as displayed in Table 27. Three quarters of the teachers thought the number of times their team met was often enough.

TABLE 27

Frequency of Building Team Meetings

	f	%
Daily	3	10
Weekly	5	17
Biweekly	4	13
Monthly	10	33
Bimonthly	3	10
As Needed	5	17

The teachers indicated that a variety of individuals attended these team meetings. The meetings generally had the teachers and administrators present. Listed in Table 28 are all the various individuals that attended the building team meetings.

TABLE 28

Building Team Meeting Participants

<u>Individual</u>	f	%
Resource/Special Education Teacher	26	79
Building Principal	19	58
Classroom/General Education Teacher	18	55
Social Worker	9	27
Counselor	9	27
Psychologist	8	24
Teacher Consultant	5	15
Curriculum/Special Education Director	5	15
Paraprofessional/Aide	5	15
Speech Teacher/Therapist	4	12
Administrator	4	12
Media Specialist/Librarian	2	6

The distribution of the teachers' age is depicted in Table 29. The majority of the teachers were in their thirties and forties and had a Masters degree (Table 30).

TABLE 29

Age Distribution of Teachers

<u>Group</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
< 21	-	-
21-30	6	19
31-40	11	36
41-50	11	36
> 50	3	9

TABLE 30

Educational Level of Teachers

<u>Degree</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
BA/BS Degree	10	31
MA/MS Degree	22	69

The experience of the teachers ranged from one year to 29 with a mean of 14, and a median and mode of 15. A listing of the grades taught are displayed in Table 31. The majority of the teachers taught in a K-8 environment.

TABLE 31

Experience of Special Education Teachers by Grade Level

<u>Grade</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
Kindergarten	13	39
First	15	46
Second	17	52
Third	17	52
Fourth	16	49
Fifth	14	42
Sixth	18	55
Seventh	16	49
Eighth	16	49
Ninth	17	52
Tenth	13	39
Eleventh	13	39
Twelfth	13	39
Post Secondary	1	3

The subject areas that the special education teachers taught in these grades included math, reading, history, science, visual arts, English, and vocational skills.

In addition to these questions, a semantic differential scale was constructed to measure the teachers' perceptions toward inclusion and the impact on students. Factor analysis identified one evaluative dimension to the scale. Displayed in Table 32 are the descriptive statistics for all teachers, special education and general education teachers by scale. All of the measures of central tendency are well above the midpoint value of 72. This indicates that the teachers, as a composite group and as general educators or special educators, assigned positive values to the idea of inclusion and that the impact on both general education and special education students was positive.

TABLE 32

Teachers Response to Evaluative Semantic Differential Scale*

Scale Item	All Teachers			General Education			Special Education		
	\bar{X}	Mdn	Md	\bar{X}	Mdn	Md	\bar{X}	Mdn	Md
Inclusion	94.7	96.5	91	92.3	94.5	104	98	100.5	124
Impact of Inclusion on Special Education Students	96.5	95.5	72	96.2	96	126	97	94.5	126
Impact of Inclusion on General Education Students	91.1	96	72	88.7	93	126	94.8	98	126

*Scale values could range from 18 to 126. Midpoint equals 72.

Closely related to these scale measures was the teachers responses to various questions about the inclusion program. Listed in Appendix B is a listing of the attitudinal questions and the responses of the general education teachers and the special education teachers. The teachers were in agreement that the inclusion project was worthwhile, that they would participate in it again, that it was a benefit to all involved and that it was implemented without additional staff. The teachers tended to meet informally about the inclusion program, they relied on the aide and the project was supported by those directly involved but tended not to be supported by other teachers in the building. The respondents indicated that they did not receive prior training and that site visits to other inclusive programs and inservice training would be beneficial.

Special education teachers, general education teachers and aides did not agree with each other or with themselves about the perceived cost of the inclusion project. Special education teachers also indicated that parents had voiced their concerns to them while general education teachers and aides indicated the opposite.

Appendix A

Attitudinal Questions

**HIGHLIGHTED AREAS INDICATE
MEASURES OF CENTRAL TENDENCY**

(MEAN, MEDIAN, MODE)

Directions: Please read each sentence carefully, then circle the number that best represents your opinion about the statement.

	Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
Example: Baseball is an exciting sport.	5	4	3	2	1	
This response indicates that the person strongly agrees with the statement that baseball is exciting.						
	Mean = bold Median = <u>underline</u> Mode = *					
1. Only teachers with special education training should have special education students in their classrooms full-time.	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1*	
2. Classrooms with special education students present enhance the learning experiences of general education children.	5*	<u>4</u>	3	2	1	
3. General education students and special education students should be taught in separate rooms.	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1*	
4. Teachers not specifically trained in special education should not be expected to deal with handicapped students.	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1*	
5. A general education teacher can do a lot to help handicapped children.	5*	<u>4</u>	3	2	1	
6. It is unfair to ask general education teachers to accept special education students into their classes.	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1*	
7. Handicapped students can not socialize well enough to profit from contact with general education students.	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u> *	
8. Aides that are used in an inclusion classroom should have training about special education students.	5*	<u>4</u>	3	2	1	
9. The building administration supports our inclusion project.	5*	<u>4</u>	3	2	1	
10. The local school district administration supports our inclusion project.	<u>5</u> *	<u>4</u>	3	2	1	
11. The ISD supports our inclusion project.	<u>5</u> *	<u>4</u>	3	2	1	

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
12. Other teachers in the school building know about our inclusion project.	5*	4	3	2	1
13. Other teachers in our school building support our inclusion project.	5	4	3*	2	1
14. All schools should implement the inclusion of handicapped students in general education classrooms.	5	4	3*	2	1
15. General education teachers benefit little from having special education students in their classroom.	5	4	3	2*	1
16. Discipline is better in the classroom with special education students present.	5	4	3*	2	1
17. Having special education students in the classroom is an added burden to the general education teacher.	5	4*	3	2	1
18. General education students act more immature with special education students present.	5	4	3	2	1*
19. General education students should know the goals and objectives of the special education student's IEP.	5	4	3	2	1*
20. It would be helpful for teachers involved with inclusion to visit other inclusion projects.	5*	4	3	2	1
21. It is of little importance if those involved with inclusion support the idea.	5	4	3	2	1*
22. Handicapped students placed full-time in the general education classroom need little additional support services.	5	4	3	2	1*
23. Special education students' self-esteem is lowered because of full-time placement in general education.	5	4	3	2	1*
24. Special education students' self-confidence is lowered because of full-time placement in general education.	5	4	3	2	1*
25. Special education students' behavior is better when in the general education environment.	5	4	3*	2	1

Strongly
Agree

Strongly
Disagree

Having special education students full-time in the general education classroom has increased the level of communication between

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| 26. | teachers and support staff and administrators | 5 | 4* | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 27. | support staff and administrators | 5 | 4* | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 28. | teachers and administrators | 5 | 4* | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 29. | The inclusion of special education students full-time in the general education classroom has made both groups of students more compassionate. | 5 | 4* | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 30. | Special education and general education students do not help each other. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1* |
| 31. | General education students tend to shun the special education students in the classroom. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1* |
| 32. | The special education staff are too possessive of the special education students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2* | 1 |
| 33. | Special education support services staff are too possessive of the special education students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2* | 1 |
| 34. | The majority of the handicapped students' parents know about the inclusion project. | 5* | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 35. | The majority of the general education students' parents know about the inclusion project. | 5 | 4 | 3* | 2 | 1 |
| 36. | Parents of general education students have complained about the inclusion project. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1* |
| 37. | Parents of handicapped students have complained about the inclusion project. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1* |
| 38. | Participation in the inclusion project was forced on me. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1* |
| 39. | Our school is a better place because of the inclusion project. | 5* | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 40. | Our inclusion project required no extra money to implement. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1* |

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
41. Additional support staff (e.g., teacher consultant, speech therapist) were hired/contracted for our inclusion project.	5	4	3	2	1*
42. Our inclusion project required hiring additional teaching staff.	5	4	3	2	1*
43. I have regular meetings with the inclusion team.	5*	4	3	2	1
44. I receive regular/systematic direction from our building team.	5*	4	3	2	1
45. I help evaluate the special education student(s) academic performance.	5*	4	3	2	1
46. I help evaluate the special education student(s) social adjustment.	5*	4	3	2	1
47. The general education teacher shows an overreliance on my working with the special education students.	5	4	3	2	1*
48. The special education teacher shows an overreliance on my working with the special education students.	5	4	3	2	1*
49. I meet informally (e.g., at coffee pot, in break room, at lunch) with others to talk about what to do.	5*	4	3	2	1
50. I am aware of the special education students' IEP goals and objectives.	5*	4	3	2	1
51. I feel like part of the inclusion project building team.	5*	4	3	2	1

3M-AIDE

Appendix B

Attitudinal Questions

HIGHLIGHTED AREAS INDICATE
MEASURES OF CENTRAL TENDENCY

(MEAN, MEDIAN, MODE)

Directions: Please read each sentence carefully, then circle the number that best represents your opinion about the statement.

		Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		
Example:	Baseball is an exciting sport.		5	4	3	2	1

This response indicates that the person strongly agrees with the statement that baseball is exciting.

Mean	=	bold
Median	=	<u>underline</u>
Mode	=	*

- | | | | | | |
|---|----|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 1. I have regular meetings with the inclusion team. | 5 | 4 | <u>3</u> | 2 | 1* |
| 2. I receive regular/systematic feedback from our building team. | 5* | 4 | <u>3</u> | 2 | 1 |
| 3. I help evaluate the special education student(s) academic performance. | 5* | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. I help evaluate the special education student(s) social adjustment. | 5* | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. I rely heavily on the aide working with the special education students. | 5* | <u>4</u> | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. The special education teacher shows an overreliance on the aide working with the special education students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | <u>2</u> | 1* |
| 7. General education students and special education students should be taught in separate rooms. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | <u>1*</u> |
| 8. I meet informally (e.g., at coffee pot, in break room) with others to talk about what to do with the special education students. | 5* | <u>4</u> | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. I am aware of the special education students' IEP goals and objectives. | 5* | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. Only teachers with special education training should have special education students in their classrooms full-time. | 5 | 4 | 3 | <u>2</u> | 1* |
| 11. Classrooms with special education students present enhance the learning experiences of general education children. | 5 | <u>4*</u> | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. Teachers not specifically trained in special education should not be expected to deal with handicapped students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | <u>2</u> | 1* |

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
13. A general education teacher can do a lot to help handicapped children.	5*	4	3	2	1
14. Handicapped students can not socialize well enough to profit from contact with general education students.	5	4	3	2	1*
15. Aides that are used in an inclusion classroom should have training about special education students.	5*	4	3	2	1
16. The building administration supports our inclusion project.	5*	4	3	2	1
17. The local school district administration supports our inclusion project.	5*	4	3	2	1
18. The ISD supports our inclusion project.	5*	4	3	2	1
19. Other teachers in the school building know about our inclusion project.	5*	4	3	2	1
20. Other teachers in our school building support our inclusion project.	5	4	3	2*	1
21. All schools should implement the inclusion of handicapped students in general education classrooms.	5	4	3*	2	1
22. Special education students' self-esteem is lowered because of full-time placement in general education.	5	4	3	2	1*
23. General education teachers benefit little from having special education students in their classroom.	5	4	3	2	1*
24. Discipline is better in the classroom with special education students present.	5	4	3*	2	1
25. Having special education students in the classroom is an added burden to the general education teacher.	5	4*	3	2	1
26. General education students act more immature with special education students present.	5	4	3	2	1*
27. It is unfair to ask general education teachers to accept special education students into their classes.	5	4	3	2	1*
28. The inclusion of special education students in general education classrooms does not cost additional dollars.	5	4	3*	2	1

		Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree	
29.	General education students should know the goals and objectives of the special education student's IEP.	5*	4	3	2	1*
30.	It would be helpful for teachers involved with inclusion to visit other inclusion projects.	5*	4	3	2	1
31.	It is of little importance if those involved with inclusion support the idea.	5	4	3	2	1*
32.	Handicapped students placed full-time in the general education classroom need little additional support services.	5	4	3	2	1*
33.	Special education students' self-confidence is lowered because of full-time placement in general education.	5	4	3	2	1*
34.	Special education students' behavior is better when in the general education environment.	5	4*	3	2	1
Having special education students full-time in the general education classroom has increased the level of communication between						
35.	teachers and support staff and administrators	5	4*	3	2	1
36.	support staff and administrators	5	4*	3	2	1
37.	teachers and administrators	5	4*	3	2	1
38.	The inclusion of special education students full-time in the general education classroom has made both groups of students more compassionate.	5	4*	3	2	1
39.	Special education and general education students do not help each other.	5	4	3	2	1*
40.	General education students tend to shun the special education students in the classroom.	5	4	3	2*	1
41.	The special education staff are too possessive of the special education students.	5	4	3	2	1*
42.	Special education support services staff are too possessive of the special education students.	5	4	3	2	1*
43.	The majority of the handicapped students' parents know about the inclusion project.	5*	4	3	2	1
44.	The majority of the general education students' parents know about the inclusion project.	5	4	3*	2	1

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
45. Parents of general education students have complained about the inclusion project.	5	4	3	2	1*
46. Parents of handicapped students have complained about the inclusion project.	5	4	3	2	1*
47. Participation in the inclusion project was forced on me.	5	4	3	2	1*
48. Our school is a better place because of the inclusion project.	5*	4	3	2	1
49. Our inclusion project required no extra money to implement.	5	4	3	2	1*
50. Additional support staff (e.g., teacher consultant, speech therapist) were hired/contracted for our inclusion project.	5	4	3	2	1*
51. Our inclusion project required hiring additional teaching staff.	5	4	3	2	1*
52. The amount of time that we have spent on implementing this inclusion project was well worth it.	5*	4	3	2	1
53. I feel like part of the inclusion project building team.	5*	4*	3	2	1
54. I would like the opportunity to continue this inclusion project.	5*	4	3	2	1
55. Our inclusion project is a success.	5*	4	3	2	1
56. Opportunities for inservice training on inclusive education were made available to me.	5	4	3	2	1*
57. Funds for equipment were made available as part of learning about inclusion.	5	4	3	2	1*
58. Additional consumable supplies were made available to the inclusion project.	5	4	3	2	1*

3M-TEACH