Student: **David** Point Total: **23.5**

Topic: **Inclusion**

1. Number of Articles: 5

2. Articles are related to the topic? Yes

3. Handouts
   - Citations included? Yes
   - Key points included? Yes
   - Clear and useful for audience? Yes

4. Strengths and/or weaknesses of each article are analyzed and discussed?

Yes. They were clearly tied to the methodology of each article.

5. Applications for policy are considered?

Yes. Your policy implications for each article were spot on. The place I would have expanded is the overall implications. Based on how much you had discussed throughout, I would have liked to hear more of your views and policy recommendations here.

6. Questions are answered fully and appropriately?

Yes. I think this presentation inspired a really great class discussion.

7. Additional comments

- A really interesting and well-done presentation. I learned a lot.
- As I mentioned to you, acknowledging your bias upfront—but then not letting it affect your evaluation of the studies—was great.
- Saying you were coming at the issue from 3 questions framed things nicely.
- Your point that many of these studies need to be replicated in light of the current situation was a very good one.

Special Education is a Service Not a Place: The Impact of Inclusion on Students with Disabilities

David Blaiklock

Brief History

- IDEA implemented in 1975 (as EAHCA) to provide FAPE in Least Restrictive Environment.
- NLTS study indicates students with disabilities have poor postsecondary outcomes
- IDEA 1997 emphasizes maximized exposure to general education curriculum
- IDEA 2004 Stresses access to general education curriculum and setting to the maximum extent possible

LRE-Continuum of Placements

LRE-Exceptional Children Must be educated in as normal an environment as possible.

Continuum of Placements

- General Education Classroom
- Resource Room
- Self-Contained Classroom
- Separate Day School
- Residential/Hospitalization

Mainstream

EAHCA required students with disabilities to be educated with nondisabled peers to maximum extent possible.

Students who were in general education more than 50% of the time were considered to be mainstreamed.

Inclusion

Students in special education completely educated in general education environment.

Definition has been adapted to full or partial inclusion.

Reduces Continuum of Placements

Prevalence (2008)

Disability	Number (thousands)	Percent School Pop.
Specific Learning Disability	2,573	5.2
Speech Language Impairment	1,456	3.0
Intellectual Disability (MR)	500	1.0
Emotional Disturbance	442	0.9
Hearing Impairments	79	0.2
Orthopedic Impairments	67	0.1
Other Health Impairments	641	1.3
Visual Impairments	29	0.1
Multiple Disabilities	138	0.3
Autism	296	0.6
Traumatic Brain Injury	25	0.1
Developmental Delay	358	0.7
Total	**6,606**	**13.4**

http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_050.asp?referrer=list

Special Ed. Placement

Disability	<21%	21-60%	>60%	Separate School	
Specific Learning Disability	59.0	29.7	9.2	1.3	0.9
Speech Language Impairment	86.7	5.7	4.5	0.4	2.8
Intellectual Disability (MR)	15.8	27.6	49.0	7.2	0.3
Emotional Disturbance	37.3	19.7	24.1	18.4	0.4
Hearing Impairments	51.9	17.6	16.8	12.6	1.1
Orthopedic Impairments	50.0	17.4	24.5	7.0	0.9
Other Health Impairments	59.0	25.4	11.7	3.1	1.0
Visual Impairments	60.1	14.3	12.9	11.5	1.3
Multiple Disabilities	12.9	16.1	45.2	25.3	0.5
Autism	34.6	18.2	36.9	9.7	0.6
Traumatic Brain Injury	43.9	24.8	22.5	8.2	0.7
Developmental Delay	61.6	20.8	16.2	1.0	0.5
Total	**56.8**	**22.4**	**15.4**	**4.2**	**1.1**

http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=59

What is the Impact of Including Students with Disabilities in the General Education Classroom?

Impact on Student Achievement
Policy Issue-Is Separate Equal?

Impact on Graduation Rates
Policy Issue-Did IDEA 1997 Work?

Impact on Nondisabled Students
Policy Issue-Does the benefit of helping some outweigh the cost to many?

Achievement

Rea, P. J., Mclaughlin, V. L., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2002). Outcomes for students with learning disabilities in inclusive and pullout programs. *Exceptional Children, 68*(2), 203-222.

Cited 23 times

Exceptional Children
- *20 % Acceptance Rate*
- *21-30% Invited Articles*
- *3 External Reviewers*
- *2 In-House Reviewers*
- *Published Quarterly*

Purpose

To determine the efficacy of inclusion for middle school students with LD.

Rationale

Previous research on inclusion has been inconclusive though it has demonstrated a positive trend for students in inclusive settings.

Participants

Enterprise
- 36 6-8 graders with LD
- 4Special Education Teachers (0f 9 total)
- 9:1 Student to Special Educator Ratio
- Inclusive Model

Voyager
- 22 6-8 Graders with LD
- 2 Special Education Teachers (of 4 total)
- 11:1 Student to Special Educator Ratio
- Pullout Model

T-tests indicated groups were similar on ethnicity, SES, age, IQ, years in special education, and years in district

Context

Enterprise
- Provides special education in general education classroom through coteaching.
- Teachers have collaborative meetings throughout the week.

Voyager
- Students receive special education services in resource classroom during elective period.

Data

Study used all archival data.
- IEP Goals & Objectives
- Accommodations
- Time Receiving Special Education Services
- Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)
- Course Grades
- State Proficiency Tests (Literacy Passport Test-LPT)-Reading, Mathematics, and Writing
- Behavioral Infractions
- Attendance

All data analyzed with t-tests.

Procedure

The researchers did a thorough record review of IEPs to determine goals, objectives, and accommodations and time n Sped. Attendance and behavior was also collected through record review(Interrater reliability = .92).

Course grades were taken from report cards and converted to 4.0 scale.

Data collection for LPT and ITBS not reported

Results

Students at Enterprise (inclusive) had significantly higher:

- IEP goals (p=.027), objectives (p=.013), accommodations (p=.000), time receiving special education (p=.000)
- Course grades (range p=.001-.016)
- ITBS Language (p=.025) and mathematics (p=.029)
- Attendance (p=.011)

Conclusions

Students in Inclusive settings receive higher grades, score higher on standardized tests, and attend more frequently than their peers in pullout programs.

Policy Implications

Lower staff-student ratio increases salary costs
Teacher preparation programs focus on coteaching (Enterprise had twice the special education staff of Voyager)
Separate is not equal
General Educator preparation for working with students with disabilties.

Strengths/Weaknesses

Strengths	Weaknesses
Great Literature Review	Small Sample Size
Identified reliability on all instruments	Not all data sources identified
Identified own limitations	Some results reported in methods section.
Great Discussion of Implications for Practice	Did not state guidelines for identification

Achievement

Waldron, N. L. & McLeskey, J.(1998). The effects of an inclusive school program on students with mild and severe learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 64*(3), 395-405.

Cited 40 times

Exceptional Children
- *20 % Acceptance Rate*
- *21-30% Invited Articles*
- *3 External Reviewers*
- *2 In-House Reviewers*
- *Published Quarterly*

Purpose

Replicate and extend previous research comparing mathematics and reading achievement for students in inclusive settings with resource programs. Compare to general education peers.

Rationale

Previous research has yielded mixed results when comparing inclusive programs to resource rooms.

Participants

Inclusive
- 3 Elementary Schools
- 71 Students with LD in grades 2-6

Resource
- 3 Elementary Schools
- 73 Students with LD in grades 2-6

No significant differences were found between groups on K-TEA reading or mathematics, IQ, Gender, or SES

Procedure

BASS pre-test for reading and mathematics was administered to both groups in the fall and posttest in the spring.

BASS pre-test and posttest was also administered to 204 general education students.

Analysis

ANCOVA using pre-test as covariate

Z-scores used to compare groups to general education

LD Groups split based on K-TEA reading and mathematics scores and z-scores used to compare to general education

Results

Students in Inclusive settings made significantly greater progress than those in resource rooms in reading ($p<.05$) but not in mathematics ($F = .47$)

48% Inclusive made comparable progress in reading to general education compared to
38% resource

34% Inclusive made comparable progress in reading to general education compared to
32% resource

Results (Continued)

Inclusion Comparable Progress
67% mild LD in reading
32% severe LD in reading
44% mild LD mathematics
31% severe LD mathematics

Resource Comparable Progress
33% mild LD in reading
36% severe LD in reading
32% mild LD mathematics
31% severe LD mathematics

Chi-Square indicates significantly greater number of students making comparable progress for students in inclusion group.

Conclusion

Inclusion can be beneficial for many students with LD but may not be good for all.

Policy Implications

One size fits all approach to inclusion may be flawed
Within every category there is a continuum
Though Progress similar between groups for Severe LD, is there a better model?
Inclusion Needs to be implemented appropriately

Strengths/Weaknesses

Strengths	Weaknesses
Well designed analysis	No implementation fidelity for inclusion program
Identifies Limitations	Analysis Procedure in results section
Great Description of analyses	Does not give p-value for nonsignificant comparisons

Achievement

Anderson, J. A., Kutashm K, & Duchnowski, A. J. (2001). A comparison of the academic progress of students with EBD and students with LD. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 9*(2), 106-115.

Cited 37 times

Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders
- *Published Quarterly*

Purpose

To examine the academic gains over time of students with LD and EBD while considering retention and level of special education service.

Rationale

Previous research has shown academic gains for students with LD particularly in inclusive settings. The research is extended to a longer period of time and include students with EBD because they demonstrate similar academic deficits to students with LD.

Participants

From Cohort of 8,000 in longitudinal study:
42 students with EBD
61 students with LD
79% male
66% White
34% African American
Mean IQ=95.81
57% identified in Kindergarten
43% identified in 1st grade

Groups were equivalent on gender, race, SES, & IQ

Procedure

Mathematics and Reading were tested at Kindergarten or 1st grade and 5th or 6th grade as part of Sped evaluation process

Tests Included KTEA, PIAT, WJA-R

Attendance, Retention, and Behavior was gathered from student records

Special Education placement collected from IEPs

Results

Students with EBD were in general education significantly less than students with LD (t-test)

Mathematics scores were significantly higher for all students (ANOVA), no group interaction

Reading scores were significantly higher for all students (ANOVA) though gains for EBD were not significant

Increased Reading and Mathematics scores were related to part-time inclusion for students with LD (Multiple Regression)

Students with EBD missed significantly more school and received significantly more behavioral referrals

Conclusions

Part-time inclusion is related to mathematics and reading achievement for students with LD but not for students with EBD.

Policy Implications

Students with LD benefit from Inclusion

Academic focus (inclusion) may benefit students with EBD

Strengths/Weaknesses

Strengths	Weaknesses
Multiple Data Analysis Formats	Description of analysis in results
Identified Limitations	Standardized time outside of general education
Great Discussion	Secondary analysis

Graduation

Goodman, J. I., Hazelkorn, M., Bucholz, J.L., Duffy, M. L., & Kitta, Y. (2011). Inclusion and graduation rates: What are the outcomes?. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 21*(14), 241-252.

Journal of Disability Policy Studies

- *27% Acceptance Rate*
- *3 External Reviewers*
- *0 In-House Reviewers*
- *Published Quarterly*

Purpose

To examine the impact of changing rates of inclusion on graduation both for all students with disabilities and by disability type.

Rationale

Increasing inclusion and access to the general education curriculum may limit options for students with disabilities resulting in higher dropout rates.

Participants

67,749 students with mild disabilities in Georgia from 6 four year cohorts.

Cohort	8th Grade	Inclusion Rate	12th Grade	Inclusion Rate
1999-2003	9,232	28.0	5,734	58.9
2000-2004	10,568	23.6	6,505	46.0
2001-2005	11,203	26.9	6,569	47.3
2002-2006	11,710	27.1	7,161	52.6
2003-2007	12,279	35.0	7,392	52.6
2004-2008	12,757	39.2	7,656	62.1

Procedure

Graduation rates were calculated by the number of students in eighth grade for each cohort that graduated with a standard diploma 4 years later.

Analysis

Descriptive analysis of cohort graduation rates

Correlation between inclusion and graduation

Results

Graduation rate ranged from 22.0%-26.7% (Mean = 24.6)

Students with EBD increased from 15.6% to 16.6%

Students with OHI decreased from 37.1% to 36.1%

Correlation between graduation and inclusion was 0.46

Graduation rates for students in inclusive settings ranged from 56.3%-65.1% (Mean=59.07)

Conclusions

Requiring students with disabilities to focus on general education curriculum decreases their exposure to alternative curriculums that may be beneficial to them resulting in them dropping out of school.

Policy Implications

Inclusion contributes to dropout rates

Access to general curriculum does not meet goal of IDEA 1997/2004

More beneficial to deliver vocational/life skills curriculum to increase likelihood of contributing member of society

Strengths/Weaknesses

Strengths	Weaknesses
Large Sample	Descriptive Statistics Only
Good Policy History	Did not take into account large decrease in cohorts
Identified Limitations	Fails to recognize student in inclusive settings graduate at same rate as general education students in state
	Does not report graduation rate for alternate diplomas
	Conclusion argues against inclusion though students with disabilities in inclusive settings match statewide graduation rate (reported in article)

Non-Disabled Peers

Fletcher, J. (2010). Spillover effects of inclusion on classmates with emotional problems on test scores in early elementary school. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 29*(1), 69-83.

Journal of Policy Analysis and Management

- *6-10% Acceptance Rate*
- *0-5% Invited Articles*
- *3 External Reviewers*
- *1 In-House Reviewer*
- *Published Quarterly*

Purpose

To determine the achievement rates in math and reading for nondisabled students in classes with a student with EBD.

Rationale

Despite the Inclusion movement, little research has been done on the impact of inclusion on general education students.

Participants

11,373 Nondisabled students in Kindergarten and First Grade

14% shared class with student with EBD for one year

1 % shared class with student with EBD for both years

Data

Part of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K)

Outcome measures are Spring term test scores in reading and mathematics

Analysis

OLS Regression formula controls for school level and student-level fixed effects

Results

Students who share classes with students with EBD score .1 standard deviations lower than their peers in mathematics (R-square = .235)

Scored .12 standard deviations below peers in reading (R-Square = .168)

Conclusion

Nondisabled students who are in classes with students with EBD will achieve at a lower rate than their peers in classes without students with EBD.

Policy Implications

The cost to nondisabled students may outweigh the benefit to students with EBD

Students in schools with large numbers of students with EBD may be susceptible to the Achievement Gap

Strengths/Weaknesses

Strengths	Weaknesses
Strong Analysis of Data	Does not identify testing instrument
Makes strong argument from cost-benefit perspective	Attempts to compound results to make argument for conclusion
	Uses EBD and emotional problems interchangeable, doe s not clearly state students have been identified.

Policy Conclusions

Separate is not equal
- However, effective co-teaching models require additional expense in staff and time allocated to collaborative planning

IDEA 1997/2004 Graduation Goal Not Realized
- According to the study but the data are subject to alternative interpretation

Cost-Benefit to Nondisabled Students
- Cost outweighs the benefits (according to author estimates)