ABSTRACT
        A national sample of 53 elementary teachers and 34
secondary school teachers who provide Level III resource room service
to learning disabled students was asked to complete a survey on
program planning and implementation practices. Statistical analyses
of responses revealed no differences of practical value between the
practices of elementary and secondary level teachers; however, there
was a great deal of variability within the responses of both groups.
Results further indicated that aside from the initial development of
the individualized education program, objective evaluation
information generally is not used to make ongoing instructional
decisions. (Author)

Lм University of Minnesota

Research Report No. 65

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY RESOURCE ROOM TEACHERS : IS THERE A DIFFERENCE?

Margaret Potter and Phyllis Mirkin

iRLD

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities

2

IRLD

Director: James E. Ysseldyke

Associate Director: Phyllis K. Mirkin

Research Report No. 65

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES
OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY RESOURCE ROOM TEACHERS:
IS THERE A DIFFERENCE?

Margaret Potter and Phyllis Mirkin

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities

University of Minnesota

January, 1982

Abstract

- Much of the focus in learning disabilities has centered on elementary-age students, and while the demands and characteristics of instructional programs at the secondary level have been discussed by those who work with LD adolescents, there is no consensus on the degree to which elementary and secondary programs should differ. In this study, a national sample of 53 elementary school teachers and 34 secondary school teachers who provide Level III resource room service to LD students was asked to complete a survey on program planning and implementation practices. Statistical analyses of responses revealed no differences of practical value between the practices of elementary and secondary level teachers. However, there was a great deal of variability within the responses of both groups. Implications of the lack of differences between groups and the presence of variability within groups are discussed.

Instructional Planning and Implementation Practices

of Elementary and Secondary Resource Room Teachers:

Is There a Difference?

Learning disabilities as a special education service area is a
young field, having only come into its own within the last two
decades. These years have been characterized by controversy and
confusion as educators have struggled with the task of determining how
best to serve learning disabled (LD) students. Much of the focus in
learning disabilities has centered on work with elementary age
students; few programs were available for secondary level LD students
before the advent of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act
(PL 94-142). It has been PL 94-142, with its requirement of provision
of services up to age 21 if necessary, that has provided the impetus
for the widespread development of secondary level programs. Perhaps
due in large part to the haste with which many secondary programs were
put together and the fact that almost all work done with LD students
initially was with elementary school age children, most secondary
school programs might be viewed as stepchildren of elementary
programs. Deshler, Lowrey, and Alley (1979) categorized responses to
a survey on secondary program service options into five major areas:
functional, remedial, tutorial, work study, and learning strategies.
Responses to the survey indicated that 45% of the secondary programs
fell into the Basic Skills Remediation category--the category
described as the most similar to services used with elementary-age
students.

The demands and characteristics of secondary level education

frequently are discussed by those who work with learning disabled adolescents (e.g., Deshler, Alley, Warner, Schumaker, & Clark, 1980; Lerner, Evans, & Meyers, 1977; Wiederholt, 1978). Despite the emphasis given by these educators to the need for programs for secondary students, as with elementary programs, there is little consensus on the desired characteristics of such programs. Various approaches have been recommended for teaching the learning disabled adolescent: continuing the basic skills instruction begun in the elementary school (Goodman & Mann, 1976), individual assistance with, and adaptation of, mainstream curriculum (Brown, 1978), instruction in the use of learning strategies (Alley & Deshler, 1979), or use of compensatory approaches (Wiseman & Hartwell, 1980). Despite their differences, there is general agreement among these leaders in the field that elementary programs cannot simply be transferred to secondary settings. Yet, direct comparisons have not been made of the educational practices of elementary and secondary teachers of learning disabled students. The study reported here was an attempt to determine what differences, if any, do exist in the practices of elementary and secondary resource room teachers.

Method

Subjects

Surveys on the planning and implementation of instructional programs were sent to a random sample of 373 members of the Division for Children with Learning Disabilities (now named the Council for Learning Disabilities), Council for Exceptional Children. Completed surveys were returned by 128 teachers of learning disabled students.

Of these 128 teachers, 87 (68%) indicated that they provided Level III (part-time, up to 4 hours per day) service; the survey responses from these 87 resource room teachers were used in the current investigation.

Eight of the subjects included in this study were male; 78 were female. The majority of the teachers (72%) indicated that they held at least a master's degree in education; the average number of years spent as a special education teacher was 5.7. There were 53 elementary school (grades 1-6) teachers and 34 secondary school teachers in this group of 87 subjects. The 53 elementary school teachers represented 71% of the total number of elementary school teachers responding to the survey; the 34 secondary level teachers represented 74% of all secondary teachers completing the survey.

Materials

Data for this study were obtained from the program planning and implementation survey developed by Mirkin and Potter (1982). The survey consisted of eight sections: (a) school and teacher information, (b) student information, (c) selection of IEP goals and objectives, (d) program description, (e) determinants of the program, (f) changes in the original instructional plan, (g) evaluation of progress, and (h) miscellaneous. A supplementary form to be used in response selection accompanied the survey. (The survey and supplementary form may be found in Appendix A.)

Procedure

Surveys were mailed to 373 randomly selected members of the Council for Exceptional Children's Council for Learning Disabilities

4

(CLD) in the late spring of the 1980-1981 school year. Teachers were asked to complete the survey with the program of only one of their students in mind. Each teacher was provided with a randomly selected number between 1 and 15; teachers with caseloads of approximately 15 students were asked to use this number to determine which student's program they would have in mind as they completed the survey. Teachers who did not have approximately 15 students were asked to devise an alternate method for random selection of the student whose program they would describe. Teachers completed survey items either by filling in a blank (where appropriate, response options were provided from which they could choose) or by checking responses representative of their practices with the individual student.

Data Analysis

For purposes of data analyses, responses to items in Part C (Selection of IEP Goals and Objectives), Part E (Determinants of the Program), and Part G (Evaluation of Progress) of the survey were grouped into categories after the surveys were completed and returned. Four categories of responses were formed for Sections C and G, and five categories were formed for Section E of the survey. Table 1 lists each category with its component items. Several survey items allowed subjects to indicate a first, second, and third choice or asked the subject to indicate which of the instructional materials, methods, motivational strategies, or uses of evaluation information listed were relied on most. For these items, only the first choice or major use were considered in this investigation. To compare the responses of the elementary and secondary teachers, t tests and chi-

square tests were run where appropriate. Data not meeting the assumptions of either type of statistic were examined in a descriptive manner.

Insert Table 1 about here

Results

Results from the survey provided data on (a) teacher and student characteristics, (b) program description, (c) bases for program decisions, (d) evaluation practices, and (e) program satisfaction/ attributions for success. Not all respondents completed all items on the survey; thus, the results reported below are based on varying numbers of subjects.

Teacher and Student Characteristics

Teacher characteristics. Descriptive information for the two groups of teachers is outlined in Table 2. This information includes sex of teacher, number of years of experience teaching special education, highest educational degree obtained, number of students provided direct service, and number of students provided indirect service. There were no significant differences between elementary and secondary teachers for any of these descriptors.

Insert Table 2 about here

Student characteristics. The average age of the elementary level students selected from the teachers' caseloads was 9.5 years (SD =

1.53, range = 6-12); .the average age of the secondary level students was 15.3 years ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.64, range = 13-18). There was no significant difference between the race distributions of the elementary and secondary students. Information was available on the year the student started receiving special education services for 49 elementary students and 29 secondary students. While 9 (31%) of these secondary students had been receiving services for two years or less, 40 (82%) of the elementary students started receiving special education services in the two years preceding the date of the survey. This difference was statistically significant [$x^2(9)$.= 33.0, $\underline{p}$ < .001]. There was no significant difference between groups in the length of time since the most recent IEP had been written.

Program Description

The amount of time students were reported to receive services in various academic areas is shown in Table 3. The differences between the groups were not significant. When $\underline{t}$ tests were run using square root transformations of the raw data to control for variability, there still were no significant differences between groups in the amount of time instruction was provided in the various areas.

---------- ------------ -------------

Insert Table 3 about here

--------- -----------------------

Teachers were asked to indicate whether instruction provided to the student in reading, math, spelling, written language, and/or other areas was in place of or supplementary to classroom instruction. The only area in which there was a significant difference in the nature of

elementary and secondary instruction was in written language. Secondary level teachers generally indicated that resource room instruction in written language was <u>supplementary</u> while elementary teachers indicated resource room instruction was <u>in place of</u> classsroom instruction $[x^2(2) = 5.08, \underline{p} < .05]$.

The materials, methods, and motivational strategies that subjects indicated they relied on most in reading, math, spelling, and "other subjects" are listed in Tables 4, 5, and 6. Because of the numerous categories and the relatively few subjects responding within each category, statistical tests were not run on these data. Informal examination of the data suggested that there were relatively few differences between the elementary and secondary teachers in the methods and motivational strategies used with their students. With regard to materials, it appeared that secondary teachers in this sample relied more heavily on commercial programs in reading and consumables in spelling than did the elementary teachers. Elementary teachers' responses were more varied than those of the secondary teachers in the types of materials they reportedly relied on for reading, and they indicated more often than the secondary teachers that they relied on a classroom text to teach spelling.

Insert Tables 4-6 about here

Bases for Program Decisions

Subjects were asked to indicate the most influential factors in determining long-term goals and short-term objectives for the student

whose program was being described. These responses were categorized into four areas: tests, observation, consultation, and constraints (see Table 1). Chi-square analyses revealed no significant differences between the elementary and secondary teachers in the frequency with which they reported that various factors influenced either their long-term goals or short-term objectives. Similarly, there were no significant differences in the factors reported to be most influential in determining the amount of time the student received services, or in determining the materials, methods, and motivational strategies used with the student.

Teachers were asked to use a four-point scale (1 = very unlikely, 2 = unlikely, 3 = likely, and 4 = very likely) to indicate how likely they were to make changes in (a) materials, (b) methods, (c) motivational strategies, and (d) time allocation, student-teacher ratio, etc.; t tests revealed no differences between the two groups in their reported likelihood of making changes in any of these areas. Both groups indicated that they were somewhat more likely to make changes in materials, methods, and motivations, than to make changes in time, student-teacher ratio, etc.

Evaluation Practices

Responses to the portion of the survey on methods of pupil evaluation were grouped into five categories: formal tests, informal tests, observation of performance, consultation, and other. The general pattern of choices of methods of evaluation was not different for elementary and secondary teachers. In the areas of reading and math, no single type of evaluation appeared to be preferred over the

others by either the elementary or secondary teachers. In spelling, both groups emphasized informal tests, and in written language observation was listed as the preferred evaluation method.

Uses of evaluation information listed by survey respondents were grouped into three categories: discuss/consult, teacher actions, and monitor/grades. A chi-square analysis revealed no differences between the elementary and secondary teachers in how they used evaluation information. The items included in each category and the distribution of teacher responses are listed in Table 7.

Insert Table 7 about here

Program Evaluation

On a scale of one to four (1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = satisfied, 4 = very satisfied), subjects were asked to indicate their degree of satisfaction with the student's program in terms of (a) materials available, (b) amount of instructional time, (c) methods being used, (d) ability to monitor progress, and (e) the student's progress. Overall, teachers reported satisfaction with the student's current program and progress; t tests showed no differences between the levels of satisfaction of elementary and secondary teachers.

The final question of the survey asked subjects to rank order six items in terms of their perceived importance in the progress achieved by the target student by the time of the annual review (see Table 8 for a list of the items). None of the subjects in either group viewed

10

the material being used as the main reason for progress; there were no significant differences in the rankings of the other five items by the elementary and the secondary teachers.

Insert Table 8 about here

Discussion

The results of this investigation indicate that for this particular group of teachers there were few differences in the program planning and implementation practices of elementary and secondary level teachers. The overriding characteristics of the responses of both the elementary and secondary teachers was variability, even though all were providing Level I-II service. While there were only a moderate number of teachers involved in this study, as members of a national professional organization, many with advanced degrees, these teachers represent a group whose responses should reflect current trends in the field.

Few people would argue that adolescents are no different than elementary school age children; in fact, the majority of American schools use a different format of education for their mainstream secondary students than they use for elementary students. Any argument for or against different educational approaches for elementary and secondary LD students must balance consideration of the student as a person with difficulties in one or more of the basic skill areas against consideration of the number of years of school remaining for the student. If the major purpose of the educational

system is to provide minimum competency in the basic skill areas of reading, math, and spelling, then concentration on the basic skills through high school, for those who have difficulty in these areas, is appropriate. If, on the other hand, the major purpose of the school is to prepare the student for life after he/she leaves school, then by the time the student reaches high school, the basic skills approach may need to be secondary to an emphasis on vocational training, problem solving skills, life skills, and general knowledge content. Support for this second approach comes from the epidemiological study done by the Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities at the University of Kansas (Warner, Alley, Schumaker, Deshler, & Clark, 1980). Their study suggests that learning disabled adolescents tend to plateau in their achievement level, and that even with continued basic skills instruction, they gain little in the way of basic skills between eighth and twelfth grades.

The variability, so evident in all areas of this survey, appears to reflect the variations in definitions of LD currently in use, as well as the variations in philosophy regarding how best to teach LD students. Variability in educational programs is not, in and of itself, good or bad. Teachers always have known that the same method of teaching is not equally effective for all children. If variability reflects instructional methods that have been empirically tested and shown to be differentially effective for individual students, then variability is desirable. However, if variability reflects confusion in the field and arbitrary use of a multitude of non-validated interventions procedures, then variability is not desirable. In a

review of interventions currently in use in special education,

Ysseldyke and Algozzine (1982) conclude that:

> the decisions to use particular interventions on students should be based on evidence that the intervention is effective....Although we do not have evidence that specific curricula are universally effective, many data support the contention that interventions must be designed for the individual and monitored frequently to ensure their effectiveness. Intervention is equivalent to research and is a process of hypothesis testing. (p. 164)

The results of the present survey indicate that aside from the initial development of the Individual Education Plan (IEP), objective evaluation information generally is not used to make ongoing instructional decisions. Rather, teachers reported that decisions to make changes in the student's program were based on subjective information (e.g., "personal observation"). Many of the evaluation methods reported to be used with students were subjective in nature and the use of evaluation information generally was said to be for consultative, purposes (talk to student, teacher, parent, etc.) or monitoring (grades, etc.), rather than directly to guide teacher actions.

Learning disabilities is a young field and programs for secondary LD students are a recent phenomenon. There are no known, universally applicable, effective approaches for teaching LD students. Teachers of LD students hold different beliefs about what "learning disabilities" are and how best to intervene with LD students (Thurlow & Ysseldyke, 1982). The results of the present study indicate that there is in fact a wide variety of instructional approaches being used with LD students of all ages. Now that programs have been established for these students, it is important that educators make a concerted effort to determine how to serve these

students most effectively, taking into account not only specific academic
difficulties, but also the developmental, social, and emotional needs of
the student.

References

Alley, G., & Deshler, D. Teaching the learning disabled adolescent: Strategies and methods. Denver: Love, 1979.

Brown, V. Curriculum development resources. In L. Mann, L. Goodman & J. L. Wiederholt (Eds.), Teaching the learning disabled adolescent. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Deshler, D., Alley, G., Warner, M., Schumaker, J., & Clark, F. An epidemiological study of learning disabled adolescents in secondary schools: Support services (Research Report No. 19). Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities, 1980.

Deshler, D., Lowrey, N., & Alley, G. Programming alternatives for learning disabled adolescents: A nationwide survey. Academic Therapy, 1979, 14, 389-397.

Goodman, L., & Mann, L. Learning disabilities in the secondary school: Issues and practices. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1976.

Lerner, J., Evans, M., & Meyers, G. LD programs at the secondary level: A survey. Academic Therapy, 1977, 13, 7-19.

Mirkin, P., & Potter, M. A survey of program planning and implementation practices of LD teachers (Research Report, in preparation). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities, 1982.

Thurlow, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Teacher's beliefs about LD students. (Research Report No. 66) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities, 1982.

Warner, M., Alley, G., Schumaker, J., Deshler, D., & Clark, F. An epidemiological study of learning disabled adolescents in secondary schools: Achievement and ability, socioeconomic status, and school experiences (Research Report No. 13). Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas, Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities, 1980.

Wiederholt, J. L. Adolescents with learning disabilities: The problem in perspective. In L. Mann, L. Goodman, & J. L. Wiederholt (Eds.), Teaching the learning disabled adolescent. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Wiseman, D. E., & Hartwell (Meyers), L. K. The poor reader in secondary schools: An alternative curriculum. Academic Therapy, 1980, 15, 613-624.

Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, B. Critical issues in special and remedial education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Tests

Overall scores on ability tests
Overall scores on achievement tests·
Pattern of scores on ability tests
Pattern of scores on achievement tests
Discrepancies between ability and
  achievement tests
Other standardized assessments
Performance on criterion-referenced
  measures

Observation of Performance

Progress on previous IEP objectives
Informal assessments done during
  previous instruction
Other informal assessments
Personal observation of student
  performance
Behavioral observations/information

Consultation

Classroom teacher's priorities
Parental input/priorities
Input of other team members

Constraints

Constraints of times, materials, teachers
  available
District policies
A commercial or locally constructed list
  of long-term goals, short-term objectives,
  and/or instructional suggestions

INFLUENTIAL FACTORS

Test Based and Objective Information

Demonstrated ability on psychological
  tests
Performance on standardized tests
Performance on informal measures
Formal observation
Medical information (hearing,
  medications, etc.)

Classroom Information

Referring teacher's statement of
  original referral problem
Classroom teacher's comments on
  classroom progress
Classroom teacher's requests
Material covered by regular
  classroom

Experiential Factors

Student characteristics (e.g., attention
  span, motivation, social skills, etc.)
Past experience with student
Past experience with students with similar
  problems
College coursework, professional journals,
  workshops, etc.

Constraints

Materials available
Your caseload
Rest of student's schedule
Other students taught at same time
Policy of lead teacher/school/district
Instructor's guide(s) for text(s)

Consultation/Family Information

Family information
Consultation with others (aside from classroom
  teacher and parents)
Parent requests

TYPES OF EVALUATION

Formal Tests

Standardized achievement tests
Standardized diagnostic measures
District developed tests
Basal text mastery tests
Formal observation

Informal Tests

Criterion referenced measures
Direct and frequent measurement
  (precision teaching-type)
Teacher-made tests/oral quizzes
Oral, silent timings
Check number of short-term objectives
  mastered

Observation of Performance

Scoring workbooks
Scoring worksheets
Amount of work completed
Number of correct flashcards
Listening to oral reading
Informal observation of student performance

Consultation

Consultation with classroom teacher
  regarding classroom performance

Table 2

Descriptive Information for Elementary and

Secondary Level Teachers

	Elementary	Secondary
Sex		
Male	7.5%	12.1%
Female	92.5%	87.9%
Highest Degree		
BA/AB	24.6%	33.3%
MA/MS	73.5%	54.5%
EdS/ABD	1.9%	12.2%
Mean Number of Years in Special Education[a]	5.7 (3.5)	5.8 (3.0)
Mean Number of Students Served[a]		
Direct Service	19.1 (6.5)	21.8(11.3)
Indirect Service	23.2(64.4)	8.1(12.1)

[a] Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

Table 3

Percentages of Students Receiving Special Education

Services in Various Academic Areas and Average

Amount of Time Spent within Each Area[a]

Academic Area	Elementary			Secondary		
	%[b]	$\bar{X}$	SD	%[b]	$\bar{X}$	SD
Reading	90.0	39.7	21.5	80.6	35.5	21.1
Math	50.9	34.4	17.6	71.0	38.7	17.9
Spelling	58.5	19.7	8.7	71.0	20.9	16.6
Written Language	58.5	20.3	12.1	64.5	25.9	23.4
Other	30.2	35.7	43.6	48.3	45.9	49.0

[a]Times are calculated on the basis of instruction five days per week.

[b]Percentages are based on the number of elementary ($\underline{n}$=53) and secondary
students ($\underline{n}$=31) reported to be receiving instruction in each academic
area.

18

Table 4

Percentages of Teachers Listing Various Types of Materials

as Most Used Within Academic Areas

	Elementary	Secondary
Materials - Reading	(n=29)	(n=22)
Classroom Text	13.8	4.5
Other Texts	17.2	13.7
Commercial Program	24.1	50.0
Local Program	13.8	4.5
Consumables	6.9	13.7
Manipulables	13.8	4.5
Others	10.4	9.1
Materials - Math	(n=18)	(n=17)
Classroom Text	33.3	23.4
Other Texts	5.6	17.7
Commercial Program	5.6	17.7
Local Program	33.3	17.7
Consumables	16.6	17.7
Manipulables	5.6	0.0
Others	0.0	5.8
Materials - Spelling	(n=23)	(n=19)
Classroom Text	43.5	10.5
Other Texts	4.3	0.0
Commercial Program	4.3	26.3
Local Program	26.1	5.3
Consumables	8.7	42.1
Manipulables	4.3	0.0
Others	8.7	15.8
Materials - Other Subjects	(n=8)	(n=6)
Classroom Text	12.5	50.0
Other Texts	12.5	0.0
Commercial Program	37.5	0.0
Local Program	37.5	0.0
Consumables	0.0	50.0
Manipulables	0.0	0.0

Table 5

Percentages of Teachers Listing Various Types of

Methods as Most Used Within Academic Areas

	Elementary	Secondary
Methods - Reading	(n=25)	(n=12)
Subskills	64.0	50.0
Practice	20.0	25.0
Modality	0.0	8.3
Modeling	8.0	0.0
Games	4.0	8.3
Other	4.0	8.3
Methods - Math	(n=13)	(n=14)
Subskills	69.2	50.0
Practice	15.4	21.4
Modality	7.7	0.0
Modeling	0.0	21.4
Games	7.7	7.1
Other	0.0	0.0
Methods - Spelling	(n=17)	(n=11)
Subskills	35.3	36.4
Practice	35.3	54.5
Modality	11.8	9.1
Modeling	5.9	0.0
Games	11.8	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0
Methods - Other Areas	(n=9)	(n=4)
Subskills	22.2	50.0
Practice	22.2	0.0
Modality	22.2	0.0
Modeling	11.1	25.0
Games	22.2	25.0
Other	0.0	0.0

Table 6

Percentages of Teachers Listing Various Types of Motivational

Strategies as Most Used Within Academic Areas

	Elementary	Secrndary
Motivation - Reading	(n=37)	(n=23)
Social	43.3	43.5
Activity	5.4	8.,
Concrete	2.7	4.4
Indirect	16.2	13.0
Contracts	13.5	8.7
Self-Management	10.8	21.7
Punishment	8.1	0.0
Motivation - Math	(n=20)	(n=16)
Social	50.0	50.0
Activity	5.0	12.5
Concrete	10.0	6.2
Indirect	10.0	12.5
Contracts	0.0	0.0
Self-Management	5.0	18.8
Punishment	20.0	0.0
Motivation - Spelling	(n=16)	(n=11)
Social	62.5	63.6
Activity	6.2	9.1
Concrete	0.0	18.2
Indirect	25.0	9.1
Contracts	0.0	0.0
Self-Management	6.2	0.0
Punishment	0.0	0.0
Motivation - Other	(n=6)	(n=9)
Social	50.0	33.4
Activity	0.0	22.2
Concrete	0.0	11.1
Indirect	50.0	1h.1
Contracts	0.0	11.1
Self-Management	0.0	11.1
Punishment		

Table 7

Percentages of Elementary and Secondary Teachers Listing Major Use

of Evaluation Information Within Categories

	Elementary	Secondary
Discuss/Consult	46.3%	45.0%
Discuss progress with student		
Discuss progress with parent		
Discuss progress with teacher		
Consult with lead teacher, principal, special ed director		
Review progress with team		
Send notes home		
Teacher Actions	37.5%	20.0%
Change instructional plan		
Decide to review/reteach		
Modify goals and objectives		
Monitor/Grades	15.7%	35.0%
Monitor progress		
Assign grades		
Total number responding	(32)	(20)

Table 8

Reasons Cited by Teachers for Student Progress

- Instructional approach used

- Material used

- Additional instruction time spent in target areas

- Lower student teacher ratio

- Increased student motivation

- Ability to monitor student progress closely and to make changes when needed

---

APPENDIX A

Copy of Survey and Supplementary Form

PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY

PART A | SCHOOL AND TEACHER INFORMATION

Type of School: _____Rural _____Suburban _____Urban

_____Elementary _____Middle/Jr. High _____Secondary/Senior High

Teacher Information: _____Female _____Male

How many years have you taught Special Education students?_____

Please identify the highest degree you hold_____

Approximately how many children do you serve each day?

Number served: _____Direct service _____Indirect service

For the remainder of the survey, respond to items while keeping in mind the program of the student selected according to the attached directions.

PART B | STUDENT INFORMATION

1. For this particular student: _____Age _____Grade _____Race

2. Month and year Special Education service began_____

3. Month and year you started working with this student_____

4. Date the current Individual Educational Plan (IEP) was written_____

5. Date of the last IEP periodic review_____

6. What level of service do you provide this student? Circle one.
   Level:

   I - Monitoring   IV - Direct service - more than 4 hours/day

   II - Consultation   V - All day, self-contained

   III - Direct service - up to 4 hours/day VI - Special School/Residential

7. How much Special Education service does this student receive in the following areas:

Area	# Min/day	#Days/wk	Area	# Min/day	# Days/wk
Reading	_____	_____	Written Language	_____	_____
Math	_____	_____	Other	_____	_____
Spelling	_____	_____	(Specify):_____		

8. What are the criteria for a student to be classified as learning disabled in your school/district?

PART C   SELECTION OF IEP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

If you were not involved in writing this student's IEP, skip this part and go on to PART D.

Use the items listed in Section C of the accompanying form (the blue sheet) to respond to the following questions. Please rank order your answers from most important to least important.

What sources of information do you feel were the most important in determining –

a. Long term goals:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," #19, was used, please specify:_____

b. Short term objectives:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," #19, was used, please specify:_____

PART D   PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. For each area listed below, check whether the instruction you provide is in place of or supplementary to classroom instruction.

Area	In place of	Supplementary	Area	In place of	Supplementary
Reading	_____	_____	Written Language	_____	_____
Math	_____	_____	Other	_____	_____
Spelling	_____	_____	(specify):_____		

For Questions 2, 3, and 4, within each area in which you provide instruction, please asterisk (*) the material, method, and motivational strategy you rely on the most with this student. Check (√) anything else used regularly within each academic area.

2. Material	Examples	Reading	Math	Spelling	Other ( )
Child's classroom text		_____	_____	_____	_____
Other standard texts		_____	_____	_____	_____
Commercial programs	DISTAR, Frostig, KeyMath	_____	_____	_____	_____
Locally developed programs	Math/reading programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Consumables	Workbooks, worksheets	_____	_____	_____	_____
Manipulables	Cuisinaire rods, flannel board	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (specify):_____		_____	_____	_____	_____

3. Method	Examples	Reading	Math	Spelling	Other ( )
Work on subskills	Regrouping in sub-traction Syllabication Comprehension skills	___	___	___	___
Practice	Oral reading practice Writing times tables Isolated word practice Writing in journals	___	___	___	___
Modality training	VAKT (visual, auditory kinesthetic, tactile)	___	___	___	___
Modeling	Student listens to selection before reading Student reads while teacher reads. Student imitates solving of math problem	___	___	___	___
Games and machinery	Tape recorder Language master Computer games	___	___	___	___
Other (specify): _____		___	___	___	___

4. Motivation	Examples	Reading	Math	Spelling	Other ( )
Social reinforcers	Verbal praise, posted praise, working with friend, positive note home	___	___	___	___
Activity reinforcers	Use typewriter, have free time, have early dismissal, be office assistant, do favorite school work	___	___	___	___
Concrete reinforcers	Candy, stars, stickers, money school materials	___	___	___	___
Indirect reinforcers	Earn points, tokens, check-marks, etc., to trade in for a reinforcer	___	___	___	___
Contracts	Between student and teacher; between student, teacher, and parent	___	___	___	___
Self-management strategies	Having student charting his/her own data; scoring his/her own tests; self-monitoring of time on task	___	___	___	___
Punishment procedures	Time out, response cost, error correction, sad faces, red checkmarks, fines	___	___	___	___
Other (specify): _____		___	___	___	___

Over, please

PART E DETERMINANTS OF THE PROGRAM

Use the items listed in Section E of the blue form to respond to the following questions. Please rank order your answers from most important to least important.

What factors have been most influential in determining –

a. The amount of time the student receives services:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," # 23, was used, please specify: _____

b. The materials used:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," # 23, was used, please specify: _____

c. The methods used:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," # 23, was used, please specify: _____

d. The motivational strategies used:

Item #_____, _____, _____

If "Other," # 23, was used, please specify: _____

PART F CHANGES IN ORIGINAL INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

How likely are you to make any changes in your instructional plan for this student between periodic reviews? (See PART D for examples of materials, methods, and motivational strategies.)

	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Very Likely
Change materials	1	2	3	4
Change methods	1	2	3	4
Change motivational strategies	1	2.	3	4
Change time allocation, student/ teacher ratio, etc.	1	2	3	4

Generally, what is the basis for your decision to make changes, or not to make changes, in this student's program? Rank order, please.

_____objective performance data

_____personal observation of student progress

_____external constraints (scheduling, changes in classroom curriculum, etc.)

_____other (specify):_____

PART G EVALUATION OF PROGRESS

Use the items listed in Section G of the blue form to respond to question 1.

1. What, if any, type of evaluation information do you collect in each of the areas in which you provide instruction? Please rank order your answers from most important to least important and indicate the frequency with which you use each form of evaluation (e.g., daily, 2X/week, monthly, etc.)

Area	Type of Evaluation (List item #)	Frequency
Reading	1. _____	_____
	2. _____	_____
	3. _____	_____
Math	1. _____	_____
	2. _____	_____
	3. _____	_____
Spelling	1. _____	_____
	2. _____	_____
	3. _____	_____
Written Language	1. _____	_____
	2. _____	_____
	3. _____	_____
Other (specify)	1. _____	_____
_____	2. _____	_____
	3. _____	_____

2. Where do you record information about this student's performance/progress?

_____No written records kept   _____Checklists

_____Charts and/or graphs   _____File samples of work

_____Grade book   _____Other (specify):_____

3. Of the total amount of instructional and preparatory time devoted to this student, what percentage would you estimate you spend in performance/ progress evaluation activities? Circle one.

up to 10%   11-20%   21-30%   31-45%   46-60%   61-75%   more than 75%

Under ideal conditions, would you like to see this percentage of time:

_____increased   _____stay the same   _____decreased

Over, please

4. How is evaluation information used with this student? Please asterisk (*) the major use and check (√) any others that apply. Also, indicate the approximate frequency of each use.

                                                           Frequency

_____ Not used

_____ Discuss progress with student

_____ Discuss progress with parent

_____ Discuss progress with regular classroom teacher

_____ Consult with lead teacher, principal, special education director, etc.

_____ Send notes home

_____ Change instructional plan (materials, methods, etc.)

_____ Decide when to review, reteach

_____ Monitor progress on IEP goals and objectives

_____ Review progress with team

_____ Modify IEP goals and objectives

_____ Assign grades

_____ Other (specify):_____

| PART H | MISCELLANEOUS

1. How satisfied are you with this student's program in terms of:

		Very Dis-satisfied	Dissat-isfied	Satis-fied	Very Sat-isfied
a.	Materials available	1	2	3	4
b.	Amount of instructional time	1	2	3	4
c.	Methods you are using	1	2	3	4
d.	Ability to monitor progress	1	2	3	4
e.	The student's progress	1	2	3	4

2. If this student has made appreciable progress by the time of the annual review, to what do you think this will mainly be due? Please rank order.

_____ The instructional approach used

_____ The material used

_____ The additional instruction time spent in target areas

_____ The lower student/teacher ratio

_____ Increased student motivation

_____ Ability to closely monitor student progress and make changes when needed

3. We welcome any comments you have on this survey or the instructional or evaluation process in general.

Use the following items in responding to questions in Part C, E, and G of the survey. The sections on this form are labeled to correspond with the portion of the survey for which those items are appropriate. These lists are by no means exhaustive. Please feel free to use the category "other"; we just ask that you specify what "other" stands for in the appropriate space on the survey itself.

Section C — Sources of Information

1. Overall scores on ability tests
2. Overall scores on achievement tests
3. Pattern of scores on ability tests
4. Pattern of scores on achievement tests
5. Discrepancies between ability and achievement tests
6. Other standardized assessments
7. Performance on criterion-referenced measures
8. Progress on previous IEP objectives
9. Informal assessments done during previous instruction
10. Other informal assessments

11. Personal observation of student performance
12. Behavioral observations/information
13. Classroom teacher's priorities
14. Parental input/priorities
15. Input of other team members
16. Constraints of times, materials, teachers available
17. District policies
18. A commercial or locally constructed list of long-term goals, short-term objectives, and/or instructional suggestions
19. Other

Section E — Influential Factors

1. Demonstrated ability on psychological tests
2. Performance on standardized tests
3. Performance on informal measures
4. Formal observation
5. Medical information (hearing, medications, etc.)
6. Family information
7. Referring teacher's statement of original referral problem
8. Classroom teacher's comments on classroom progress
9. Classroom teacher's requests
10. Material covered by regular classroom
11. Student characteristics (e.g., attention span, motivation, social skills, etc.)

12. Past experience with student
13. Past experience with students with similar problems
14. Materials available
15. Your caseload
16. Rest of student's schedule
17. Other students taught at same time
18. Policy of lead teacher/school/district
19. Instructor's guide(s) for text(s)
20. Consultation with others (aside from classroom teacher and parents)
21. Parent requests
22. College coursework, professional journals, workshops, etc.
23. Other

Section G — Types of Evaluation

1. Standardized achievement tests
2. Standardized diagnostic measures
3. District developed tests
4. Basal text mastery tests
5. Criterion referenced measures
6. Direct and frequent measurement (precision teaching-type)
7. Teacher-made tests/oral quizzes
8. Scoring workbooks
9. Scoring worksheets
10. Amount of work completed

11. Number of correct flashcards
12. Listening to oral reading
13. Oral, silent timings
14. Informal observation of student performance
15. Formal observation
16. Consultation with classroom teacher regarding classroom performance
17. Check number of short-term objectives mastered
18. Other

PUBLICATIONS

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities
University of Minnesota

The Institute is not funded for the distribution of its publications. Publications may be obtained for $3.00 per document, a fee designed to cover printing and postage costs. Only checks and money orders payable to the University of Minnesota can be accepted. All orders must be pre-paid.

Requests should be directed to: Editor, IRLD, 350 Elliott Hall; 75 East River Road, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Ysseldyke, J. E. Assessing the learning disabled youngster: The state of the art (Research Report No. 1). November, 1977.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Regan, R. R. Nondiscriminatory assessment and decision making (Monograph No. 7). February, 1979.

Foster, G., Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. Susceptibility to stereotypic bias (Research Report No. 3). March, 1979.

Algozzine, B. An analysis of the disturbingness and acceptability of behaviors as a function of diagnostic label (Research Report No. 4). March, 1979.

Algozzine, B., & McGraw, K. Diagnostic testing in mathematics: An extension of the PIAT? (Research Report No. 5). March, 1979.

Deno, S. L. A direct observation approach to measuring classroom behavior: Procedures and application (Research Report No. 6). April, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Mirkin, P. K. Proceedings of the Minnesota roundtable conference on assessment of learning disabled children (Monograph No. 8). April, 1979.

Somwaru, J. P. A new approach to the assessment of learning disabilities (Monograph No. 9), April, 1979.

Algozzine, B., Forgnone, C., Mercer, C. D., & Trifiletti, J. J. Toward defining discrepancies for specific learning disabilities: An analysis and alternatives (Research Report No. 7). June, 1979.

Algozzine, B. The disturbing child: A validation report (Research Report No. 8). June, 1979.

Note: Monographs No. 1 - 6 and Research Report No. 2 are not available for distribution. These documents were part of the Institute's 1979-1980 continuation proposal, and/or are out of print.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., & Potter, M. Technical
adequacy of tests used by professionals in simulated decision
making (Research Report No. 9). July, 1979.

Jenkins, J. R., Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Measuring pupil progress
toward the least restrictive environment (Monograph No. 10).
August, 1979.

Mirkin, P. K., & Deno, S. L. Formative evaluation in the classroom: An
approach to improving instruction (Research Report No. 10). August,
1979.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Current assessment and decision-making
practices in model programs for the learning disabled (Research Report
No. 11). August, 1979.

Deno, S. L., Chiang, B., Tindal, G., & Blackburn, M. Experimental analysis
of program components: An approach to research in CSDC's (Research
Report No. 12). August, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Shinn, M., & McGue, M. Similarities and
differences between underachievers and students labeled learning
disabled: Identical twins with different mothers (Research Report
No. 13). September, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, R. Perspectives on assessment of learning
disabled students (Monograph No. 11). October, 1979.

Poland, S. F., Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Current
assessment and decision-making practices in school settings as reported
by directors of special education (Research Report No. 14). November,
1979.

McGue, M., Shinn, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Validity of the Woodcock-Johnson
psycho-educational battery with learning disabled students (Research
Report No. 15). November, 1979.

Deno, S., Mirkin, P., & Shinn, M. Behavioral perspectives on the assess-
ment of learning disabled children (Monograph No. 12). November, 1979.

Sutherland, J. H., Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Young, S. What
can I say after I say LD? (Research Report No. 16). December, 1979.

Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Data-based IEP development: An approach
to substantive compliance (Monograph No. 13). December, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., & McGue, M. The influence of
test scores and naturally-occurring pupil characteristics on psycho-
educational decision making with children (Research Report No. 17).
December, 1979.

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Decision makers' prediction of
students' academic difficulties as a function of referral informa-
tion (Research Report No. 18). December, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. Diagnostic classification decisions as a function of referral information (Research Report No. 19). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Chiang, B., & Lowry, L. Relationships among simple measures of reading and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 20). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Lowry, L., & Kuehnle, K. Relationships among simple measures of spelling and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 21). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., & Marston, D. Relationships among simple measures of written expression and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 22). January, 1980.

Mirkin, P. K., Deno, S. L., Tindal, G., & Kuehnle, K. Formative evaluation: Continued development of data utilization systems (Research Report No. 23). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Robinson, S., & Evans, P. Relationships among classroom observations of social adjustment and sociometric rating scales (Research Report No. 24). January, 1980.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Factors influential on the psycho-educational decisions reached by teams of educators (Research Report No. 25). February, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. Diagnostic decision making in individuals susceptible to biasing information presented in the referral case folder (Research Report No. 26). March, 1980.

Thurlow, M. L., & Greener, J. W. Preliminary evidence on information considered useful in instructional planning (Research Report No. 27). March, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Regan, R. R., & Schwartz, S. Z. The use of technically adequate tests in psychoeducational decision making (Research Report No. 28). April, 1980.

Richey, L., Potter, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Teachers' expectations for the siblings of learning disabled and non-learning disabled students: A pilot study (Research Report No. 29). May, 1980.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Instructional planning: Information collected by school psychologists vs. information considered useful by teachers (Research Report No. 30). June, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Webber, J., Campbell, M., Moore, S., & Gilliam, J. Classroom decision making as a function of diagnostic labels and perceived competence (Research Report No. 31). June, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R. R., Potter, M., Richey, L., & Thurlow, M. L. Psychoeducational assessment and decision making: A computer-simulated investigation (Research Report No. 32). July, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R. R., Potter, M., & Richey, L. Psychoeducational assessment and decision making: Individual case studies (Research Report No. 33). July, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., Potter, M., & Richey, L. Technical supplement for computer-simulated investigations of the psychoeducational assessment and decision-making process (Research Report No. 34). July, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Stevens, L., Costello, C., Reattie, J., & Schmid, R. Classroom perspectives of LD and other special education teachers (Research Report No. 35). July, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Siders, J., Siders, J., & Beattie, J. Using assessment information to plan reading instructional programs: Error analysis and word attack skills (Monograph No. 14). July, 1980

Ysseldyke, J., Shinn, M., & Epps, S. A comparison of the WISC-R and the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Ability (Research Report No. 36). July, 1980.

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. An analysis of difference score reliabilities on three measures with a sample of low achieving youngsters (Research Report No. 37). August, 1980.

Shinn, M., Algozzine, B., Marston, D., & Ysseldyke, J. A theoretical analysis of the performance of learning disabled students on the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Research Report No. 38). August, 1980.

Richey, L. S., Ysseldyke, J., Potter, M., Regan, R. R., & Greener, J. Teachers' attitudes and expectations for siblings of learning disabled children (Research Report No. 39). August, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., & Thurlow, M. L. (Eds.). A naturalistic investigation of special education team meetings (Research Report No. 40). August, 1980.

Meyers, B., Meyers, J., & Deno, S. Formative evaluation and teacher decision making: A follow-up investigation (Research Report No. 41). September, 1980.

Fuchs, D., Garwick, D. R., Featherstone, N., & Fuchs, L. S. On the determinants and prediction of handicapped children's differential test performance with familiar and unfamiliar examiners (Research Report No. 42). September, 1980.

Algozzine, B., & Stoller, L.   Effects of labels and competence on
    teachers' attributions for a student (Research Report No. 43).
    September, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Thurlow, M. L. (Eds.).   The special education
    assessment and decision-making process: Seven case studies
    (Research Report No. 44).   September, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Potter, M., & Regan, A.   A descriptive
    study of students enrolled in a program for the severely learning
    disabled (Research Report No. 45).   September, 1980.

Marston, D.   Analysis of subtest scatter on the tests of cognitive
    ability from the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery
    (Research Report No. 46).   October, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Shinn, M.   Identifying children with
    learning disabilities: When is a discrepancy severe? (Research
    Report No. 47).   November, 1980.

Fuchs, L., Tindal, J., & Deno, S.   Effects of varying item domain and
    sample duration on technical characteristics of daily measures
    in reading (Research Report No. 48).   January, 1981.

Marston, D., Lowry, L., Deno, S., & Mirkin, P.   An analysis of learning
    trends in simple measures of reading, spelling, and written expression:
    A longitudinal study (Research Report No. 49).   January, 1981.

Marston, D., & Deno, S.   The reliability of simple, direct measures of
    written expression (Research Report No. 50).   January, 1981.

Epps, S., McGue, M., & Ysseldyke, J. E.   Inter-judge agreement in classi-
    fying students as learning disabled (Research Report No. 51).   Feb-
    ruary, 1981.

Epps, S., Ysseldyke, J. E., & McGue, M.   Differentiating LD and non-LD
    students: "I know one when I see one" (Research Report No. 52).
    March, 1981.

Evans, P. R., & Peham, M. A. S.   Testing and measurement in occupational
    therapy: A review of current practice with special emphasis on the
    Southern California Sensory Integration Tests (Monograph No. 15).
    April, 1981.

Fuchs, L., Wesson, C., Tindal, G., & Mirkin, P.   Teacher efficiency in
    continuous evaluation of IEP goals (Research Report No. 53).   June,
    1981.

Fuchs, D., Featherstone, N., Carwick, D. R., & Fuchs, L. S.   The impor-
    tance of situational factors and task demands to handicapped chil-
    dren's test performance (Research Report No. 54).   June, 1981.

Tindal, G., & Deno, S. L. Daily measurement of reading: Effects of varying the size of the item pool (Research Report No. 55). July, 1981.

Fuchs, L. S., & Deno, S. L. A comparison of teacher judgment, standardized tests, and curriculum-based approaches to reading placement (Research Report No. 56). August, 1981.

Fuchs, L., & Deno, S. The relationship between curriculum-based mastery measures and standardized achievement tests in reading (Research Report No. 57). August, 1981.

Christenson, S., Graden, J., Potter, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Current research on psychoeducational assessment and decision making: Implications for training and practice (Monograph No. 16). September, 1981.

Christenson, S., Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, B. Institutional constraints and external pressures influencing referral decisions (Research Report No. 58). October, 1981.

Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., & Deno, S. Reliability and validity of curriculum-based informal reading inventories (Research Report No. 59). October, 1981.

Algozzine, B., Christenson, S., & Ysseldyke, J. Probabilities associated with the referral-to-placement process (Research Report No. 60). November, 1981.

Tindal, G., Fuchs, L. Christenson, S., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. The relationship between student achievement and teacher assessment of short- or long-term goals (Research Report No. 61). November, 1981.

Mirkin, P., Fuchs, L., Tindal, G., Christenson, S., & Deno, S. The effect of IEP monitoring strategies on teacher behavior (Research Report No. 62). December, 1981.

Wesson, C., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. Teachers' use of self instructional materials for learning procedures for developing and monitoring progress on IEP goals (Research Report No. 63). January, 1982.

Fuchs, L., Wesson, C., Tindal, G., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. Instructional changes, student performance, and teacher preferences: The effects of specific measurement and evaluation procedures (Research Report No. 64). January, 1982.

Potter, M., & Mirkin, P. Instructional planning and implementation practices of elementary and secondary resource room teachers: Is there a difference? (Research Report No. 65). January, 1982.