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Recent research studies have determined that students with emotional and behavior disorders (EBD) are the most difficult to integrate into the general education environment. Students with EBD are most likely to be educated in separate settings and least likely to be found in traditional education environments. However, the mandate of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act reauthorized in 1997 (IDEA '97) and the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) regulation indicates all educators, including administrators, have the responsibility to challenge teachers and schools to be more inclusive regarding students with EBD and to provide services that better support students in this setting.

The study focuses on three issues: (a) the essential and supportive variables needed to be implemented in order for students with EBD to be successful in general education settings; (b) the quality indices are being implemented by school districts in the State of Michigan; and (c) the success of each district in placing students with EBD in partial and full inclusion settings when using the quality indices.
This study used a survey created by the researcher from a literature review to determine the use of the quality indices in each local education agency (LEA) in the State of Michigan. In addition, the survey asked questions regarding the placement of students with EBD in partial and full inclusion settings. The researcher then analyzed the use of quality indices and the relationship between the use of quality indices and both the success of districts with students with EBD and the placements in each available service delivery program.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of Issue

Recent research studies have determined that students with emotional and behavior disorders (EBD) are the most difficult to integrate into the general education environment (Yell, 1995; Cartledge & Johnson, 1996; Heflin & Bullock, 1999), moreover, general education teachers are least tolerant of the behaviors and placement of students with EBD in their classes (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1994). Downing, Simpson, & Myles (1990) report that students with emotional and behavior disorders have the highest rejection rate of all students who have been included into the general education setting. The 23rd Annual Report to Congress (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) states that over the past ten years the percentage of students with disabilities served in schools and classes with their non-disabled peers has gradually increased while 33.2% of students with emotional and behavior disorders still receive more than 60% of their educational services in separate schools or classrooms. In fact, only 16% of students with EBD receive a majority of educational services in the regular education environment compared to 35% of all other students receiving special education services (Cessna & Skibba, 1996).
Students with EBD are most likely to be educated in separate settings and least likely to be found in traditional education environments (Cheney & Muscott, 1996). Due to the complex behavioral, social, emotional, and academic problems students with EBD exhibit, they demand a flexible range of individual options and services from those who educate them (Rock, Rosenberg, & Carran, 1995; Bassett, Jackson, Ferrell, Luckner, Hargerty, Bunsen, & MacIsaac, 1996; Meadows, 1996). Historically, they have been the first students asked to leave a general education classroom and the last ones to be invited back to receive educational services in the general education environment (Janney, Snell, Beers, & Raynes, 1995). All of these facts indicate the issue of integrating students with EBD into the general education setting presents one of the greatest challenges within the inclusion movement facing our educational system (Yell, 1995; Cartledge & Johnson, 1996; Aiello & Bullock, 1999; Gibb, Allred, Ingram, Young, & Egan, 1999; Landrum & Tankersley, 1999).

Special education rules and regulations regarding programs, services, and placement have been recently revised in many states in order to comply with the Federal legislation, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, P.L. 105-17 (IDEA '97), which was reauthorized in 1997 and implemented in 1998. Many of these changes focus on the requirements of IDEA '97 identifying the general education setting as the foundation and preferred location for socialization and instruction for all students (Gunter, Denny, & Venn, 2000; Helfin & Bullock, 1999; Hendrickson, Smith, & Frank, 1998). Additionally, IDEA '97 addresses the issue of keeping students identified with emotional and behavior problems in the school building by
restricting the number of days for suspension and requiring alternative placements for students who violate school discipline codes.

The mandates of IDEA '97 and the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) regulation specify all educators, including administrators, have the responsibility to challenge teachers and schools to be more inclusive regarding students with EBD and to provide services that better support students in this setting (Yell, 1995; Cessna & Skibba, 1996; Hendrickson, Smith, & Frank, 1998). However, according to a study regarding teacher perceptions on the educational placements of students with EBD, Martin, Lloyd, Kauffman, Coyne (1995) determined it was clear that the intent of the law has not been realized and many school buildings are not exercising best practices.

Although special education law requires school districts to place students with EBD on a case by case basis in the LRE, studies have shown that these students have been placed in more restrictive environments regardless of identified individual need (Grosnick, George, & George, 1991; Gunter, Denny, & Venn, 2000). Furthermore, it has been noted the availability and quality of services for students with EBD vary considerably from school to school and state to state causing placement decisions to be based on the types of existing services rather than on individual student need (Muscott, Morgan, & Meadows, 1996).

Statement of the Problem

Due to the current emphasis on including all students with disabilities in the general education environment, it seems increasingly important to determine
placement procedures and quality indices for successful integration of students with EBD (DuPaul, McGoey, & Yugar, 1997). However, there has been little experimental research conducted to determine appropriate procedures for placement into regular education settings for these students, and particularly little data regarding the success of partial inclusion programs designed to include students with EBD for portions of the school day (Harvey, 1996; Summy, 1998). When it comes to research on the success of students with EBD, complete and accurate information is not readily available (Guetzloe, 2001).

Janney et al (1995) conclude personal and professional fears continue to remain the greatest barriers to the inclusion of students with EBD in the general education classroom. They report fears of not being able to meet the needs of the included students in their classes and a general fear of the student who exhibits emotional and behavior disorders (Heflin & Bullock, 1999). Many general education teachers do not agree with the basic philosophy of inclusive education (Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998), and feel imposed upon when required to teach students with emotional and/or behavioral needs (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). They consider themselves unprepared and uncomfortable with their presence in the classroom while reporting a lack of knowledge, skill and confidence with regard to curriculum and instruction (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995; Heflin & Bullock, 1999). In fact more than ten years ago, Downing, Simpson, & Myles (1990) reported a bias developing against these students in general education settings. General education teachers, currently
feeling over-loaded, are reluctant to engage in discussions regarding changes in the placement of students with EBD (Janney et al., 1995).

School failure is higher for students with EBD than for students within any other category (Gibb et al., 1999). There are many characteristics exhibited by students with EBD that frequently determine their failure in the general education environment. Inability to attend, inappropriate peer interactions, social withdrawal and anxiety, academic frustration, non-compliance with rules, aggression, and inconsistent work completion are just a few (Downing, Simpson, & Myles, 1990; Dunlap & Childs, 1996; DuPaul, Mc Goey, & Yugar, 1997). One possible cause for the failure of so many programs attempting to integrate students with EBD into the general education environment is the lack of research regarding the variables that are essential to the success of these students in this setting (Rock, Rosenberg, & Carran, 1995). There is even less documentation regarding the use and the success of these variables in public school classrooms. A limited amount of current research has produced a list of quality indices that have been documented as essential to the success programs providing services to students with EBD in the general education setting. These quality indices are program variables determined by an extensive literature review and a group of experts in the field to be the elements essential and supportive to programmatic success not only with the students themselves, but also with the teachers with whom they have contact on a daily basis.

There is, however, a common agreement among professionals that students with disabilities deserve to be educated as much as possible with their same-aged
peers (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996). Guetzloe (1999) states that when including students in general education settings, it becomes essential that both general and special educators collaborate to develop the most effective policies, procedures, facilities, and service delivery options essential to the success of all children in the general education environment. Therefore, the consensus of teachers and researchers indicates that the inclusion of students with EBD must be carefully planned and individually determined (Heflin & Bullock, 1999).

It is evident that progress in the inclusion of students with EBD into general education setting lags behind the inclusion of students receiving special education services with other disability labels (Shapiro, Miller, Sawka, Gardill, & Handler, 1999). In order for students with EBD to be successful in the least restrictive environment, changes in the form of accommodations and modifications to curriculum, instructional methods, and teacher attitudes must be made in the general education classroom (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002; Gunter, Denny & Venn, 2000; Penno, Frank, & Wacker, 2000; Cheney & Muscott, 1996; Meadows, 1996). These changes will allow students with EBD to achieve the same results as students without disabilities in any educational setting.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation study was to determine from current research and experts in the field the quality indices essential to implementing successful programs for students with emotional and behavior disorders (EBD) in least
restrictive environment. It was also to determine the quality indices currently being used by each school district in the State of Michigan and how the use of these variables affect the placement of students with EBD in general education settings.

Research Questions

The research questions are three-fold (1) What are the essential and supportive quality indices currently essential to the success of programs in the general education setting for students with EBD? (2) Which quality indices have been implemented by the school districts in the State of Michigan? and (3) How is the use of quality indices related to the success districts report regarding progress made with students with EBD, and do districts place students with EBD in programs using the general education environment more if their use of the quality indices is greater?

In regards to the first research question, this researcher expects current literature to contain many researched-based variables proven to be beneficial to educational programs for students with EBD. The goal of this section of the project is to list all of these variables, and then using the Delphi Technique, develop a quality indice list of essential variables for success of programs for students with EBD.

This researcher’s hypothesis for research questions two and three is that a large number of school districts in the State of Michigan have not implemented many of the quality indices of successful programs into their service delivery models and, therefore, have many students with EBD placed in more restrictive programs and even receiving outside services. In addition, it is this researcher’s feeling that the
more quality indices implemented in a local school district, the higher percentage of
students with EBD will be placed successfully in less restrictive programs and the
greater amount of success district’s will report regarding progress made with students
with EBD.

Research Justification

The State of Michigan has recently revised the Michigan Special Education
Rules (www.mde.state.mi.us) to reflect the changes found in the reauthorized
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, P.L. 105-17 implemented in 1998.

In order for the State of Michigan to remain in compliance with the federal
law and continue to improve its services to all students, it is extremely important to
document the essential strategies, support systems, and quality indices currently being
used in each school district. Additionally, it is essential to determine baseline data
regarding current placements of students with EBD in mainstreamed and inclusive
general education settings before adopting a new rules package.

Two specific issues have surfaced in the State of Michigan concerning
students with Emotional Impairments (EI), which is the label used in Michigan to
categorize students with emotional and behavioral disorders (Michigan Department of
Education, 2002). One of these issues includes the placement of students with EI
while the other concerns the eligibility of students within the EI label. Both of these
issues surround the current placement and effectiveness of implemented programs
across the state. The number of local school districts searching for support has
increased dramatically as the number of hearings involving disputes between parents of students with EBD and local school districts has increased (Sharon LaPointe & Associates, 2002).

Between January 1, 1997 and August 1, 2002, there were 755 hearings requested to the state by either parents of students with special needs or local school districts (Michigan Department of Education, 2002). Of those 755 requests, 101 cases were actually heard by state hearing monitors. It was documented that 28 out of the 101 hearings regarded issues surrounding students with Emotional Impairments. More importantly to this research study, 15 of the 28 hearings held specifically addressed the issue of program placement regarding students with emotional impairments.

The Michigan Department of Education also documented that between January 1, 1999 and the present time, 1197 total complaints were lodged to the state department of education regarding special education in general. Of the 1197 total complaints, 147 surrounded the issue of eligibility of students to the label of EI while 80 out of the 1197 regarded program service type. It was demonstrated that 227 of 1197, approximately 20%, of the total number of complaints statewide concerned students with emotional and behavioral disorders.

The findings from this research study will assist in the identification of local school districts needing support in their attempts to provide programs for students with EBD that are in compliance with state and federal law. Additionally the outcomes of this study will provide local school districts with quality indices essential
to providing opportunities for students to reach their maximum potential and
demonstrate adequate yearly progress.

Definitions

In this dissertation study, the researcher will refer to students with emotional
and behavior disorders as students with EBD. In the State of Michigan, students with
EBD are labeled as EI or emotionally impaired. The researcher will use EBD due to
the use of this label in much of the literature as well as its use in Federal documents
and legislation. In addition, services on the continuum referred to throughout include,
inclusion, resource room, self-contained, and center-based. An inclusion program
refers to services delivered to students with EBD in the general education classroom
throughout the entire school day. Students receive both academic and social services
through a special education teacher who is working along side a general education
teacher in the general education setting. A resource room program refers to services
delivered to students with EBD in a mix of classes in the general education classroom
and support provided in a special education classroom. A self-contained program
refers to services delivered to students with EBD for the majority of the school day in
a separate classroom from the rest of their non-disabled peers. Finally, a center-based
program refers to services delivered to students with EBD in a separate facility away
from a student's neighborhood local public school building.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The integration of students with emotional and behavior disorders (EBD) into the general education environment remains one of the greatest challenges to both special and general educators (Shapiro et al., 1999; Landrum & Tankersley, 1999). In addition to reports showing the majority of students with EBD receive services in separate schools and classrooms (U.S. Department of Education, 2002), studies surveying general education teachers reveal the majority feel uneasy and unprepared to teach this population of students (Heflin & Bullock, 1999; Schumm & Vaughn, 1995). In fact, one researcher states students with EBD are unwanted in regular education programs, especially those students who demonstrate aggressive and defiant behaviors in the classroom (Guetzloe, 1999). Many schools in our country including the school districts in the State of Michigan are reaching a breaking point in dealing with their most disruptive students, just as experts in the field are recognizing how multifaceted and systematic in nature the problems that students with emotional and behavioral disorders face (Landrum & Tankersley, 1999).
Current Service Delivery

The 23rd Annual Report to Congress (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) reports students with emotional disturbances are more likely to receive services outside of the regular education setting, with most students receiving services in separate classrooms up to 60% of the day. On the whole, 47% of students with special needs are served outside of the regular education environment less than 21% of the day, but for student with EBD, only 25.5% of students receive services outside of the regular education setting for less than 21% of the day. In fact, 33.2% of students with EBD spend greater than 60% of their educational day in a separate educational setting. While overall progress continues to be made in educating students with disabilities in general education settings, students with EBD continue to receive the majority of their education in more restrictive environments.

Gunter, Coutinho, & Cade (2002) report current service delivery practices have left many students with EBD either mis- or underidentified, excluded from the general education setting, or producing at inadequate and unacceptable levels with regard to curriculum benchmarks. Hendrickson, Smith, & Frank (1998) report in their study which examined the decision making process of placing students with EBD that 55% of the students did not receive any supplementary aids and services to support their participation and success in less restrictive settings. They also report that given the variety of needs of students with EBD, many of their IEPs still did not provide for such complex needs.
The bottom line remains, the current system of delivery of services has failed to provide an education in the least restrictive settings for students with EBD (Cessna & Skiba, 1996). The services currently being offered in the general education environment are falling short of what is needed to provide opportunities for academic and social success for students with EBD (Gunter, Coutinho, & Cade, 2002), and there is little evidence that education as a whole is developing or creating the capacity to provide a better level of service to students with EBD (Landrum & Tangersley, 1999).

**IDEA '97 and Placement Decisions**

In direct contrast to current practices, federal law states the general education setting, which is the least restrictive environment (LRE), is the foundation of socialization and instruction for students with disabilities, including students with EBD (U.S. Department of Education, 2002; Gunter, Denny, & Venn, 2000). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) entitles all students with disabilities, including students with EBD to receive services in the most appropriate least restrictive environment (Cessna & Skiba, 1996). In fact, new regulations in IDEA '97 call for both general and special educators to be involved in the determination of appropriate accommodations and modifications for the intervention of academic and behavioral problems that hinder the ability of students with disabilities to learn (Hendrickson, Smith, & Frank, 1998).
Current Placement Decisions

Little evidence has been found in the research contradicting the report that placement and service delivery decisions are being made in today’s school systems based not on the law or student ability but on available programs (Downing, Simpson, & Myles, 1990; Muscott, Morgan, & Meadows, 1996). Glassberg (1994) report in a research study conducted on the determinants of placement outcomes of students with behavioral disorders that cognitive, academic, and behavioral factors did not appear to play a major role in placement decisions, however, race, age, socio-economic level, and available programming did. Hendrickson, Smith, & Frank (1998) state the content of curriculum and services has priority over the location when it came to placement and service delivery decisions. Recent examinations of service delivery practices with regards to students with EBD indicate the process and results of current interventions have been less than acceptable and that further improvement, innovation and growth is essential to our success (Dunlap & Childs, 1996).

Benefits of Integration

The need for growth and innovation toward an inclusionary service delivery model stems from many researched benefits for students with EBD. Including students with EBD in regular education settings has improved learning opportunities, developed appropriate social skills, improved attitudes of students both with and without disabilities, and developed positive relationships and friendships between peers (Lewis, Chard, & Scott, 1994; Cartledge & Johnson, 1996; Harvey, 1996).
Meadows, Neel, Scott, and Parker (1994) report students with EBD who spend at least part of a school day in the general education setting display higher academic skills, a better work ethic, receive higher grades, and exhibit less aggression and inappropriate behavior than students with EBD educated in self-contained settings. Janney, Snell, Beers, & Raynes (1995) report the benefits of integration far outweigh the costs. Their study cites improved functional skills, appropriate friendships, and a higher level of acceptance whereas students in self-contained settings displayed more aggressive and disruptive behavior.

**Barriers to Integration**

Although there are “pockets of excellence” (Guetzloe, 1999, p.93) in school districts across the country, the truth of the matter still remains that many school districts do not provide the services needed to be successful with students with EBD. History has shown resistance to requests for improvement and innovation that have come in the form of greater inclusive and systematic approaches to education (Dunlap & Childs, 1996).

Heflin & Bullock (1999) suggest the research on the inclusion of students with EBD has produced four common themes, (a) inclusion as a top-down mandate from administration, (b) emphasis in the classroom on social goals not academic goals, (c) resistance among both general and special education teachers, and (d) exclusion of students with EBD in the inclusion continuum. Long (1994) reports that general education teachers feel students with disabilities are being dumped into general
education settings with no support by administrators attempting to compensate for financial constraints. The lack of support from administration in addition to the fact that many teachers feel unprepared to make curricular and instructional decisions that may determine the success or failure of students in the classroom leads to the exclusion of students with EBD from the general education setting (Arllen, Gable, & Hendrickson, 1996; Heflin, Boreson, Grossman, Huette, & Ilgen, 1994).

**Quality Indices Essential for Program Success**

Although we know more about the characteristics of students with EBD now than ever before, for a variety of reasons, lack of research being one of them, educators do not always know what would be best for the success of these students in school (Guetzloe, 2001). However, there has been limited commentary concerning the essential variables school systems need in order to be more successful with this particular group of students. Providing successful and effective services to students in the general education setting requires teachers to develop a knowledge base, expertise, and experience in the development, implementation, and evaluation of intervention procedures known to be effective with students with EBD (Shapiro, Sawka, Gardill, & Handler, 1999; Guetzloe, 1999; Heflin & Bullock, 1999; Landrum & Tankersley, 1999).

In a national survey of school district administrators, Grosenich, George, George, and Lewis (1991) report a set of effective teaching practices including modeling, self-management skills, and a social skills curriculum were used for
success in classrooms in 80% of the districts sampled. Results from this survey suggest that a specific collection of skills and a body of knowledge are essential for general education teachers to possess if they are to be successful in working with this population. In 1991, Kauffman and Wong asked if generic teaching skills are enough to be effective with students with emotional and behavior disorders. Research has since answered their question with a resounding NO!

It becomes apparent from the literature that there is no one single variable that can be used for success with students with EBD (Simpson, 1999). Instead, the most effective programs for students with EBD are those that implement a variety of quality indices thus establishing a framework for the success. Throughout the literature, a group of specific variables are indicated for their success with students with EBD in the general education. These variables have become the quality indices used in this study as essential for success in providing services and implementing programs for students with EBD.

Quality Indices

Program Indices

**Inclusive School Philosophy**

Researchers report a school’s philosophy toward the integration of students with EBD may be one of the most important elements of successful inclusion (Rock, Rosenberg, & Carran, 1995). Rock et al (1995) reports that if a school as a whole is
not pointing the way toward integration, it will not happen. The philosophy of inclusion is an individual and shared commitment among teachers, staff, families, and community members toward an ownership of all students including those with disabilities, without disabilities, and those at-risk for school failure (Guetzloe, 1999).

A sense of shared ownership for all students between special and general educators requires the commitment of all staff (Lassman, Jolivette, & Wehby, 1999). The academic and social success of all students becomes the shared responsibility of all staff as each professional uses their expertise to meet the needs of all students in their classroom (Cessna & Skibba, 1996). The partnership created by sharing an inclusive vision supports not only all students, but also all school personnel in their attempts to grow and learn (Lassman, Jolivette, & Wehby, 1999).

Criteria for Placement

Taking into consideration the current service delivery practices and the negative attitudes of general education staff in regard to working with students with EBD, it becomes necessary for school districts to establish criteria for placement and fluidity between placements for these students (Lewis, Chard, & Scott, 1994). Rock et al (1995) reports many school districts do not have established criteria for placement or procedures for the integration process. By establishing criteria, districts will hold themselves accountable for appropriate placements and ease general educators' fears of placing students with no support. In addition, schools with no plans, policies, or
criteria are unlikely to include students with EBD into the regular education setting (Rock et al, 1995).

**Administrative Support**

Schools that are considered effective and progressive typically are lead by strong, visionary, instructional administrators. However, more often than not, administrators leave the leadership and sole responsibility of educating students with EBD to special educators (Cheney & Muscott, 1996). Administrative support including the facilitation of an inclusive school philosophy is essential to success (Rock et al, 1995). Successful inclusion of students with EBD depends on administrators who promote, facilitate, support and train their staff for the integration of all students into the general education setting (Gibb, Allred, Ingram, Young, & Egan, 1999).

One urban school in Minnesota indicates the only way they were able to successfully include all of their students with an EBD label was with the support of a principal who had many years of experience with students exhibiting emotional and behavioral disorders (Braaten & Quinn, 2000). The leader of this school has implemented the necessary program elements and facilitated the growth of teachers in order to make the program successful. Because administrators set the tone for the building, establishing a positive attitude toward the integration of all students by the administrator is imperative to success (Janney, Snell, Beers, & Reynes, 1995). Another message to administrators from teachers successfully delivering services in
inclusive schools is to make inclusive practices a priority, follow-up on it, and provide on-going support for all staff.

**Set Procedures**

Written policies and procedures created and reviewed by all staff are one of a number of specific techniques that contribute to the success of students with EBD in general education settings (Guetzloe, 1999). It is a critical responsibility of both general and special education staff to determine collectively the best policies and procedures that must be in place for each school district. This collaboration will ensure staff is aware of expectations, consequences, and support services when involved with the progress of students with EBD on a daily basis. It will also support the educational success of all students. Written, documented and user-friendly policies and procedures for including students with EBD had a positive impact on the rate of integration into the regular education setting (Rock et al, 1995).

**Multiple Placement Options**

Rock et al (1995) found in their study on the variables that affect the reintegration rate of students with EBD that programs with multiple integration options had a higher rate of successful integration. These options included full day, partial day, trial, and transitional programs. In order to improve successful school functioning for students with EBD, school districts need to provide and use many service options (Burns, Hoagwood, & Maultsby, 1998).
Just as regular education students do not come in nice neat packages, students with EBD have a variety of personality, academic, behavioral, and social styles. It should not be assumed that one program would be appropriate for all students with an EBD label (Kauffman, Lloyd, Baker, & Riedel, 1995). Rather, many types of interventions across educational settings are necessary in order to transfer, generalize, and maintain academic and behavioral skills. It is impractical to serve all students with EBD unless multiple placement options are available (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996).

**Parent Collaboration**

In addition to staff and interagency collaboration, collaboration between home and school is imperative for success with students with EBD (Meadows, 1996). The consistency that is established when all three groups of people collaborate to support a student is essential for improvement in academic and social behaviors. Parents must be recruited as partners in their child’s education as both education and community-based services attempt to move toward more family-centered service delivery (Cheney & Muscott, 1996). Providing education and support to parents as partners will support the students being integrated into regular education settings.

**Interagency Collaboration**

Students with EBD and their families often face a variety of challenges that require a multitude of services both educationally and from the community (Cheney...
& Muscott, 1996). Interagency links between school, family, and community-based agencies provide the foundation for effective provision of coordinated and shared services for the success of students with EBD in the classroom and in the community (Kauffman, Lloyd, Baker, & Riedel, 1995; Braaten & Quinn, 2000).

Traditional service delivery models place students with EBD in more restrictive environments as the variety of needs become greater (Cessna & Skibba, 1996). Recent developments in interagency collaboration suggest an alternative approach to restrictive placements may be possible. The wrap around model of service delivery otherwise known as needs-based approach puts an emphasis on interagency collaboration in order to increase services not increase restriction. Basing services on student need instead of current programming fundamentally changes where and how we serve students with EBD.

Flexible Academic Programs

In addition to the positive attitudes and willingness of general education teachers to include students with EBD in their classrooms, Cartledge & Johnson (1996) reports teachers who are able to be flexible in instruction and classroom programming are often more successful working with students with EBD. Examples of this flexibility include a variety of classroom activities, using a sense of humor, class discussions of relevant topics, offering choices, allowing students to make up missing work, and providing positive reinforcement to students who accomplish goals. It is also indicated that teachers who develop positive relationships with
students are able to actively engage students in the learning process in their classrooms.

General and Special Education Teacher Indices

Flexible Academic Instruction & Management

Hendrickson, Smith, & Frank (1998) report successful integration of students with EBD remains dependent on the extent to which an variety of effective classroom and instructional management skills are used by classroom teachers. In order to contradict the literature suggesting regular education teachers are not prepared to teach social skills nor manage behavior, Landrum & Tangersley (1999) propose strengthening the preparation of teachers to deal with intense classroom management. Instead of fixing students with EBD and sending them back into the regular education environment on their own, we must implement effective learning and behavioral strategies in classrooms that serve these students. These strategies include teaching specific social skills and providing long-term support services in the regular education setting.

Classroom management has been linked to student success in the classroom when it involves effective use of classroom rules, the arrangement of the classroom, teacher movement and mobility patterns, and use of positive reinforcement to promote appropriate academic and social behavior (Gunter, Coutinho, & Cade, 2002). Research indicates that effective classroom arrangements allow the teacher to move about the room more effectively thereby allowing a variety of classroom activities,
and promoting teacher and student interactions (Gunter, Shores, Jack, Rasmussen, & Flowers, 1995). The study also documents that when teachers are able to move around the room during instructional activities, there is an increase in student on-task behavior as well as a decrease in inappropriate academic and social behaviors.

**Consultant Support**

Surveys of general educators reveal they feel obtaining skills in professional development trainings is necessary but not enough. Teacher consultant support in addition to training is an essential element in the success of meetings the needs of students with EBD (Cheney & Barringer, 1995; Keenan, 1997; Heflin & Bullock, 1999; Shapiro, Miller, Sawka, Gardill, & Handler, 1999). The provision of on-going professional support and assistance from staff with expertise in the area of students with EBD to general education teachers and other school personnel is essential if integration is going to be successful (Martin & Wienke, 1998).

**Staff Collaboration**

Many teachers feel collaboration may be the hardest part of the integration process (Bassett et al, 1996). Teachers themselves have stated a need for increased staff collaboration (Summy, 1998). Although educators talk about the importance of collaborating with each other and staff from community agencies, reality indicates it often does not always happen (Guetzloe, 2001). Not only is collaboration essential as integration begins, Aiello & Bullock (1999) stress the importance of continued and
increased support as school districts become more inclusionary in their service delivery.

Time for collaboration and weekly planning during the school day was a reoccurring theme in the literature (Rock et al, 1995; Cheney & Muscott, 1996; Gibb, Allred, Ingram, Young, & Egan, 1999; Guetzloe, 1999). Literature on best practices indicates time needs to be set aside for general communication, reflection, and instruction and lesson planning. Teams need to be able to contact parents and agencies, create new strategies, and reflect on current instructional practices on a daily basis (Cheney & Muscott, 1996).

**Professional Development**

Martin & Wienke (1998) state the success of inclusive programming depends upon on-going professional development and consultant support in the classrooms themselves. They report that well prepared teachers are the keys for success when integrating students with EBD into regular education settings. Schumm & Vaughn (1995) suggest professional development programs must enable teachers to plan for and accommodate students with EBD within the framework of their planning for the whole class and for the success of all students.

**Trained and Prepared Staff**

In order to tackle the lack of training in special education, one of the biggest challenges currently facing general education teachers, preparing and training all staff
to work with students with EBD becomes a necessity (Bassett, Jackson, Ferrell, Luckner, Bunsen, & MacIssac, 1996; Cheney & Muscott, 1996; Gibb et al, 1999). A well-prepared teacher is one of the most important pieces to the success of students with EBD in the general education environment (Martin & Wienke, 1998).

Both general and special education teachers report in recent surveys that training in the inclusion philosophy and collaboration to be essential (Heflin & Bullock, 1999). In addition, general educators know training in modifying and adapting instruction is essential in order to appropriately include students with EBD. Bassett et al (1996) verifies this by stating that training in curricular adaptations, teaching strategies, and collaboration are topics of particular importance to the success of integrating students with EBD into the general education setting. However, a survey research study in the late 90's of both general and special education teachers involved in the reintegration of students identified as severely emotionally disturbed (SED), determined there is a moderate to extreme need for every kind of training and support system (Summy, 1998).

In a chapter on designing effective services for students with emotional problems, Guetzloe (1994) reports that in order to provide meaningful and purposeful inservice training administrators need to include a menu of offerings that address a variety of issues, provide on-going training options on the same topic, offer recurring teacher support groups, a professional library of books, journals, and instructional materials, and opportunities to attend local and national conferences and university
courses and workshops. When teachers receive a great amount of training, Rock et al (1995) finds these programs have a higher success rate of integration of students with EBD. Moreover, Martin & Wienke (1998) describe trained and prepared teachers as ready and willing to implement the essential elements necessary for better results for children and youth with EBD.

**Teacher Attitude and Willingness**

In a study designed to survey successful inclusion practices with students with EBD in Texas, Heflin & Bullock (1999) report that at every school, classes for inclusion have been chosen because of the general educator’s personality and willingness to participate. Although the success of integration does not rest solely on favorable teacher attitudes, interviews with 13-18 year old students with EBD report helpful teachers who establish personal relationships, are willing to talk about student problems, and teachers that show interest in student opinions, questions, and answers are the ones that are most successful (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996). Unhelpful, rigid teachers and those who insist on doing things their own way are the most disliked by the students.

In a research study on the relationship between teacher practices and the task-appropriate and social behavior of students with EBD, Beyda, Sentall, & Ferko (2002) found that a teacher’s negative style can contribute to a poor learning environment. For example, negative teacher responses to students’ academic and/or social behaviors can elicit disruptive and aggressive behavior from the students with
EBD. On the flip side of this finding, they also found significance in the fact that when teachers showed students positive attention and exhibited positive teacher practices, students exhibited task appropriate and socially appropriate behaviors in the classroom.

Soodak, Podell, & Lehman (1998) conducted a survey of general education teachers regarding predictors of teachers’ responses to inclusion. They report that general educators’ willingness to include students with disabilities in their classrooms is critical to the successful implementation of those programs. Maximizing positive teachers’ attitudes toward the students with EBD and their willingness to try new instructional methods in their classrooms are key factors in the success or failure of the integration of these students with the regular education setting (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996). Teachers who seem to be the most effective are those who demonstrate a belief that teaching can change any student, who have confidence in their own teaching abilities, and those who hold expectations high for all students (Landrum & Kauffman, 1992).

**Curricular and Instructional Accommodations**

Recent studies are showing that modifying curriculum and instruction supports success when used with students with EBD (Arlen, Gable, & Hendrickson, 1996; Gunter, Denny, & Venn, 2000). Curricular and instructional accommodations include size of assignments, time for assignment completion and mastery of content, level of in-class support, delivery of information, difficulty of projects, student
choice, alternative written and verbal response to instruction, degrees of participation, alternative curricular goals, and varying curriculums. Adaptations of the general education curriculum used to engage students with EBD in teacher instruction and curricular activities are critical to their success in the general education setting (Gibb et al, 1999).

Implementing of one or more instructional and curricular accommodations in the general education environment results in a significant increase in academic success and production (Penno, Frank, & Wacker, 2000). In addition, a reduction in behavior problems is evident in classes using instructional modifications. Making academic tasks less daunting and more manageable results in an increase in academic performance and a decrease in inappropriate behavior. Meadows, Neel, Scott, & Parker (1994) conclude that when 80% to 90% of teachers in a school use academic and instructional accommodations, included students with EBD outperform students with EBD placed in a self-contained setting. Dunlap, dePercezel, Clarke, Wilson, Wright, White, & Gomez (1994) report that even when the only accommodation offered is giving students a choice, this accommodation alone results in more on-task behavior and less disruptive behavior.

It seems that instructional and curricular accommodations are fundamental to the regular classroom instruction of students with special needs and disabilities (Arllel, Gable, & Hendrickson, 1996). The academic needs of students with EBD are directly interrelated to their social and emotional needs as shown by the current research (Meadows, 1996; Daniels, 1998).
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Teaching/Instructing Indices

Instructional Teaching Strategies

Approximately 50% of students with EBD fail one or more classes during a typical school year (Gunter & Denny, 1998). Students with EBD enter the general education classroom with many academic skill deficit areas and are in need of opportunities to experience success in the classroom. These opportunities are important to self-esteem and the generalization of skills for future successful academic performance and classroom behavior (Jolivette, Wehby, & Hirsch, 1999). The modeling and use of teaching strategies increase the opportunities of students with EBD to succeed in both the general education curriculum and classroom environment and provide support in the identified deficit skill areas. Additionally, teaching strategies have the ability to bring meaning and purpose to instruction by giving students the ability and information to respond correctly in curricular activities (Daniels, 1998; Gunter & Denny, 1998). The opportunity to perform academically on the same playing field as the other students in the class causes a decrease in the display of inappropriate behavior both academically and socially in the classroom.

Clarke, Dunlap, Foster-Johnson, Childs, Wilson, White, & Vera (1995) report that the use of teaching strategies such as student interest and hands on instructional activities result in a decrease in disruptive behavior and an increase in academic engagement. Jolivette, Wehby, & Hirsch (1999) also demonstrate an increase in
academic performance in mathematics when students with EBD use appropriate strategies in that content area.

**Differentiated and Individualized Instruction**

Current findings support the belief that classroom practices matter when it comes to successfully including students with EBD (Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998). Ineffective teaching skills are documented as one of the biggest barriers to the success of inclusionary service delivery (Cheney & Muscott, 1996). One of the classroom practices found to support the inclusion of students with EBD is differentiating instructional practices with learning strategies, lesson planning, and rate of academic progress (Gunter, Denny, & Venn, 2000). Differentiating instruction also allows educators the instructional flexibility to address the academic needs of a diverse group of learners while keeping the integrity of the curriculum benchmarks (Arllen, Gable, & Hendrickson, 1996; Cessna & Skibba, 1996).

Individualized instruction implemented with two boys identified as EBD resulted in an increase in on-task academic and social behavior on previous tasks that had been documented as disruptive and off-task (Lee, Sugai, & Horner, 1999). Based on their research findings, Bassett et al (1996) requested all educators accept differentiated outcomes for diverse learners who are involved in state mandated curriculum.
Social Skills Curriculum

Research in teaching social skills to students with EBD finds positive results (Lewis, Chard, & Scott, 1994; Guetzloe, 1999). Frequently students with EBD do not learn new positive social skills without the use of direct teaching techniques, therefore, social skills training programs are essential to the success of the integration process (Cheney & Muscott, 1996). Teaching positive social and interpersonal relationship skills along with rules, procedures, and consequences within the context of the general education classroom provides students with EBD the opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with others (Cessna & Skiba, 1996).

In order to support the risk of failure in the general education setting due to inappropriate social behavior, there is a need to develop communication skills as well as peer acceptance skills such as greeting others, sharing, cooperating, negotiating and play skills (Cartledge, & Johnson, 1996). Providing social skills training for students with EBD in the general education settings allows them to generalize new skills into real-life settings. It also allows teachers to model effective and appropriate ways to manage behavior. Failure to teach these social skills delays the social development of all students and results in academic and social difficulties leading to exclusion in and out of school for students with EBD.

Peer-Tutoring

Peer-tutoring is advocated as a method for delivering instruction and successful integrating students with EBD (Meadows, Neel, Scott, & Parker, 1994;
Shapiro, Miller, Sawka, Gardill, & Handler, 1999). Peer-tutoring and other peer-based strategies are documented to support positive peer interactions as well as academic achievement (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996). There is also evidence of improvements in attitudes, self-concept, and social skills. In one survey of teachers, teachers report that peer-tutoring is an effective strategy for the success of students with EBD in the general education setting almost 100% of the time (Shapiro et al, 1999).

**Self-Management**

Recently in the literature, self-management or self-determination interventions are linked to successful outcomes for students with EBD in general education settings (Meadows, Neel, Scott, & Parker, 1994; Keefe & Hoge, 1996; Daniels, 1998). In a survey of 25 school districts, teams of teachers report that in 69.7% of the cases, self-management is an effective strategy for facilitating the inclusion of students with EBD in the general education settings (Shapiro et al, 1999). This strategy has become the technique most widely used in these specific school districts. The survey indicates this procedure is effective because students are able to take ownership of the academic or behavior situation. It provides a way for the student to monitor and manage their own behavior in addition to having some control over consequences and rewards. Self-management techniques are shown to be effective in increasing academic productivity and encouraging behavior change (Daniels, 1998). When students with EBD become comfortable with self-management techniques, teachers...
become free for other tasks such as instruction while students become responsible for their own behaviors.

**Behavioral Strategies**

Behavioral strategies may include anything from classroom management procedures to individual behavior plans. Teachers need strategies for immediate use when students exhibit inappropriate social and academic behavior in order to promote a successful learning environment for all students (Cheney & Muscott, 1996). One behavioral strategy proven to be extremely successful with students with EBD includes building positive teacher-student relationships in the classroom (Lassman, Jolivette, & Wehby, 1999). Positive teacher-student relationships have the potential to contribute to the effectiveness of instruction and appropriate academic and social behavior in the general education environment for students with EBD. Another behavioral strategy is individual behavior plans written by both the teachers and the student (Meadows, 1996). These plans can also be called collaborative behavior contracts or CBCs (Lassman, Jolivette, & Wehby, 1999). CBCs have been shown to provide an opportunity to build teacher-student relationships as well as promote self-management and social skills in the classroom. These plans provide students with EBD choices and stated consequences so as to increase the control the students feels in classroom situations.

Teachers who are able to use behavior strategies in their classroom will establish a successful learning environment for all students (Daniels, 1998).
classroom containing clear and concise classroom rules and procedures, defined academic expectations, and clarified student and teacher responsibilities will see a reduction in the amount of disruptive behavior and an increase in time for instruction.

Training in these specific behavioral strategies reduce the fears and increase the comfort of general education teachers who include students with EBD in their classrooms (Shapiro et al, 1999). Verbal de-escalation strategies as well as pinpointing resources in the school building also help general education teachers feel comfortable bringing students with EBD into their classroom environments (Cheney & Muscott, 1996).

Although consultant support can mean many things, Shapiro et al (1999) demonstrate the importance of consultation services as a staff development strategy in their three-year project facilitating staff development in the inclusion of students with EBD into the general education environment. With consultant support, teams involved in the inclusion study implement effective in class strategies such as self-management techniques, problem solving processes, peer-tutoring, and cooperative learning groups which impact the success of the included students in the general education setting.

Undeniably consultation support, in addition to training opportunities, is an essential element in successfully meeting the needs of general education teachers and for enhancing the effectiveness of these teachers in inclusive classrooms (Shumnn & Vaughn, 1995). Gibb et al (1999) reported in their study on inclusion in a middle school setting that the consultants served as a liaison between the students with EBD
and the general education teachers. Both the students and the teachers attributed the success of the program to having the consultants in the classroom and available when needed. Teachers need support within their classroom and instructional environment in providing appropriate structure and curriculum for both students with learning problems and EBD. Consultation support should be sensitive to the needs of individual teachers and the specific issues they face in their respective classrooms.

Delphi Design

Background of the Technique

The Delphi technique is a process originally developed in the 1950's by the RAND Corporation for obtaining greater consensus among experts about critical defense situations without having to have face-to-face meetings (Moore, 1987; Uhl, 1983). While face-to-face meetings can be feasible in some circumstances, at times, they are too time consuming and too expensive. In addition, one party can end up monopolizing communication and/or biased decisions are reached due to group pressure. The technique becomes very useful when it is important to have unbiased pooled findings or to provide results that are consistent with what the majority thinks (Spencer-Cooke, 1989; Moore, 1987). Finally, the Delphi technique, which is very honest, respected, and trusted, makes research data more reliable than the use of some other techniques (Tiedemann, 1986).

The Delphi technique is described as a technique that effectively creates a communication process that allows a group of people to tackle a complex issue
(Cookson, 1986). The technique uses a series of questionnaires allowing groups of experts to make statements, comments, and provide discussion regarding their expertise in a particular area. The purpose of the process is to combine individual contributions into group consensus on policy, procedures, or future actions (Moore, 1987; Uhl, 1986).

Types of Delphi

There are three types of Delphi, conventional, real-time, and policy (Moore, 1987). In a conventional Delphi, a small team designs a questionnaire that is sent to a larger respondent group. After the results are summarized and returned to the small team, a new questionnaire is created and given to the larger respondent group for review. A real-time Delphi is different from the conventional Delphi because instead of taking weeks to carry out the process, it takes place during the course of a meeting or conference. The driving objective of the policy Delphi is to generate consensus on any particular option being discussed. In order to create consensus, groups must make sure they ensuring that all possible options have been considered, estimating the consequences of all options, and examining the acceptability of all options. In all types of Delphi, the questionnaire becomes the critical tool.

Uses of Delphi

There are a variety of ways the Delphi technique can be used (Uhl, 1986). One area is cost-effectiveness. The Delphi has been used to determine budgetary issues.
and curriculum planning. Institutions have used the Delphi technique to support curriculum planning and revision processes for a number of years. A third area is forecasting the future. The Delphi technique can be used to obtain group opinion regarding events to occur in the future. Finally, the fourth area and the area in which the Delphi technique was used in this research study is rating scales. The Delphi techniques is a process by which an individual or group can obtain agreement on an issue with the use of a rating scale.

**Delphi Procedures**

The Delphi technique is implemented by following a general pattern, however, the procedure may vary to meet the objectives of a particular group or situation (Cookson, 1986). The basic steps for conducting a typical Delphi include, identifying a subject or topic area, investigating of the topic area, selecting the group of experts, drafting the questionnaire, distributing the questionnaire to the experts, analysis of the first-round responses, drafting of the second-round questionnaire, distributing the questionnaire to the experts analysis of the second-round questionnaire, and continuing the rounds as necessary to achieve stability of expert responses. In some situations, as many as five or six rounds are conducted in the Delphi technique, however, three rounds is standard procedure.
Advantages of Delphi

There are many advantages of using the Delphi process (Tiedemann, 1986; Spencer-Cooke, 1989). One of the most important advantages is the reduction of bias, which may result from individual opinion, or understanding of a specific issue. The use of Delphi increases the validity and credibility of a product. Another advantage is the discussion of issues minus the influence or domination of individual personalities in face-to-face meetings. It also creates group consensus and clarification of the problem solving process in order to provide valid judgments for other professionals. In fact, some experts report the collection of more thought provoking data as a result of their participation in the Delphi process.

Limitations

Although there are advantages to the Delphi techniques, there are also certain limitations (Tiedemann, 1986; Moore, 1987). The Delphi process takes time. It is estimated that the shortest amount of time needed to complete a Delphi process is 45 days. Another variable is the group or individual monitoring for implementation. Analysis of the responses from each of the experts is not free from the bias of the group or individual conducting the process. Another limitation is the lack of inspiration created by face-to-face communication that is eliminated by the design of the process.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This dissertation study combined two research methods, the Delphi Technique (Moore, 1987; Uhl, 1983) and a descriptive, cross-sectional survey research method (Fink, 1995) to answer the three initial research questions. The Delphi Technique created the research based quality indice list of essential variables for successful programs for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. This quality indice list was then employed in the development of the survey instrument used in this study.

Cross-sectional survey research methodology was used to collect data from public school districts across the State of Michigan regarding the use of the quality indices and placements of students with emotional and behavior disorders (EBD) in current programs implemented in their districts. In this chapter, the researcher will describe how the Delphi Technique was used for this specific research project, the procedures used for conducting the survey, the data collection methods, and the rationale behind the analysis process.
Delphi Technique

After a complete review of the literature on the essential variables required to support the success of students with EBD in local public school programs, the researcher compiled a list of comprehensive variables. Variables appearing on the original comprehensive list were determined by emerging as essential for success four or more times in the literature review. The researcher then grouped the variables into four separate categories by looking for themes within the comprehensive list. These categories included; (1) Program Variables, (2) General Education Teacher Variables, (3) Special Education Teacher Variables, and (4) Teaching/Instructing Variables (See Appendix A for complete list of variables listed by bibliographic reference).

The Delphi Technique (Moore, 1987; Uhl, 1983) was used to put together a group of experts with the sole purpose of analyzing, refining, and weighting the comprehensive variable list. At the end of the process, the group then was charged with selecting the final list of 30 variables regarded essential to the success of students with EBD. The final list is entitled the Quality Indices for Inclusive Success for Students with Emotional and Behavior Disorders (See Figure 1).

A group of four experts on students with EBD was selected based on their expertise and experience working with students with EBD to review the list of comprehensive variables. One expert is a national Council for Exceptional Children “Teacher of the Year” selected on her work in programs for students with EBD. The other three members of the expert group were selected based on the research completed on students with EBD. One member currently facilitates a federally funded
grant program to develop effective programs for students with EBD in Washington State. Another member's expertise lies in developing effective secondary inclusive programs for students with EBD. She also is the director of a federally funded grant program preparing general education teachers to work with students with EBD. The last member of the expert group conducted her dissertation study on the integration of students with EBD back into the public school setting.

The list of variables was transformed into a rating scale for the experts to rate the importance of each individual variable in each group for success with 1 being most important and so on (See Appendix B for all 3 rating scales used in the Delphi Technique). The rating scale was distributed to the experts and received back to the researcher within two weeks. The experts were also allowed to propose additional variables they personally regarded as critical to the success of programs serving students with EBD.

Analysis of the results and discussion collected from the experts caused the researcher to reformat the rating scale to collect information using a Likert Scale of importance instead of a numerical rating scale (See Appendix B). The variables proposed by the experts in the first round were added to the reformatted quality indice list. The second round questionnaire was created to discuss the importance of the researched based variables including the variables identified by the experts in their responses to the first round. The list was re-distributed to the experts and feedback was collected within another two to three week period.
The second round analysis of responses by the experts on the Likert Scale of importance produced a definite list of essential variables needed by programs to support success for students with EBD. It is interesting to note that the variables suggested by the group of experts during the first round were defeated by the rest of the group in the second round and therefore removed from the final list.

The final list was then distributed to the experts in a third round questionnaire. Consensus on the list was achieved based on the final feedback from the group of experts (See Figure 1 for the complete quality indice list). The entire Delphi Technique process and development of the final quality indice list was completed in a two-month time period.

Figure 1

Quality Indices for Inclusive Success for Students with EBD

Program Indices

1. Criteria for Placement
2. School-Wide Inclusion School Philosophy
3. Set Procedures
4. Multiple Placement Options
5. Administrative Support
6. Interagency Collaboration
7. Parent Collaboration
8. Flexible Academic Programs

General Education Teacher Indices

9. Trained and Prepared Staff
10. Positive Willing Attitudes
11. Continued Education and Professional Development
12. Flexible Academic Instruction
Figure 1 continued

13. High Teacher Expectations
14. Staff Collaboration

Special Education Teacher Indices

15. Consultant Support
16. Flexible Classroom Programs
17. Staff Collaboration
18. Curricular Accommodations
19. High Teacher Expectations

Teaching/Instructioning Indices

20. Use of Self-Management/Self-Determination Techniques
21. Use of Peer-tutoring
22. Use of Behavioral Strategies
23. Use of Social Skills Curriculum
24. Use of Instructional Teaching Strategies
25. Use of Differentiated/Individualized Instruction

Quality Indices Survey

The Quality Indices Survey (See Appendix C) is comprised of four sections. The first section is a number of questions regarding demographic information including specific job title of participant, school district name, and description of district size. The researcher chose to begin the survey with demographic information in order to assist in the statistical analysis of the data portion of the survey. The second section of the survey requests information concerning implementation of current programs and services. Additionally, it asks for percentages of students with EBD in current program placements within the school district. The third section uses the Quality Indices for Inclusive Success for Students with EBD to document the use
and the importance of the quality indices within programs and services provided to students with EBD. In a dual Likert Scale model, the participants are asked to rate their district’s level of use and the level of importance to the district of each quality indice. Although the level of importance information does not directly answer the research questions in this study, this portion of survey was designed to collect information to be used in additional research opportunities.

The fourth and final section of the survey is a narrative section asking participants to write a few thoughts down regarding the district’s philosophy on their programs and placements of students with EBD, barriers to integrating students with EBD in regular education settings, and their perception of the elements of service the district does well, and the elements the district would like to improve. The literature suggests the use of narrative questions be included when looking deeper into the reasons why the districts documented the answers they did on the quantitative portion of the survey (Borg & Gall, 1983). Although the narrative portion of the survey will not be used in the results section of this dissertation study, the responses given by districts will be used in further studies on this same topic and also used by the State of Michigan’s Department of Education in their compliance program.

After the survey instrument was developed by the researcher, directors and supervisors of special education programs in the school districts surrounding Western Michigan University were asked to pilot the survey. During a two-week time period, this group of administrators tested the survey by completing it online with information from their specific programs. Although the group was satisfied with the
content and format of the survey, they provided feedback concerning the directions and instructions used to assist the participants in completion of the document. This feedback was incorporated into the final edition of the survey and used to collect the data used in this project.

Recruitment, Selection, and Setting

One special education administrator from each local education agency (LEA) in the State of Michigan was asked to participate in this survey study. Michigan has 538 local school districts, therefore, 538 administrators were asked to participate thus representing the entire population in the study. It was decided to include every public school district in the state of Michigan for a number of reasons. It was deemed to be cost effective to include all the districts in the state, it was beneficial to the State Department of Education for their record keeping, and it maximized the response rate for the researcher to provide significant statistical analysis of a large enough sample of the population.

Requirements of participation included current administration duties in a LEA and knowledge of special education programming in the district in which they work. Consent to participate in the study was given by each participant by completing the survey and returning it to the researcher. A participant could choose to withdraw their consent at any time during the research process by notifying the researcher and/or her doctoral committee chairperson. Participants, who chose not to participate, did so by not returning their survey to the researcher.
When the survey instrument was completed, the researcher applied to the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) at Western Michigan University for permission to conduct the study (See Appendix D for the complete HSIRB application & letter of acceptance). The HSIRB reviewed the application and determined that approval was not required to conduct the project because the data collected, although reported by individuals, was about school districts not individuals. Participation in this study was complete when the participants returned the completed survey to the researchers either via the Internet or via the postal system being used during the study.

Participants

Special education administrators in 538 local school districts in the State of Michigan were identified to participate in this study. An email address list was obtained from the Michigan State Department of Education. This list provided the email addresses of one administrator from each of the local school districts that held the duties of special education programming and placement decisions as well as personnel development.

Internal and External Validity

This research study is cross-sectional survey design, therefore, it provides a baseline of information and a description of the participants as representatives of their school district's programs at only one point in time (Fink, 1995). In order to assure
internal validity, the researchers made sure to invite an administrator from each and every local school district in the State of Michigan to participate. In doing so, every eligible district had an equal chance to be included and represented in research data. Another internal risk to cross-sectional survey design is attrition. The researchers designed the survey questions with the time and convenience of the participants in mind.

External validity becomes a risk in survey research because of the external environments in which participants find themselves (Fink, 1995). In order to control as many of the variables as possible, the researchers will extend the same invitation to participate to a complete representation of the sample population at the same time. Because the researchers are surveying a representative sample, the findings will be applicable to the population and will indeed provide relevant data regarding the programs currently serving students with EBD in each public school district within the State of Michigan.

Data Collection Procedures

Data was collected using mail survey research methods (Borg & Gall, 1983). Borg & Gall suggest a three-step procedure for obtaining a high return rate when conducting a survey research study; (1) mail out the original survey, (2) follow up with a second survey mailing two weeks later to participants who have not yet responded, and (3) send a reminder postcard to remaining non-respondents requesting completion of the survey after another two-week time period. Although additional
steps may need to be taken, following this three-step process assists a researcher in obtaining a high response rate creating a stronger claim in the generalization of results.

This researcher elected to send out an electronic Internet mailing of the survey instrument for the first mailing of the study. A website was created using SurveySuite (University of Virginia, 2002) for this research study, and the Quality Indices Survey was uploaded on the website for completion by the participants. An email address was also created so that participants could send questions and concerns immediately to the researcher. Emails were sent out to all administrators requesting participation in the study (See Appendix E for all three survey cover letters). A link was provided on the email announcement to the survey website for their convenience. Participants were able to send results directly to the database using a link at the bottom of the survey website page. The researcher sent out a follow-up email reminder one week after the original sending date.

Electronically, the researcher was able to collect 15.4% (See Table 1 for return rates) of the surveys sent. This was not nearly the return rate desired. The second mailing following up the electronic mailing was conducted with a hard copy of the survey through the U.S. mail. The survey was sent to administrators from districts that did not respond electronically. Non-respondents were mailed a cover letter inviting participation in the study, the survey instrument, and instructions on completion and return. According to Borg & Gall (1983), mailed questionnaires deserve this specific attention in order to assure completion in the way designed by
the researchers. The follow-up mailing produced a total return rate of 37% for the study.

Two weeks following the second mailing of the survey, a third mailing was conducted with the purpose of obtaining a minimum return rate of 40%. The researcher used the Michigan Intermediate School District mailing system (REMC) in order to complete the third mailing. Once again, a cover letter explaining the procedure was sent in addition to a hard copy of the survey to administrators in districts who had not responded electronically or by U.S. mail. They were urged to complete the survey and send the results back to the researcher through REMC free of charge for local public school districts.

The third mailing of the survey produced a 40.7% return rate. A total of 216 out of 538 public school districts in the State of Michigan returned surveys to the researcher. Participants used a three-week time period to return results using this mailing system. The data collection portion of this dissertation study was conducted in a little less than three months. The researcher began the second week of September, 2002 with the Internet mailing and concluded the REMC mailing the first week of December, 2002. The week of the Thanksgiving Holiday is not counted in this time period.
Table 1

Return Rates for Each Survey Mailing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internet Mailing</th>
<th>U.S. Postal Mailing</th>
<th>REMC Mailing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return Rate</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from mailed surveys were immediately collected manually on the survey website databank. The hard copies of the surveys were kept in the office of the principal researcher. When the survey portion of the study was complete, the website and return email address were deleted. Online results were erased, however, the databank created by the website was saved on the computer of the principal researcher. The surveys and the databank remain in the office of the principal researcher.

Management of the Data

The researcher began the data analysis process by cleaning up the data in the databank created by SurveySuite (University of Virginia, 2002). A category of "other" was added to many of the questions in the survey in order to allow districts who did not feel they fit into one of the 5 categories provided a way to respond to the question. The narrative responses indicated in the "other" category were fit into a response on the Likert Scale by the researcher. A complete narrative of the rationale, justification, and decision-making process used to complete the clean up of the data.
can be found in Appendix F. The data was now useful for the statistical analysis portion of the study.

**Analysis of the Data**

Using the data produced by the Quality Indices Survey, the researcher used the SPSS data analysis program to conduct a frequency and descriptive statistical analysis to describe and summarize the nominal data set. Because the data was not collected from a sample population but from the whole population of local public school districts in the State of Michigan, the decision was made to stick to descriptive statistics and measures of frequency. The purpose of these analyses is to produce findings describing occurrence, regularity and relationships between responses among the entire population.

New variables were created to combine responses into greater quantities for greater statistical power. A variable category was set up to indicate use each of the four quality indice categories which include, program indices, general education teacher quality indices, special education teacher quality indices, and teaching/instructional quality indices. A total quality indice variable representing a total use response rate was also set up in order to cross tab with placement responses.

Cross-tabulation analyses were conducting with the location variable, and available program variables and the use of quality indices variables. These analyses were used to answer the second research question regarding the use of the quality indices and the current placements of students with EBD in the general education
setting of local public school districts. In addition, cross-tabulation analyses were conducted on program placement and the total quality indice variable from the survey in order to consider the relationship between placement of students with EBD and use of all of the quality indices within established programs across the state. Finally, the researcher conducted cross tabulation analyses using the quality indice categories, total quality indice variable and districts’ feelings of success variable in order to investigate the relationship between the use of the quality indices and the feelings of success districts felt regarding progress made with students with EBD.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The statistical analyses conducted on the data created by the survey produced results and findings for each of the three research questions posed at the beginning of the study. These results will be presented to the reader by research question. Each section will contain an introduction to the question, the statistical analyses conducted, and a summary of results and findings pertaining to the research question. Participants also provided demographic and location information to the researchers. This data was used to gain information regarding the participating districts, and to gather more details about the types of data collected. Demographic and location data is also presented to help the reader understand the participants of the study.

Demographic Information

Frequency and descriptive statistics were performed on the data collected by the Quality Indices Survey (See Appendix C). Out of a total population of 538 public school districts in the State of Michigan, 216, or 40.7% responded to the Quality Indices Survey. Although the researcher included the entire population in the study, a
40.7% return rate was acceptable for strength of the research (Borg & Gall, 1983). The participating districts are also considered to be reflective of the larger population of districts in the State of Michigan. Twenty-one or 9.7% of the respondents were from urban districts, seventy-two or 33.3% were from suburban districts, and one hundred twenty-three or 56.9% were from rural districts. The researcher used district location information in order to sort data used to answer the three research questions.

The Quality Indices Survey was sent to special education administrators in each local district in the State of Michigan. Some rural districts did not have a separate special education administrator so the superintendent or a building principal responded because their job title was that of local district special education contact person. It needs to be noted that in some cases, special education teachers and teacher consultants did respond to the survey due to requests made by district special education administrators (See Table 2 for complete list of respondents).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Special Ed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Ed</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Supervisor</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Consultant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Teacher</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Essential Quality Indices for Successful Programming

The first research question, which inquired about the essential and supportive quality indices essential to the success of programs for students with emotional and behavior disorders (EBD) in the general education setting, obtained its results from the extensive literature review and Delphi Technique described in Chapter 3 (See Appendix B for quality indice rating scales produced from the Delphi process). This was an examination of the research-based variables proven to be essential to educational programs for students with EBD. The variables were grouped into four categories and were developed into the Quality Indices for Inclusive Success for Students with EBD (See Figure 2). The indice list is a finding that directly addresses the first research question of this study by clearly stating the program and professional elements essential for implementing effective and successful programs for students with EBD in general education settings within local public school districts.
Figure 2

Quality Indices for Inclusive Success for Students with EBD

Program Indices

1. Criteria for Placement and Movement
2. Inclusion School Philosophy
3. Set Procedures
4. Multiple Placement Options
5. Administrative Support
6. Interagency Collaboration
7. Parent Collaboration
8. Flexible Academic Programs

General Education Teacher Indices

9. Trained and Prepared Staff
10. Positive Willing Attitudes
11. Continued Education and Professional Development
12. Flexible Academic Instruction
13. High Teacher Expectations
14. Staff Collaboration

Special Education Teacher Indices

15. Consultant Support
16. Flexible Classroom Programs
17. Staff Collaboration
18. Curricular Accommodations
19. High Teacher Expectations

Teaching/Instructing Indices

20. Use of Self-Management/Self-Determination Techniques
21. Use of Peer-tutoring
22. Use of Behavioral Strategies
23. Use of Social Skills Curriculum
24. Use of Instructional Teaching Strategies
25. Use of Differentiated/Individualized Instruction
Availability of EBD Services

Using a response scale of 'agree', 'somewhat', and 'disagree', districts were asked to report the availability of services within the continuum for students with EBD in their district. The resource room was the most available service reported by participating districts with 86.1% reporting availability. Inclusion was the second most available services with 70.4% of districts reporting availability. The resource room and inclusion programs both use the general education setting for service delivery during the school day. On the other side of the continuum, self-contained and center-based services were reported by approximately 60% of the respondents of the survey. A complete frequency breakdown of the specific services available within the continuum of services in the State of Michigan is presented in Figure 3.

Figure 3

Frequency of Services Available to Students with EBD in the State of Michigan
In addition, a cross-tabs analysis of the location (urban, suburban, and rural) of participating districts with the availability of the continuum of services within the districts was conducted. The frequency analysis for services within all three locations is presented in Figure 4.

A summary of the results found 81% of urban districts implemented a continuum of services for students with EBD, while 69.4% of suburban districts and 45.5% of rural districts reported the availability of a continuum. Figure 4 indicates that although rural districts reported a decline in district responses to the availability of a continuum of services, urban and suburban districts reported either they had the
services (80% and 70% respectively) available or they did not have the services (12%).

Placements in Service Delivery Options

In addition to reporting what types of services are available within the districts, the participants were asked to report the percentage of their population of students with EBD that were placed in each of the service delivery options including; full inclusion, resource room, self-contained, and center-based. There was also a category of 'not available' in order to allow districts to report service options not currently implemented or not available. The complete result of the frequency analysis is presented in Table 5 (See Appendix G for a bar chart of each service delivery option with the percentage of placements for students with EBD in the State of Michigan).
Results indicate that placements in inclusion ranged from 10% to 35%. There was a small spike in the numbers of students placed at either end of the placement scale with 21.5% of districts reportedly placing students with EBD in inclusion 70%-100% of the time and 36.6% of districts reportedly placing their population of students with EBD in inclusion 10%-20% of the time. In the ranges between the two extremes, districts placed 13.8% and 11.1% of students with EBD into inclusion services.
Resource Room

The resource room was the service most used by participating districts with 28.3% placing students with EBD in the resource room 70% of the time or more, and another 28.9% of districts placing students with EBD in the resource room 50% to 60% of the time. In fact, 5.6% of districts placed students with EBD in the resource room 100% of the time. The placements in the resource room then decreased with approximately 18% of districts placing students with EBD 30%-40% of the time and only 15% of districts placing students with EBD 10%-20% of the time.

Self-Contained

Placements in self-contained services remained low with districts only averaging about 12% for placement rates above 30%. The numbers then spike at the end of the placement scale with 38% of school districts reporting they placed students with EBD placed in self-contained programs approximately 10%-20% of the time. Another 25% of districts report self-contained classroom services for students with EBD were not available.

Center-Based

The center-based program was the service most likely unavailable in districts with 32.4% of participating districts reporting no center-based program available for use. In addition, another 56% of districts placed their population of students with EBD in center-based programs only 10%-20% of the time. Districts report 2%-5% of
students with EBD were placed in center-based programs between 30%-100% of the
time.

In summary, school districts placed higher percentages of students with EBD in
inclusion and resource room services at a much greater placement rate (30% or
greater). In contrast, districts placed larger numbers of students with EBD in center-
based and self-contained services a lower percentage of the time or report those
services are not available. Results indicate districts not only are placing more students
in inclusive and resource services, but also have the capacity to do so more often.

District Success vs Frustration with Progress

Districts were also asked to report the amount of success they have had with
regard to progress made with students with EBD and the amount of frustration they
have had with regard to lack of progress made with students with EBD. Figure 6
presents the frequency analysis of district success with students with EBD while
Figure 7 presents frequency analysis of district frustration. Results reported in Table 6
indicate 44.9% of participating districts agreed they had success with the progress
made with students with EBD in their district, while results of Table 7 indicate 22.7%
of districts reported frustration with the lack of progress made with students with
EBD in their districts.

In regard to both district success and district frustration, the response of
'somewhat' represented a significant number of responses with 38.0% of districts
reporting being somewhat successful with progress made and 36.6% of districts
reporting being somewhat frustrated with lack of progress. Additionally, only 12% of districts disagreed they were successful with students with EBD while 38.9% of districts disagreed they were frustrated with progress. In summary, the results of both Tables 6 and 7 indicate the percentage of districts reporting success and reporting disagreeing with frustration counter balance each other. The fact that some districts reported both success and frustration with progress made with students with EBD raises some concerns to the researcher. These concerns will be addressed in the next chapter.

Figure 6

District Success with Progress Relating to Students with EBD
Figure 7

District Frustration with Progress Relating to Students with EBD

A frequency cross-tabulation analysis was also conducted with the survey questions of district success and frustration with progress regarding students with EBD and the availability of the specific services on the continuum. The result of that analysis is presented in Figure 8. Results indicate approximately 40% of districts who reported that using resource room and inclusion services agreed they were successful with students with EBD. Approximately 30% of districts who reported using self-contained and center-based services agreed they were successful with students with EBD. In contrast, although districts reported the least amount of frustration with regard to the inclusion service option (only 10%), all of the service options had reported frustration between 10% and 18%. (See Appendix H for Bar Graphs Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.)
presenting results of individual service options and district success versus frustration with students with EBD).

Figure 8

Success vs Frustration and the Availability of Specific Services

The Use of Quality Indices

The second research question inquires about the use of quality indices in public school districts in the State of Michigan. Participating districts were asked to report their use of each of the quality indices on a nominal scale including the responses of (a) used, (b) implementation in progress, (c) not used, and (d) not available. A frequency analysis was conducted on each of the twenty-five quality indices. Table 3 presents the results of the frequency analysis for each of the quality
indices in rank order within each indice category. A frequency analysis was also conducted on each of the four categories of quality indices, (1) program indices, (2) general education teacher indices, (3) special education teacher indices, and (4) teaching/instructing indices (See Appendix I for bar charts presenting the frequency analysis of the use of each of the four quality indice categories).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Indices Used</th>
<th>Implementation Not Used</th>
<th>Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Indices</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Implementation In Progress</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Collaboration</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Placement</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Academic Programs</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Procedures</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Placement Options</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Collaboration</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Philosophy</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Education Teacher Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Teacher Indices</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Implementation In Progress</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed. Staff Collaboration</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Gen Ed Expectations</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Academic Instruction</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Willing Attitudes</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained &amp; Prepared Staff</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Indices</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Implementation In Progress</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Teacher Indices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sped Staff Collaboration</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sped Expectations</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Accommodations</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Classroom Programs</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Support</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching/Instructing Indices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Behavioral Strategies</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Instructional Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Self-Management</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Peer-Tutoring</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Social Skills Curriculum</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 3 indicates, districts reported much higher percentages for the 'used' response for each indice than any other response category. In the program indice category at least 80% of districts reported using parent collaboration, administrative support, and a criteria for placement, however, in the same program indice category only 52.8% of districts reported using the indice of school-wide inclusion philosophy. School-wide inclusion philosophy along with use of social skills were the two indices districts reported the lowest use percentages (52.8% and 69.4% respectfully).
Districts reported the highest 'implementation in progress' percentages with regard to indices in the general education teacher indice category. Between 17%-26% of participating districts reported these indices to be 'in progress'. This is higher than the 'implementation in progress' response percentages in the other three indice groups which hovered around a 10% 'implementation in progress' rate. The overall 'used' response percentages, however, were lower than the other three indice groups.

Districts reported the highest 'used' response percentages in the special education teacher indice category. Between 70.4% and 83.3% of participating districts reported using the indices in this category. The indice of consultant support received a 70.4% response rate, while the indice of special education staff collaboration received an 83.3% response rate. In addition, districts reported the lowest percentages of 'not used' response percentages in the special education teacher indice category. Only 1.9% of districts reported not using the indice of special education collaboration, while only 8.8% of districts reported not using both the indices of consultant support and flexible classroom programs.

Districts reported the greatest amount of variety in response percentages in the teaching/instructing indice category. Use of behavioral strategies received a strong 81.9% use rate while only 52.8% of districts reported using a social skills curriculum with students with EBD. Additionally, only 55.1% of districts reported using peer tutoring while 21.3% of districts reported not using the indice. Peer tutoring was the indices with the highest 'not used' response percentage. However, between 11.6% and 19.0% of districts reported 'implementation in progress' responses for the indices.
in this category. This was the second highest percentage range in the ‘implementation in progress’ response category.

Finally, results of the program indices showed a range of use between 52.8% and 89.4%. This same range was demonstrated in the teaching/instructing category with the range of quality indice use between 52.8% and 81.9%. However, in the general education indice category, indice use varied between approximately 60% and 70%. In the special education indice category, indice use varied between approximately 70% and 80%. Wider ranges were found in the program and teaching/instructing indice categories while more consistent use scores were found in both the general and special education teacher indice categories.

In summary, the indices receiving the highest ‘used’ response percentages include parent collaboration (89.4%), administrative support (86.1%), special education collaboration (83.3%), criteria for placement (81.9%), use of behavioral strategies (81.9%), curricular accommodations (80.1%), and special education teacher high expectations (81.0%). The indices receiving the highest ‘not used’ percentages include use of peer-tutoring (21.3%), school-wide inclusion philosophy (19.4%), and use of social skills curriculum (13.4%).

A total quality indices variable was created by combining the districts’ response rate from the four indice groups. The researcher assigned each district response with a number (1=used, 2=implementation in progress, 3=not available, 4=not used) and all of the district’s responses were added together to create a total response value. If a district reported use of each and every quality indice, the district
would receive a value of 25 because there were 25 total indices. District responses of 'implementation in progress', 'not available', or 'not used' increased the total response value for the district. The researcher then broke the total response values into three use ranges for manageability. A bar chart presenting the frequency analysis of the total quality indice variable by range is presented in Figure 9.

Figure 9

District Use of All Quality Indices by Use Range

A group of analyses were conducted with the total quality indice variable. The frequency analysis (See Figure 9) indicated 43.5% of the districts reported a high use of the quality indices (25.0-32.0), which indicates district responses in the 'used' and 'implementation in progress' categories. Approximately 49% of districts reported a
mid use range (33.0-55.0), which indicated a variety of responses in all four response categories. In the low use range (57.0-77.0), 7.7% of districts reported they did not use many of the indices or did not have the indices available to use. Seven districts either did not complete the survey, or reported that they did not have any students with EBD in their district. The total quality indice variable used a total of 209 participating district responses out of the 216 districts represented in this study.

A cross tabulation analysis was conducted using the total quality indice use variable and the location variable (urban, suburban, and rural). The purpose of this analysis was to investigate a district’s location and use of quality indices in the high use range. The investigation continued with a look at district location and responses in the middle use range, and concluded with a look at district location and responses on the low use range. Results of the cross-tabulation analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Use of Quality Indices and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Quality Indice Ranges</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use (25.0-32.0)</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (33.0-55.0)</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (57.0-77.0)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Results indicate urban districts report most of their use of the quality indices in the mid range with 66.6% of districts reporting implementation in progress of many indices. Suburban and rural districts reported use more evenly spread through the high and mid use ranges. The highest percentage of districts reporting low use of the quality indices were in the rural areas of the state with 12.4% of these districts reporting little or no use of most of the quality indices.

Another cross tabulation analysis was conducted using the total quality indice variable with districts using inclusion, resource room, self-contained, and center-based services. The results, presented in Table 5 indicate the percent of districts in the quality indice use ranges when specific services are used in the district. It is important to note that results only indicate the use of quality indices in districts reporting use of the specific services, not use of quality indices in all services. That information is presented in the total quality indice table and bar chart (See Table 3 and Figure 9). In addition to the results presented in Table 5, the data presented in Table 5 is also displayed in bar graph form in Appendix J.
Table 5

Use of Quality Indices and Availability of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Quality Indices Ranges</th>
<th>Available District Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use 25.0-32.0</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use 33.0-55.0</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use 57.0-77.0</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering the use of the quality indices within the services available to districts in the State of Michigan, results indicate similar percentages of districts reporting use in each of the use ranges. Districts reported highest percentages of use in all ranges with 40.6% high use, 40.6% mid use, and 7.1% low use. It is important to note that the resource room was the service most used throughout the state. The second highest use percentages were recorded in the inclusion service with 35.3% of districts reporting high use and 33.2% reporting mid use, however, inclusion also reported the lowest percentage in the low use range with 2.4% of the districts reporting low use.
Use of Quality Indices, Districts’ Success, & Service Placements

The total quality indice variable in addition to the quality indice category variables allowed the researcher to conduct analyses used to investigate the third research question. This question inquires about the relationship between the use of the quality indices and the success of districts regarding the progress of students with EBD placed in services that use the general education setting. Moreover, it asks how the use of quality indices is related to placements of students with EBD in services that use the general education setting.

Cross tabulation analyses were conducted with the quality indices category variables, the total quality indice variable, and the districts’ reported success in order to determine the relationship between districts who reported a greater use of the quality indices and districts who reported being successful with students with EBD. A cross tabulation analysis was also conducted with the total quality indice variable and each of the service variables, center-based, self-contained, resource-room, and inclusion. This analysis investigated how the use of all of the quality indices is related to the services districts in the State of Michigan are currently using with students with EBD.

Discussion of Success

Results of the cross tabulation of quality indice categories and the total quality indice variable with districts’ success are presented in Tables 6-10. Each table indicates information from each of the four quality indice categories as described in...
Figure 2. Data is broken down into use ranges with high use equal to a response of ‘used’ for each of the quality indices in that category. The number representing mid use is equal to the value of a district responding with ‘implementation in progress’ for each quality indice. The numbers representing low use are equal to districts responding with ‘not available’ or ‘not used’ for each of the quality indices in that category. In Table 10, use of total quality indices and districts’ success, the same quality indice use ranges used in previous tables are used to present this data.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Program Indices</th>
<th>District Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use (8)</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (16)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (24-26)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate 64.8% of districts reporting a high use of the program indices also reported success with students with EBD with 33.3% of districts reporting high use reporting some success. In contrast, not one of the districts reporting a low use of program indices reported success. Table 6 indicates a considerable decrease in district success as the use of program indices decreased.
Table 7

Use of General Education Teacher Indices and District Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of General Education Teacher Indices</th>
<th>District Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use (6)</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (12)</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (18-24)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate 67.1% of districts reporting a high use of general education teacher indices also reported success with students with EBD while 25.7% of districts reporting a high use reported some success. More than half of the districts reporting use in the mid range also reported success, which is a different finding than the program indices (See Table 6) found. Districts reporting a low use of the general education teacher indices were not able to report much success with only 22.2% able to indicate at least some success. Table 7 also indicates a considerable decrease in district success as the use of general education teacher indices decreased.
Table 8

Use of Special Education Teacher Indices and District Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Special Education Teacher Indices</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Use (5)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (10)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (17-20)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Table 8 indicate 62% of districts reporting a high use of special education teacher indices reported success with students with EBD while 32% of these districts reported some success. Along with program indices, districts reporting use of special education teacher indices in the mid range reported their greatest percentage of success in the ‘somewhat’ response category. Districts reporting a low use of special education teacher indices were not able to report much success with only 33.3% able to indicate at least some success and 66.6% not able to report any success. As with the other categories of quality indices, Table 8 indicates a considerable decrease in district success as the use of general education teacher indices decreased.
Table 9

Use of Teaching/Instructing Indices and District Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Teaching/Instructing Indices</th>
<th>District Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use (6)</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (12)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (18-24)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Table 9 indicate 62.5% of districts reporting a high use of the teaching/instructing indices were able to report success with students with EBD. Additionally, 30.4% of districts reporting a high use of the teaching/instructing indices were able to report some success. Half of the districts reporting use of the teaching/instructing indices in the mid range also reported success with students with EBD. Although a few more districts reporting use of these indices in the low range were able to report success (14.3%) or some success (14.3%), the greatest percentage of districts reporting use in the low range were not able to report success with students with EBD. Table 9 indicates a considerable decrease in district success as the use of general education teacher indices decreased.
Table 10

Use of Total Quality Indices and District Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Total Quality Indices Ranges</th>
<th>District Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use (25.0-32.0)</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (33.0-55.0)</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (57.0-77.0)</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Table 10 indicate 58.9% of districts reporting a high use of all of the quality indices also were able to report success with students with EBD. Additionally, 37.8% of districts reporting a high use were able to report some success. Districts reporting use of all of the quality indices in the mid range reported comparable percentages of success, some success and no success. However, 68.75% of districts reporting a low use of all of the quality indices were able to report some success while only 25% of these districts reported no success.

In summary, Tables 6-9 indicated a decrease in the percentage of districts reporting success with regard to progress with students with EBD as the use of each of the categories of quality indices decreased. Moreover, Table 10 also found that as the use of all of the quality indices decreased, so did the number of districts reporting...
success with students with EBD. In summary, as the use of quality indices increased, the percentage of districts reporting success with students with EBD increased.

Discussion of Placement

Results of the cross tabulation analysis using the total quality indice variable and the four service variables are presented in Tables 11-14. District total quality indice use values are presented in the use ranges, while percentages of districts’ placements of students with EBD in the four services are presented in ranges as well. The survey question presented to the districts asked for a percentage, in a scale from 0%-100%, of students with EBD placed in each of the four available services. The data is broken down into four placement ranges, 0%-10%, 20%-30%, 40%-70%, and 80%-100%.

Table 11

Use of Quality Indices and Placements in Center-Based Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Quality Indice Ranges</th>
<th>Frequency of Placements of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use (25.0-32.0)</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (33.0-55.0)</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (57.0-77.0)</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Table 11 indicate districts reporting high and mid use of the quality indices placed approximately 85% of their population of students with EBD in center-based programs only 0%-10% of the time. In contrast, districts reporting low use of the quality indices reported placing 37.5% of their population of students with EBD in center-based programs only 0%-10% while they placed 56.25% of students with EBD in center-based programs 40%-70% of the time.

Table 12

Use of Quality Indices and Placements in Self-Contained Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Quality Indice Ranges</th>
<th>Frequency of Placements of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use (25.0-32.0)</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (33.0-55.0)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (57.0-77.0)</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Table 12 indicate districts reporting high, mid, and low use of the quality indices placed approximately 50% of their population of students with EBD in self-contained services 0%-10% of the time. Districts reported placing similar percentages of students with EBD in self-contained services in the first three ranges on the scale with the exception of the 80%-100% range. Districts reporting a low use
of the quality indices also reported placing the greatest number of students with EBD in self-contained services 80%-100% of the time.

Table 13

Use of Quality Indices and Placements in Resource Room Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Quality Indice Ranges</th>
<th>Frequency of Placements of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use (25.0-32.0)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (33.0-55.0)</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (57.0-77.0)</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Table 13 indicate districts reporting high, mid, and low use of quality indices reported placing their greatest percentage of students with EBD into resource room services 40%-70% of the time. However, districts reporting low use of the quality indices reported their second greatest percentage of students with EBD (18.75%) in resource room services only 0%-10% of the time.
Table 14

Use of Quality Indices and Placements in Inclusion Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Quality Indice Ranges</th>
<th>Frequency of Placements of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Use (25.0-32.0)</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Use (33.0-55.0)</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use (57.0-77.0)</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Table 14 indicate districts reporting high use of the quality indices placed large percentages (35.2% and 29.7 respectively) of their population of students with EBD in inclusion services in the 0%-10% range and in the 40%-70% range while districts reporting mid use of the quality indices reported consistent percentages of students with EBD in inclusion services in all ranges. Districts reporting low use of the quality indices reported placing 81.25% of their population of students with EBD in inclusion services only 0%-10% of the time.

In summary, Tables 11-14 indicate that districts reporting a high and mid use of the quality indices placed lower percentages of their population of students with EBD in services excluded from the general education setting such as center-based and self-contained services, and higher percentages of their population of students with EBD in resource room and inclusion services which use the general education setting.
Districts reporting a low use of the quality indices placed higher percentages of their population of students with EBD in the excluded services and lower percentages of students with EBD in services using the general education setting.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

There are three research questions investigated in this dissertation study. The results of the analysis of data were presented in Chapter Three according to the specific research question being examined. The discussion and implications will follow in the same pattern. The researcher will discuss the conclusions and implications of the research questions in the order they were asked.

The Quality Indices of Successful Programs

The first research question asks what the essential variables are to effective programs delivering services for students with EBD. The outcome of this question is the list of the 25 Quality Indices of Successful Programs for Students With Emotional and Behavioral Disorders (See Figure 1 in Chapter 3). Rock, Rosenberg, & Carran (1995) have suggested the cause of the failure of so many current programs to provide the necessary services in the general education environment is the lack of research regarding the variables that are essential to the success of these students in this setting. Based on an extensive review of the literature, this researcher developed a list of variables that have been proven to be essential to the success of students with
EBD in the general education setting. This list was then validated by a group of four experts in the area of students with emotional and behavioral disorders.

The quality indice list provides a comprehensive snapshot of the current literature and law regarding best practices in the field of educating students with EBD. Additionally, the list will be useful in the development and implementation of progress for districts struggling to offer students with EBD and their families the services needed to ensure adequate yearly progress in meeting goals and objectives and curriculum benchmarks. Moreover, it will assist school districts in providing service delivery that is in compliance with state and federal law.

The State of Michigan in particular has seen a rise in the number of disputes between parents and local districts regarding students with emotional impairments (EI is the label used to describe students with EBD in Michigan and the services being provided by local public school districts). The Michigan Department of Education reports 27.7% of the special education hearings considered by state hearing monitors in the 2001-2002 school year were related to disputes between parents of students with EI. Additionally, 53.6% of those hearings directly addressed the issue of program placement and service delivery related to students with EI (Michigan Department of Education, 2002).

Recently state level discussions have reviewed changes in programming and service delivery provided to students with EI. These discussions have occurred in collaboration with a state-based law firm used to represent state districts in hearings and court cases. The quality indice list provides state administrators and monitors
with the information necessary to assist local districts in their efforts to improve programs and provide services that are aligned with both federal law (IDEA '97) and the needs as well as demands of students and their parents in this state.

Implications of The Quality Indices for Success

The Quality Indices for Inclusive Success for Students with EBD (See Figure 1 in Chapter 3) has implications for both assisting all service providers in developing effective programs and services, and in developing the capacity for successful instruction and relationship building in all staff that work with students with EBD. This list of program elements has the potential of becoming a framework for program and personnel development in all public school districts. Additionally, the categories of indices indicate specific program and personnel variables essential in four areas of service delivery; (a) facilitating programs, (b) general education teachers, (c) special education teachers, and (d) teaching and instructing. Districts assessing their use of indices in one area have the opportunity to focus their attention on one of the other three areas in order to improve lack of use in those particular indices in personnel and program services.

Implications include the use of the quality indices as a framework for creating programs and services that have the maximum potential for program effectiveness and student success. The list also identifies the critical areas of professional development critical for all educators to be actively engaged, in order to be successful
and effective with students displaying difficult or inappropriate behavior and emotional issues.

The implications of this study also tie back to the literature, which has indicated a need for programs and services that meet the complex behavioral, social, emotional, and academic problems. Researchers have determined this can be done with the use of accommodations and modifications to curriculum, specific instructional methods, and positive teacher attitudes in the general education classroom (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). Furthermore, the results of this study support the conclusions of previous studies and their implications. The possibilities for use of the quality indice list will only be determined when professionals in the field allow it to assist them in supporting the program and personnel development needed at this time.

Available Services

The second research question inquires about two topics regarding the use of quality indices. The first topic is the identification of programs and services available in districts in Michigan and the second topic is the use of the quality indices in the identified programs and services. In order to determine if the use of the quality indices support the placements of students with EBD in the general education environment, the types of programs available within the general education setting needed to be determined. Questions regarding the availability of the continuum of
services and the programming within that continuum were asked of the participating districts.

The data indicated the majority of available services within the responding districts were resource room and inclusion programs suggesting there is the capacity to place students with EBD in the least restrictive environment. Another interesting result is that teacher consultant and center-based programs were the services least available in the State of Michigan. The phasing out of teacher consultants has been an ongoing trend in Michigan since the implementation of IDEA '97 beginning in 1998. It is also encouraging to discover the most available programming can be found in the general education setting. This allows Michigan to be in compliance with IDEA '97 and litigation that supports special education law (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1997; Yell, 1995).

The researcher then looked at urban, suburban, and rural areas within the State of Michigan and how the different geographical areas used the quality indices. It is important to report that although 81% of urban districts reported the availability of a full continuum of services, only 28.6% of urban districts reported use of quality indices in high range which is the lowest of the three locations. Suburban districts reported only 69.4% having the availability of a full continuum of services, yet they reported the highest use of quality indices with 49.3% reporting they use most or all of the indices in their programs.

Although rural districts reported the lowest availability of the continuum with a score of 45.5%, they also reported 41.3% of districts use most or all of the indices
which is just slightly lower than suburban districts. It also needs to be mentioned that 12.4% of rural districts reported no availability or no use of many of the quality indices while 0% of urban districts and 1.4% of suburban districts reported no availability or no use of many of the quality indices. This suggests rural districts not only have fewer resources and services available to them, they either use the quality indices or they don’t use the quality indices at all. In rural districts, there appears to be very little middle of the road implementation of the quality indices.

    Urban districts, on the other hand, have many services and resources available but are only average in their use of the quality indices. Suburban districts not only have the full continuum of services and programs available to them, they are doing a better job at implementing and using the quality indices within those programs.

    Implications of Available Services

    Previous studies have shown that students with EBD have been initially placed in more restrictive environments regardless of the identified student needs (Grosnick, George, & George, 1991; Gunter, Denny, & Venn, 2000). Implications of this study indicate the State of Michigan has the capacity to place students in the least restrictive environment as soon as they are identified. It also indicates that although many districts are initially placing students in programs that use the general education setting, many of these placements become considered no longer appropriate.

    The implication of these conclusions for the State of Michigan and beyond surrounds the push for accountable and compliant programs in relationship to IDEA
'97. This is especially true as we brace ourselves for the reauthorization of the federal law in 2003. It seems as though many districts in Michigan have responded to IDEA '97. They also may be ready to embrace a new set of regulations that are assumed to be aligned with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001: The Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L. 107-110). This is the Federal Law that has redefined the role of the federal government in K-12 regular education (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Furthermore, this study indicates there are opportunities for districts in the State of Michigan to begin placing students with EBD in programs and services based on individual student need rather than available programs. As noted in Chapter 1 the availability and quality of services for students with EBD vary considerably from state to state and school to school causing placement decisions to be based on the types of existing services rather than on individual student need (Muscott, Morgan, & Meadows, 1996). This study indicates the continuum of services is available in many districts across the state, and although students are currently being placed in those available services, there is capacity for districts to place students based on individual need rather than available services.

Building on the idea of placing students based on needs rather than available services, Cessna & Skibba (1996) introduce the idea of a type of wrap around model of service delivery otherwise known as needs-based approach. This model of service delivery puts an emphasis on interagency collaboration in order to increase services while being careful not to increase exclusion.
Although it cannot be inferred from the data that participating districts have already begun the practice of needs based placements, the implications of the results of this study show districts in Michigan have positioned themselves in a way that with support and assistance of professional development, and collaboration between professional agencies, special education could become a direct service instead of a place. It remains to be seen if the districts in the State of Michigan and across the country use this research to assist them in developing their programs and relationships with other agencies in order to fundamentally change where and how we serve students with EBD.

The Use of Quality Indices

The use of quality indices within the State of Michigan is optimistic. The responding districts reported that they “use” the quality indices much more frequently than the other response options which included ‘implementation in progress’, ‘not available’, and ‘not used’. The second greatest response was ‘implementation in progress’ which also indicates an awareness of the need for some progress toward an increase in future use of the quality indices.

Of the four quality indice categories, two categories had significantly lower ‘use’ responses than the others. One area of concern is the category of general education teacher indices where the percentage of ‘used’ responses were 10%-20% below the other three categories. However, the ‘implementation in progress’ responses were 10%-15% higher than the other three categories. This suggests that
although the local districts are aware of best teaching practices general education teachers need to be implementing in their classrooms, these elements are not currently being used.

The other quality indice category of concern is the teaching/instructing indice area. Because the area of general education teacher indices scored lower usage responses, it is natural that this area of teaching techniques designed for use in the general education classroom would score lower than the other response options. Since the results of this study indicate many of the participating districts place a majority of their students in resource room and inclusion services, the conclusion can be made that general education teachers are being given the opportunity to instruct students with EBD whether they like it or not. Using more of the indices in the teaching and instructing category would definitely increase the potential for academic and behavior success for students with EBD in the general education setting.

Given the fact that a majority of students with EBD are receiving at least half of their educational services in the general education setting, it is very disturbing to find that within the general education teacher indice category, the indice of 'trained and prepared staff' received one of the lowest 'used' percentages of the entire list. This issue deserves discussion due to the fact that the literature reports the training and preparing of general education staff as one of the biggest challenges currently facing general education teachers and education as a whole (Cheney & Muscott, 1996; Gibb et al, 1999). More importantly, the literature has recognized that a well-
prepared teacher is one of the most important pieces to the success of students with EBD in the general education environment (Martin & Wienke, 1998).

In addition, two indices in the teaching/instructing indice category received low percentages of ‘used’ responses. These two indices include, ‘use of self-management techniques’ and ‘use of a social skills curriculum’. Once again, this causes concern because both of these teaching tools have also been linked to very successful outcomes for students with EBD in general education settings (Daniels, 1998; Guetzloe, 1999).

Finally, the indice receiving the lowest percentage of ‘used’ responses, 52.8%, was school-wide inclusion philosophy in the program indice category. This finding precisely indicates the position of school districts in the State of Michigan on the issue of inclusion. Although subsections of professionals within school districts work with an educational philosophy of inclusion of all students in the general education setting, the districts participating in this study clearly reported only half work in environments where school-wide inclusion is the philosophy driving the decision making regarding service delivery.

The reality of where districts stand in relationship to inclusion is critical to providing successful programs and services to students with EBD in general education setting (Rock, Rosenberg, & Carran, 1995). The academic and social success of all students must become the shared responsibility of all professionals if we are going to move to a needs-based service delivery model. In addition, the partnership created by an inclusive educational philosophy allows both teachers and
students to learn and grow together by modeling diversity both in the classroom and in the community.

There were, however, more encouraging findings to report from the responses of participating districts in regard to the use of quality indices from special education teachers. Three out of the five special education teacher indices, 'special education staff collaboration', 'curricular accommodations', and 'high teacher expectations', received 'used' responses of 80% or greater. Districts reported a high level of confidence in the use of the quality indices in the programs and services their special education staff provide to students with EDB. In addition to the high frequency of use of the special education teacher indices, quality indices receiving an 80% or greater use rate include 'parent collaboration', 'administrative support', and 'criteria for placement' in the program indice category.

The high percentage (89.4%) of districts reporting to use parent collaboration in the State of Michigan is very encouraging considering the directive from IDEA '97 to hold educators accountable for communication with parents (De Bettencourt, 2002; Huefner, 2000). The two new requirements under IDEA '97 include the required participation of parents at the Individual Education Program (IEP) meeting as part of the IEP team, and regular information provided to parents regarding the progress of their child on IEP goals and objectives. These new requirements not only increase the opportunities for parent collaboration, but also hold teachers accountable for working more closely with parents on their child’s educational services. The superior amount
of reported parent collaboration in this study demonstrates districts in the State of Michigan to be in compliance with the law on this particular set of requirements.

Moreover, the presence of administrative support in 86.1% of participating districts is encouraging because it has been documented that successful inclusion of students with EBD in general education settings depends on administrators who promote, facilitate, support including students with special needs in their school (Gibb, Allred, Ingram, Young, & Egan, 1999). Administrative support, which includes the facilitation of an inclusive school philosophy, is essential to the success and integration of all students into the general education setting (Rock et al, 1995). Districts (86.1%) reporting administrative support also report high percentages of use with many of the other quality indices on the list. These districts appear to be more likely to include students with EBD in general education settings.

This study also investigated district use of all of the quality indices by creating a variable that added all responses by districts given to each of the individual indices and creating a total quality indice use value. Results indicated suburban districts reported more frequent responses of 'used' or 'implementation in progress' for all of the quality indices than either urban or rural districts. Rural areas reported the highest percentage of districts responses of 'not used' or 'not available' to use of the quality indices. Previously in this chapter (Availability of Programs) it was reported that urban districts had the most resources and services available, however, urban districts reported the lowest percentage of districts using of all of the quality indices. This finding suggests suburban districts have the services, resources, and the capacity to
use many of the quality indices. Rural districts have less resources and services available which may indicate why they struggle to use some of the quality indices. Urban districts, on the other hand, report having the resources and services available, but are not using the quality indices to support the students with EBD in their districts.

District use of all of the quality indices was also investigated in relationship to the use of indices in available services on the continuum of services. Districts reporting availability of a resource room program also reported use of the quality indices in the high range (25.0-32.0). Districts reporting availability of a full inclusion programs reported use of the quality indices in both the high range (25.0-32.0) and in the medium range (33.0-55.0). Results of this study indicated the resource room was the program most used in the State of Michigan across all participating districts.

Two other services frequently available to districts reporting ‘no use’ or ‘no availability’ of the quality indices were center-based and self-contained services. Although further research needs to be conducted specifically regarding the use of quality indices in specific services, findings in this study indicate districts implementing resource room and full inclusion services use more of the quality indices.

Implications of The Use of Quality Indices

The greatest implication of the results regarding the use of quality indices by participating districts is the need for professional development and training for the
general education teachers in the State of Michigan. The literature states most general education teachers feel imposed upon when required to teach students with emotional and/or behavioral needs because they consider themselves unprepared to deal with these students. These feelings have been linked to a lack of knowledge, skill and confidence with regard to curriculum, instruction, and behavior management of students with EBD (Schumm & Vaughn, 1995; Heflin & Bullock, 1999; McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). Based on the fact that the use of general education teacher indices were below the use of program indices and special education teacher indices, results of this study suggest the general education teachers in the State of Michigan also share these feelings.

This finding is shown in Figures 10 and 11. Special education teacher indices are used approximately 15% more of the time than general education teacher indices with the general education indice used most often (staff collaboration - 71.8%) representing approximately the same percentage as the special education teacher indice used least often (consultant support - 70.4%). This finding is distressing due to the fact that students with EBD are receiving a greater percentage of their services in the regular education setting where the general education teacher is the lead educational professional instead of being placed in separate classrooms and facilities where the special education teacher is the lead educational professional.

It is, therefore, imperative that districts in the State of Michigan and across the country put more resources into training and preparing general education teachers in the skills and best practices necessary to be successful with students with EBD.
Findings of this study show that when resources are put forward, districts respond. Participating districts reported 89.4% are using parent collaboration, 81.9% are using criteria based placements, 86.1% are receiving administrative support, and 83.3% are using special education staff collaboration. Resources and efforts put into training and developing general education staff will not only support teachers, but also support placements of students with EBD in the general education setting. This will in turn promote the future of special education service delivery, which includes needs-based placements rather than placements based on available services.

Figure 10

Use of General Education Indices
Another finding indicating necessary improvements are teaching skills and instructional techniques educators use with students with EBD. Differentiated instruction is one teaching technique that did receive a 76.8% use rate, however, districts reported much lower use of social skills curriculums (52.8%), self-management skills (69.0%), and peer tutoring techniques (55.1%).

In a recent study conducted by Shapiro, Miller, Sawka, Gardill, & Handler (1999), peer-tutoring and self-management techniques were determined to be effective strategies for the success of students with EBD in the general education setting almost 100% of the time. In addition, using a social skills curriculum to teach positive social and interpersonal relationship skills along with rules, procedures, and
consequences allows students with EBD to be successful in programs using the
general education setting (Cessna & Skibba, 1996). Along with the training and
preparation of general education teachers, the greatest implication of the findings of
the use of quality indices portion of the study is the work that needs to be conducted
in the areas of teaching and instructing techniques. The established success of
teaching and instructing techniques, the recognized benefits of a prepared and trained
general education staff, combined with the dismal results of reported use of these
quality indices in districts in the State of Michigan leads to this conclusion.

Current Placements of Students with EBD

Considering the availability of services of participating districts and the use of
quality indices within these services, it is necessary to discuss where students with
EBD are currently being placed. Results from Table 5 in Chapter 4 indicate districts
are placing a greater percentage of their students with EBD in resource room and
inclusion services than in self-contained and center-based services. The conclusion
can then be made that districts are placing more students in services using the general
education setting because resource room and full inclusion services deliver services in
the general education setting throughout most of the school day. Although the
resource room remained the service that placed the most students with EBD,
inclusion placements were a close second. In fact, most of the participating districts
reported placing a majority of their students with EBD in self-contained or center-
based services only 10%-20% of the time. Additionally, 81.9% of participating
districts reported either no center-based program availability, or they placed less than 10% of their population of students with EBD in such services.

Implications of Service Placements

The results of current placements of students with EBD in local districts in the State of Michigan suggest we are placing slightly fewer students in services using separate classrooms or facilities than the national average (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). The national average indicates 33.2% of students with EBD receive more than 60% of their education in separate classrooms or facilities. This study indicates 30.1% of students with EBD in the State of Michigan receive more than 60% of their education in classrooms and facilities away from their non-disabled peers.

The data supports the conclusion that districts within the State of Michigan are placing students with EBD in services with some interaction with their non-disabled peers instead of routinely placing them in programs providing services in separate classrooms and/or facilities. Although this conclusion indicates compliance with IDEA ’97, it also indicates districts are not placing students based on their individual needs rather the placement continues to be determined by available service delivery options. The least restrictive environment for many students with EBD is the general education setting so they can use their cognitive abilities. At a national level, Gunter, Coutinho, & Cade (2002) report current placement practices leave many students with
EBD performing academically at inadequate and unacceptable levels with regard to
curriculum benchmarks.

It seems as though Michigan falls into this national average. This study
indicates many students are being pulled out of the general education classroom and
being taught core curriculum benchmarks in a resource room or self-contained
classroom. Students with EBD who have identified behavior and academic deficit
areas need instruction in social skills and self-management skills taught in general
education settings where the social skills can be generalized and instruction of
essential cognitive skills can be obtained.

However, the availability of the continuum of services and the use of quality
indices in many of the participating districts indicates that districts in the State of
Michigan have the capacity to increase services to students with EBD in the general
education classroom. This finding contradicts Landrum & Tangersley (1999) who
report there is little evidence that the field of education is developing or creating the
capacity to provide a better level of service to students with EBD.

Capacity to provide more effective services to students with EBD would
increase with better training and preparation of general education teachers. Findings
in this study show a greater percentage of students with EBD are receiving services in
the general education setting than in separate classrooms or facilities, however, only
57.9% of the participating districts reported their general education teachers are
trained and prepared with the essential skills to be able to meet both the academic and
social needs of these students. While it is encouraging to see an increase in service
delivery to students with EBD in the general education setting, it is imperative that
we also increase the training of general education professionals in the complex area
of emotional and behavioral disorders.

District Success Versus Frustration

Although the researcher originally hypothesized the percentage of districts
reporting success would be higher than the 45%, 97 out of 216, the number of
districts reporting success regarding progress being made with students with EBD
was approximately twice the number, 22.7%, of districts reporting frustration with
lack of progress made with students with EBD. In addition, it is interesting to note
that approximately the same number of districts reported some success, 82, as some
frustration, 79. In contrast, only 13.4% of districts reported no success, however,
38.9% of districts reported frustration with the lack of progress being made with
students with EBD.

While it is encouraging to find approximately half of participating districts
report success, these findings indicate the following conclusions. The first conclusion
is large number of districts are reporting some success as well as some frustration.
The second conclusion is that even though this study found many districts are using a
majority of the indices (see Table 8 in Chapter 4), a great deal of success is not being
felt by approximately half of participating districts in the State of Michigan.
Implications of District Success Versus Frustration

Implications of district success versus district frustration revolve around the conclusion that only about half of participating districts in the State of Michigan report success with progress made with students with EBD. Moreover, this finding remains even though district use of the quality indices was reported between 70%-89% in two out of the four indice categories. This finding implies a need for educational agencies to revisit the list of quality indices and ensure they are addressing indices in each category. It is clear from the data that use in some, but not all, areas results in some success, however, it also can also result in some frustration. Because the general education setting a complex environment and students with EBD have complex needs, use of all quality indices is essential in order to be successful with these students. In order to provide opportunities for meeting academic benchmarks and behaving in a socially appropriate manner in the general education setting, it is imperative to put effort into creating programs and services that include use of all of the quality indices.

Another possible reason for the mediocre success in districts in the State of Michigan with this population of students is the lack of use of general education teacher quality indices. The most important educational professional in the general education classroom is the general education teacher. As determined in this study, general education teachers are not using the critical variables for success with students with EBD.
Considering the finding that 75% of districts place students with EBD in services using the general education environment 50% of the school day or more, the question then begs to be asked, if students with EBD are spending half of their school day or more in the general education setting, how are districts going to be successful when the most important education professionals don’t use the quality indices that have been determined to assist them? Moreover, general education teachers haven’t been provided the opportunities for the training and preparation needed to have the skills necessary for the implementation of these critical variables. Once again, it is essential that the State of Michigan allocate time and resources towards supporting our general education partners.

Use of Quality Indices and Placements in Services

The third research question investigated whether districts placing students with EBD in services using the general education setting more frequently use a larger number of the quality indices as well. The results combined information regarding the use of quality indices and the percentages of students with EBD currently placed in each of the service delivery options in districts in the State of Michigan. The results from this cross tabulation analysis indicated districts reporting a high use of the quality indices placed lower percentages of their population of students with EBD in services excluded from the general education setting such as center-based and self-contained programs. Districts reporting a low use of the quality indices reported placing higher percentages of their population of students with EBD in services.
excluded from the general education setting 80%-100% of the time (See Tables 16-19 in Chapter 4).

For example, 86.8% of the districts reporting a high use of the quality indices placed students with EBD in center-based services 0%-10% of the time while only 37.5% of districts reporting a low use of the quality indices placed their students with EBD in center-based services 0%-100% of the time. Hence, the conclusion can made that districts using the quality indices place lower percentages of their population of students with EBD in center-based services than districts reporting less use of the quality indices.

In addition, 24.2% of districts reporting a high use of the quality indices placed 80%-100% of their students with EBD in inclusion services which use the general education setting the entire school day. At the same time, only 6.25% of districts reporting a low use of the quality indices placed 80%-100% of students with EBD in inclusion services. Therefore, the conclusion can made that districts using the quality indices place a higher percentage of their population of students with EBD in inclusion services than districts reporting less use of the quality indices.

Implications of the Use of Quality Indices and Placement in Services

Based on these two conclusions, the greatest implication of the relationship between the use of quality indices and the placement of students with EBD in the general education setting is the use of the research-based indices. As a result, it is evident that special education is quickly becoming a service, not a place for students
with special needs (Implementing IDEA: A Guide for Principals, 2001). It is a support system of instruction and services in the general education setting. Therefore, special education and general education are not to be considered separate systems but one system working together and sharing the responsibility of providing effective services for all students. Special educators need to increase as well as continue providing services in the general education setting.

Furthermore, little evidence has been found in the research to contradict the fact that placement and service delivery decisions are made in many schools based on available services not on law or student ability and need, therefore, the quality indice list is one tool that can and must be used to support all educators in providing services that meet both the academic and behavioral needs of students with EBD in the least restrictive environment (Muscott, Morgan, & Meadows, 1996).

Use of Quality Indices and District Success

The third research question examined how the use of quality indices relates to the success districts report regarding progress made with students with EBD. For this part of the investigation, analyses combined information regarding the use of quality indices and the success districts in the State of Michigan reported regarding students with EBD in programs in the general education setting.

Results of this cross tabulation indicated a decrease in the percentage of districts reporting success with regard to progress with students with EBD as the use of each of the categories of quality indices (See Tables 11-15 in Chapter 4). For
example, 64.8% of districts reporting a high use of the program indices also reported success with students with EBD while 100% of districts reporting low use of the program indices reported frustration with the lack of progress in their district.

Moreover, the same results were found when looking at the total quality indice variable. Approximately 59% of districts reporting high use of all of the quality indices also reported success while only 6.25% of districts reporting low use of the quality indices reported the same success with their population of students with EBD. Based on the results of this cross tabulation, the conclusion can be made that as the use of quality indices increased, the number of districts reporting success with students with EBD using services in the general education setting also increased.

Implications of the Use of Quality Indices and District Success

The conclusion regarding the impact of the use of quality indices on the success of districts with students with EBD has powerful implications for how districts can become more successful with this population of students in the general education setting. The most important implication is the direction it provides districts in the development of successful services for students with EBD as well as the need to support staff in developing the skills essential in implementing these services designed to meet the needs of students with EBD.

The direction of these results parallels the direction of the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education (2002), which is toward prevention and intervention in the general education setting rather than on remediation in
separate classrooms and facilities. It is essential that districts reporting frustration with the lack of progress being made with students with EBD begin following the direction provided by this study and current leading experts. The use of quality indices in each of the categories more frequently in all educational settings will support districts in that direction.

Another implication is the support it gives to previous implications, more training for general education staff, increased use of teaching and instructional strategies, and the implementation of the program variables, indicated by the findings of this study. The contrast of the results indicating a total of 61.7% of districts reporting a high use of the quality indices reported success with students with EBD while 77.8% of districts reporting low use of the quality indices did not report success clearly indicates the need for a well-trained general education staff, collaboration between general and special education staff, and knowledge and use of flexible academic instruction.

More specifically, the 64.8% of districts reporting a high use of quality indices and reporting success, versus 100% of districts reporting a low use of the quality indices and reporting frustration, indicates both the need and the benefits of implementing the program indices in order to increase the success of services delivered to this population. In addition, the 67.1% of districts reporting high use of the general education indices and reporting success versus the 0% of districts reporting low use of the general education indices reporting success further supports the implications of support to general education staff.
The importance of using the quality indices to develop more effective programs and services for students with EBD ties back to the current state of this population of student with special needs as described in the 23rd Annual Report to Congress (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). With 33.2% of students with EBD receiving more than half of their education outside of the general education setting, the issue of providing effective services within the general education setting has become one of the most challenging issues in education today. Professionals in the area of special education have an obligation to use current literature, research, and the findings of this study to make the general education setting a more desirable, effective, and successful place for students with EBD to receive their educational services.

Finally, with the President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education (2002) calling for better preparation and support for educators working with students with special needs, implementation of evidence-based practices, and the consideration of students with disabilities as general education students first, it is our professional obligation to use the findings of this study to create effective and successful programs that deliver services in a unified environment where all students are all of our responsibility.

Limitations

The findings in this study need to be considered in light of a few methodological limitations. Although attempts were documented to survey each and
every school district in the State of Michigan, 216 out of 538 actually participated in this study. Results of this study are based on participating districts, not the entirety of local public school districts in the State of Michigan. Although, conclusions of the results of this study may be generalized to districts in every state across the country, however, the only districts participating in this particular study were from the State of Michigan.

The survey used in this study was send to special education administrators in each public school district in the State of Michigan. As demographic results indicated (See Chapter 4), some administrators allowed special education teachers to complete the information for some individual districts. It needs to be noted that these teachers may not have had access to the information needed to answer district wide service delivery questions requested by the researcher.

Implications for Further Research and Study

Despite the limitations, the findings of this study have several implications for future practice as well as further research. One implication suggests the need for all of the quality indices to be implemented in order to attain the maximum amount of success with students with EBD. The researcher feels it may be necessary to continue research with this tool in order to determine whether this is necessary or if the focus should remain on specific categories of indices.

In addition, longitudinal studies could investigate the improvement of districts reporting low use of the quality indices in this study. A future research question may
ask if implementation and use of more of the quality indices allows districts to change their response of frustration with lack of progress being made with students with EBD to a response of success. Furthermore, would the implementation and use of more of the quality indices allow districts to place more of the their population of students with EBD in programs that use the general education setting.

Conclusion

In conclusion, findings of this study indicate that the use of quality indices in the State of Michigan seems to fall in the mid to high range. However, with an increase in the use of all of the quality indices districts will be able to more effectively place students with EBD in services that use the general education setting. In particular, it is essential general education teachers receive the training and preparation needed to both feel and be effective in the classroom. As a result, districts will experience more success with regard to students with EBD. The quality indices, when used as a tool, can and will support local public school districts in their attempts to make special education a service in the least restrictive environment, not a place where students with EBD are placed and left behind.
Appendix A

Variable List with References
Variables affecting the Success of Students with EBD


- Staff collaboration
- Instructional accommodations and strategies
- Flexibility in instruction
- Effective evaluation strategies
- Curricular accommodations
- Differentiated instruction
- Contextual accommodations


- Socialization
- Instructional strategies
- Training & and preparation of staff
- Consultation support
- Administrative support
- Attitudes & opinions of general education staff
- Many placement options on the continuum

Braaten, B. & Quinn, C. Successful inclusion of students with emotional and behavioral disorders: The bryn mawr elementary school program. Preventing School Failure, 45(1), 15-17.

- Interagency Collaboration
- In school mental health services
- Special education consultant services
- Administrative support
- Social skills curriculum
- Effective instruction
- Building relationships with students
- School philosophy


- Set placement criteria & procedures
- Social skills curriculum
- Positive teacher attitudes & opinions
- Relationship building with students
- Flexible academic programming
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• Flexible classroom programming
• Trained & prepared general education teachers
• Trained & prepared special education teachers
• Positive peer relationship building
• Staff collaboration
• Collaboration with parents
• Self-management
• Peer-tutoring
• Many placement options

• Placement decisions made on a case by case basis
• Interagency collaboration
• Consultation support
• Shared staff vision
• Collaboration/Teaming
• Expanded curriculum
• Differentiated instruction
• Social/life skills curriculum
• Instructional strategies – modeling, demonstration, feedback, guided practice
• Administrative support
• Staff willingness
• Behavioral intervention support

• Individualized Placement Decisions
• Building relationships
• On-going staff training
• Positive teacher attitudes and opinions
• Flexibility in instruction
• Academic instructional accommodations
• Differentiated instruction
• Interagency collaboration
• Parent collaboration & communication
• Many placement options
• Set procedures
• Staff Collaboration
• Commitment by staff
• School philosophy
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• Trained & prepared staff
• School wide social skills curriculum
• Problem solving techniques


• Teacher training & experience
• Interagency collaboration
• Many placement options
• Differentiated teaching
• Collaboration with parents
• Individualized teaching approaches/flexibility in instruction
• High expectations


• Teaching/Instructional strategies
• Appropriate curriculum
• Curricular adaptations
• Matching teaching & learning styles
• Self-management
• Positive feedback
• Alternative educational settings
• School-wide discipline rules & procedures


• Matching teaching style to students' learning style
• Individualized program decisions made on case by case basis
• Use of structured routines
• Teaching generalization of skills
• Structured transition plans


• Social skills
• Self-management


- Peer-mediated self-management
- Instructional modifications
- General education peer group
- General education teacher willingness


- Positive teacher attitudes & opinions
- Teaching generalization of skills
- Student-teacher contracts


- Appropriate curriculum
- Classroom/instructional strategies
- Teacher willingness/attitudes
- Philosophy of the school
- Consultation support
- Administrative support
- Criteria & set, written procedures
- Instructional methods
- Social skills
- Peer tutoring
- Collaboration
- Many placement options
- Training and professional development


- Curricular accommodations and modifications
- Effective instructional practices
- Balance between academic and functional curriculum
- Student choices
- Self-monitoring
- Close proximity
- Incorporating interests into curricular activities
- Individualized instruction
- Effective lesson planning/pacing/timelines
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• Differentiated instruction


• School philosophy
• Interagency collaboration
• On-going staff development
• Academic modifications
• Trained & prepared staff
• Administrative support
• Parent partnerships
• Teaching strategies


• Teacher resistance
• Administrative support
• Training in strategies
• Class size
• Curriculum modifications
• Collaboration & consultation
• Many placement options on full continuum
• Specialized/differentiated instruction
• Set procedures for implementation
• Instructional strategies
• Consultation support


• Teacher training & preparation
• Curricular accommodations and modifications
• Flexible & expanded programming
• Interagency collaboration
• Collaboration with related services
• Many placement options
• Smaller class sizes

- Administrative support
- Supportive school philosophy
- Collaboration – Effective Communication
- Consultation support
- Training & Prepared Staff
- Freedom to be flexible and make decisions as teachers
- Positive teacher attitudes and opinions
- Team Planning and problem solving
- Instructional adaptations
- Relationship building
- Collaborative culture


- Systematic data based interventions
- Continuous assessment of progress
- Flexibility in treatment options
- Interagency collaboration
- Social skills curriculum
- Many placement options
- Trained & prepared staff
- Collaboration between staff
- Low teacher to student ratios
- Placement decisions on case by case basis


- Instructional & management strategies
- Teacher positive attitudes & opinions
- Teacher tolerance


- Instructional & behavioral intervention strategies
- Social skills training – conversation/dialogue
- Self-management techniques

Knitzer, J., Steinberg, Z., & Fleisch, B. (1990). *At the schoolhouse door: An examination*

- Curricular strategies
- Flexibility in instruction and curriculum
- Appropriate identification
- Mental health services
- Interagency collaboration
- Improve quality of school life
- Parent and advocacy collaboration
- Trained & prepared staff
- On-going research on best practices
- Link families and schools


- Teacher training & preparation
- Instructional & behavioral intervention strategies
- Early intervention & identification
- Peer tutoring
- Set procedures
- Appropriate expectations & realistic outcomes


- Collaborative Behavioral Contracting
- Staff collaboration
- Shared inclusive vision/school philosophy
- Individually set goals
- Relationship building with students
- Consultative support
- Specific behavior strategies
- Student choices


- Social skills & social competence curriculum
- Positive attitudes of teachers
- Many placement options on the continuum
- School philosophy
- Administration support
- School-wide behavior interventions
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- Collaboration
- Set procedures
- Teacher attitudes & opinions
- Consultant support
- Training
- Placement options
- Interagency collaboration


- Collaboration/Partnerships with parents
- Faculty cohesiveness
- Administrative support
- Academic instructional strategies
- Effectively implementing behavior plans


- Interagency collaboration
- Staff collaboration
- Staff willingness
- Administrative support
- Academic modifications
- Collaboration with parents
- Behavior management plans
- On-going professional development
- Differentiated curriculum
- Social skills curriculum
• Crisis management spot
• Consultation support

  • Academic strategies for instruction
  • Peer-tutoring and cooperative learning strategies used in the classroom
  • Management accommodations

  • Instructional accommodations
  • Self-monitoring techniques
  • Peer-tutoring
  • Less aversive instructional tasks
  • Instructional interventions

  • Self-management
  • Teacher training
  • Matching of teacher and student
  • Social skills
  • Remediating academic deficits

  • School philosophy
  • Administrative support
  • Collaboration & consultation
  • Teacher attitude & opinions
  • Training for general education teachers
  • Set procedures
  • Multiple options for re-integration/many placement options

- Self-management techniques
- Consultant support
- Set-procedures for identification & implementation of placement
- Trained & prepared staff
- Peer-tutoring & cooperative learning techniques used in the classroom
- Problem solving techniques
- Social skills training for students
- Teacher attitudes & opinions
- Instructional & behavioral intervention strategies


- Teacher attitudes & beliefs
- Teacher attributes
- School philosophy & climate
- Differentiated instruction
- Collaboration
- Willingness of all staff
- Effective strategies for instruction
- Class size
- Teacher training


- Collaboration
- Set procedures
- Staff training
- Consultant support
- Interagency support & collaboration


- Accommodate student learning styles
- Meaningful participation in the curriculum
- On-going assessment
- Trans-environmental programming
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• Staff collaboration
• Individually tailored instruction
• Peer-tutoring
• Use of problem solving teams
• Consultant support
• Use of learning strategies
• Social skills curriculum
• Staff training & preparation
Appendix B

Delphi Technique Rating Scales
May, 2002

Dear

My name is Alice Hoekstra, and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Studies at Western Michigan University. I am currently in the process of creating a survey with the goal of completing a survey research study for my dissertation looking at the criteria and quality indicies used in the State of Michigan to place students with Emotional and Behavior Disorders (EBD). Through an extensive literature review, I gathered articles regarding what the research says are the essential variables needed for successful placements of students with EBD. I then created a master list of variables from the literature. The list I am asking you to review was taken from this master list by selecting all variables that were mentioned more than four times. These have become the quality indices I would like to use to survey all the local school districts in the State of Michigan.

I am requesting that you, as an expert in this area, review this list of quality indices as indicated by the literature, and with your own expertise indicate the variables you also would consider to be quality indices of successful placements for students with EBD. In addition, I am asking you to rank the variables in each category with 1 being the most critical for success. Finally, please write any comments you feel are essential when considering quality indices of successful placements for students with EBD.

Sincerely,

Alice Hoekstra
March 22, 2002

Dear Expert:

My name is Alice Hoekstra, and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Studies at Western Michigan University. I am currently in the process of creating a survey with the goal of completing a survey research study for my dissertation looking at the criteria and quality indices used in the State of Michigan to place students with Emotional and Behavior Disorders (EBD). Through an extensive literature review, I selected articles regarding the essential variables needed for successful placements of students with EBD. Subsequently, I created a master list of variables from the literature. As a result, I developed a master list of all variables mentioned a minimum of four times. These have become the quality indices I would like to use to survey all of the local school districts in the State of Michigan.

I am asking that you, as an expert in this area, review this list of quality indices, and with your expertise, rank the variables in each category with 1 being the most critical for success. Finally, please make any additions to the list or make comments regarding essential information regarding successful placements for students with EBD.

In closing, I want to share my appreciation for your time and thought on this issue. Based on the responses I receive from the various experts I am consulting with, I will prepare a new list for a second review.

Sincerely,

Alice Hoekstra
Quality Indices of Successful Programs for Students With Emotional and Behavioral Disorders – Number Ranking of Importance
Results from the Experts Round One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Variables</th>
<th>Voyt.</th>
<th>Cheney</th>
<th>Summy</th>
<th>Dierker</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Criteria for Placement and Movement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inclusion School Philosophy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Set Procedures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Multiple Placement Options</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Administrative Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intergency Collaboration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parent Collaboration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Flexible Academic Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education Teacher Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trained and Prepared Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive Willing Attitudes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Continuing Education and Professional Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Flexible Academic Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations – add higher teacher expectations, information regarding legal mandates to general education staff

**Special Education Teacher Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consultant Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Flexible Classroom Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff Collaboration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Curricular Accommodations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations – add high teacher expectations, student-centered connectedness, data-driven decision making, ability to relate to students' lives, and strong sense of caring, defining differences between accommodations and modifications,

**Teaching/Instructing Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1.57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use of self-management Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of Peer-tutoring</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use of Behavioral Strategies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of Social Skills Curriculum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use of a Problem Solving Process</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations – use self-determination with self-management, add Positive Behavior Supports

Observations:

1. Voytecki (=1) is a center-based teacher of students with EBD. I noticed that she rated staff collaboration, parent collaboration, inclusion philosophy, administration support, peer-tutoring, behavioral strategies, and set procedures much lower than that other experts. Although she did not state this – I have a feeling that is because her experience in a center-based program lends itself to lower levels of collaboration, and set procedures already in place and supported automatically by administration.

2. Program indices did not have a clear cut #1, however, when the ratings were averaged out multiple placement options and an school inclusion philosophy were rated highest by the experts.

   General education teacher indices – trained and prepared staff was the clear cut #1 pick. 3 of 4 experts rated it as their highest in importance with positive willing attitudes as a close 2nd.

   Special Education teacher indices – staff collaboration was the clear cut #1 pick. 3 of 4 experts rated it highest in importance with flexible classroom programs a close 2nd.

   Teaching Instructional indices – social skills curriculum and use of self-management strategies received the highest ratings from the experts.
June 25, 2002

Dear Expert;

Thank-you for providing feedback on the list of variables for successful programming for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. On the second page of this document you will find a revised list of variables which includes the feedback received from the various experts.

As promised, I am returning this revised list to you for a second review. This time I am asking each expert to rate all variables with the appropriate rating from the list below. You may use each rating as many times as needed to accurately reflect your knowledge and expertise regarding students with emotional and behavioral disabilities.

1 ESSENTIAL
2 SUPPORTIVE
3 NOT SUPPORTIVE
4 NEUTRAL

An essential rating means the variable is essential to a program’s success in working with students with EBD, a supportive rating indicates the variable is helpful to the success of a program, however, is not essential to the success. A not supportive rating indicates the variable is not helpful to the success of a program while a neutral rating indicates it makes no difference whether or not the variable is implemented in a program for students with EBD.

Once again, if you have any questions or comments please respond to this email or call at (616) 998-8705. When you have completed the ratings and provided any remaining feedback you have to offer, please attach the document back to me via email at this summer email address s8hoekst@wmich.edu. Thank-you for taking the time to complete a second review. I will be using this list in my survey of all the school districts in the State of Michigan in the fall. I will send you a copy of the survey when it is complete.

Sincerely,

Alice Hoekstra
Doctoral Associate
Western Michigan University
**Quality Indices of Successful Programs for Students With Emotional and Behavioral Disorders – Revised**

*For each variable, please put a X under the rating that corresponds most accurately with your expertise*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Variables</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Criteria for Placement and Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inclusion School Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Set Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Multiple Placement Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Administrative Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interagency Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parent Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Flexible Academic Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education Teacher Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Teacher Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Trained and Prepared Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Positive and Willing Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Continued Education and Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Flexible Academic Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. High Teacher Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Trained Staff in Legal Mandates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Education Teacher Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Teacher Indices</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Consultant Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Flexible Classroom Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Staff Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Curricular Adaptations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. High Teacher Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Student-Centered Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Data-Driven Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Relation to Students’ Lives with a Strong Sense of Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Teaching/Instructing Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. Use of Self-Management/Self-Determination Techniques
24. Use of Peer-tutoring
25. Use of Behavioral Strategies
26. Use of Social Skills Curriculum
27. Use of a Problem Solving Process
28. Use of Academic Instruction Strategies
29. Use of Differentiated/Individualized Instruction
30. Use of Positive Behavior Supports
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Quality Indices of Successful Programs for Students With Emotional and Behavioral Disorders
Final Revision by Experts

Program Variables
1. Criteria for Placement and Movement
2. School-Wide Inclusion Philosophy
3. Set Procedures
4. Multiple Placement Options
5. Administrative Support
6. Interagency Collaboration
7. Parent Collaboration
8. Flexible Academic Programs

General Education Teacher Variables
1. Trained and Prepared Staff
2. Positive Willing Attitudes
3. Continuing Education and Professional Development
4. Flexible Academic Instruction
5. High Teacher Expectations
6. Staff Collaboration

Special Education Teacher Indices
1. Consultant Support
2. Flexible Classroom Programs
3. Staff Collaboration
4. Curricular Accommodations
5. High Teacher Expectations

Teaching/Instructing Indices
1. Use of self-management/self determinations
2. Use of Peer-tutoring
3. Use of Behavioral Strategies
4. Use of Social Skills Curriculum
5. Use of Instructional Teaching Strategies
6. Use of Differentiated/Individualized Instruction
Appendix C

Quality Indices Survey
Survey of Programs for Students with Emotional & Behavioral Disorders
Districts in the State of Michigan
September 2002

Section 1: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Michigan School District ________________________________
2. Location of District:
   Urban [ ] Suburban [ ] Rural [ ]
3. Current Position in the District: Please check one
   [ ] Teacher Consultant  [ ] Special Education Director
   [ ] Special Education Supervisor  [ ] Principal
   [ ] Superintendent  [ ] Other __________________________
4. This survey reflects information regarding (Please check one)
   [ ] Secondary Programming  [ ] Elementary Programming
   [ ] Elementary & Secondary Programming
   (If this survey reflects either secondary or elementary programming exclusively, please complete a second survey indicating programming information for the other level)

Section 2: PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Please circle the appropriate response for the following questions regarding your district’s current programming for students with emotional and behavioral disorders.

1. Our school district has a continuum of services for students with EBD.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Somewhat  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

2. Our school district has an inclusion option for students with EBD.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Somewhat  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

3. Our school district has a self-contained option for students with EBD.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Somewhat  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
4. Our school district has a resource room option for students with EBD.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Somewhat  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

5. Our school district has teacher consultant support for students with EBD.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Somewhat  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

6. Our school district has a center-based program for students with EBD available for our use.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Somewhat  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

7. Our school district feels successful regarding the progress made including students with EBD in the general education environment.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Somewhat  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

8. Our district feels frustrated regarding the lack of progress made including students with EBD in the general education environment.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Somewhat  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

9. What percent of the time does your district place students in a center-based program for students with EBD?
   10%  20%  30%  40%  50%  60%  70%  80%  90%  100%  ?

10. What percent of the time does your district place students in an inclusion program?
    10%  20%  30%  40%  50%  60%  70%  80%  90%  100%

11. What percent of the time does your district place students in a self-contained program?
    10%  20%  30%  40%  50%  60%  70%  80%  90%  100%

12. What percent of the time does your district place students in a resource room program?
    10%  20%  30%  40%  50%  60%  70%  80%  90%  100%
Section 3: QUALITY INDICE USE

Below you will find the list of quality indices developed from the literature indicating essential elements to a successful program for students with EBD. Please use the rating scales to rate the variables according to your district's use of the following indices and how the district feels about each variable used to implement successful programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District's Level of Use</th>
<th>District's Feeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Used</td>
<td>5. Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Not Used</td>
<td>6. Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Not Available</td>
<td>7. Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Implementation in Progress</td>
<td>8. Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Variables

13. Criteria for Placement
14. School-Wide Inclusion School Philosophy
15. Set Procedures
16. Multiple Placement Options
17. Administrative Support
18. Interagency Collaboration
19. Parent Collaboration
20. Flexible Academic Programs

General Education Teacher Variables

21. Trained and Prepared Staff
22. Positive Willing Attitudes
23. Continuing Education/Professional Development
24. Flexible Academic Instruction
25. High Teacher Expectations
26. Staff Collaboration
Special Education Teacher Variables

27. Consultant Support
28. Flexible Classroom Programs
29. Staff Collaboration
30. Curricular Accommodations
31. High Teacher Expectations

Teaching/Instructing Variables

35. Use of Self-management/Self-determination
36. Use of Peer-tutoring
37. Use of Behavioral Strategies
38. Use of Social Skills Curriculum
40. Use of Instructional Teaching Strategies
41. Use of Differentiated/Individualized Instruction
Section 4: Narrative Questions

42. Describe your district's current philosophy regarding the provision of services to students with EBD?

43. Describe some of the barriers your district faces when attempting to integrate students with EBD into the general education setting.

44. Describe one area your district succeeds in regarding services provided to students with EBD, then describe one area you feel the district could improve in.
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Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Application (HSIRB)
Date: 8 August 2002

To: Elizabeth Whitten, Principal Investigator
   Alice Hoekstra, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Mary Lagerwey, Chair

Re: Approval not needed: 02-07-21

This letter will serve as confirmation that your project "The Use of Quality Indices for Successful Programs for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders in the State of Michigan" has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB). Based on that review, the HSIRB has determined that approval is not required for you to conduct this project because the data being collected is about school districts and not individuals. Thank you for your concerns about protecting the rights and welfare of human subjects.

A copy of your protocol and a copy of this letter will be maintained in the HSIRB files.
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
APPLICATION FOR PROJECT REVIEW

I. BASIC INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: The Use of Quality Indicators for Successful Programs for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders in the State of Michigan.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR OR ADVISOR
Social Security Number: 354-40-0380
Name: Elizabeth Whitten
Electronic Mail Address: Whitten@wmich.edu
Department: ES
Street or Campus Address: 3505 Sangren Hall
City: Kalamazoo
State: MI
ZIP: 49008
Office Phone: (616)387-5940
Home Phone: (616)372-7343

(1) CO-PRINCIPAL OR STUDENT INVESTIGATOR
Social Security Number: 376-98-7685
Name: Alice Hoekstra
Department: ES
Electronic Mail Address: s8hoekst@wmich.edu
Street or Campus Address: 5088 ON Ave.
City: Kalamazoo
State: MI
ZIP: 49009
Office Phone: (616)998-8705
Home Phone: (616)372-7098

If this is a student investigator, please indicate status:

☑ Undergraduate ☑ Master level student ☒ Doctoral level student

☐ Assisting Faculty Research ☐ Thesis ☒ Dissertation

☐ Other (please specify):

(2) CO-PRINCIPAL OR STUDENT INVESTIGATOR
Social Security Number: 
Name: 
Department: 
Title: Select one
Electronic Mail Address: 
Street or Campus Address: 
City: 
Office Phone: 
Home Phone: 

If this is a student investigator, please indicate status:

☑ Undergraduate ☑ Master level student ☒ Doctoral level student

☐ Assisting Faculty Research ☐ Thesis ☒ Dissertation

☐ Other (please specify):

COLLABORATING INVESTIGATORS AND AFFILIATIONS

Name: Affiliation:
Name: Affiliation:
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II. Targeted Participant Pool

Total number of subjects: 744
Number of subjects in the control group: 0
Age range: 30-60
Gender: Both
Ethnic Minority: None

Inclusionary criteria: Administrators knowledgeable of special education programming in their school district
Exclusionary criteria: No knowledge of special education programming

Source of participants: Administrators of Special Education in local school districts in the State of Michigan

Length of participation: 1 month

Participants which may Require Special Consideration: (Check all that apply.)
- None
- Children (age range: )
- Cognitively impaired persons
- Prisoners
- Pregnant or lactating women
- Blind individuals
- Other subjects whose life circumstances may interfere with their ability to make free choice in consenting to take part in research (please specify):

III. HSIRB Protocol Outline:

Potential source(s) of funding: Department of Educational Studies
WMU proposal number: 1
Date of proposal submission to agency: 07/31/02
Site(s) of the research activity: WMU

Letters of approval from project site officials are not needed (research on-campus).

Prepare a proposal for review by HSIRB that follows the outline below. Do not submit your thesis dissertation proposal, grant application, etc. These cannot be processed by HSIRB and will be returned to you. Please review your proposal and mark each box below with a B following review of that section.

☑ PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Includes purpose, research procedure (including what exactly participants do as part of the study), research design, location and duration.

☐ BENEFITS OF RESEARCH: Briefly describe the expected or known benefits of the research. Indicate benefits specific to the research participants in addition to longer term or more general benefits.

☑ SUBJECT SELECTION: Describe in detail how you intend to go about contacting and recruiting participants. Attach all written advertisements, posters and oral recruitment scripts.

☐ RISKS TO SUBJECTS: Describe the nature and likelihood of possible risks (e.g., physical, psychological, social) as a result of participation in the research. Risks include even mild discomforts or inconvenience as well as potential for disclosure of sensitive information.

☐ PROTECTION FOR SUBJECTS: Describe measures to be taken to protect subjects from possible risk or discomfort.

☐ CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA: Describe the precautions that will be taken to ensure the privacy of subjects and confidentiality of information. Be explicit if data are sensitive. Describe coding procedures and subject identification numbers. Include the method, location and duration of data retention. (Federal regulations require data to be maintained for a minimum of 3 years.)

☐ INSTRUMENTATION: All questionnaires, interview scripts, and data collection instruments must be identified and attached. Coding sheets for video-tape or audio-tape and other data collection procedures required.

☐ INFORMED CONSENT PROCESS: For all research, regardless of whether or not a signed consent form is required, describe the process by which informed consent will be obtained. If the participant is a child or mentally retarded, explain how the parent(s)/guardian(s) will be contacted for consent and how the participant understands what he/she is consenting to. A copy of all consent forms will be retained.
IV. LEVEL OF REVIEW

☐ Exempt: This project is exempt because the research is surveys/interviews (not of children).
Forward the original application to the office of the research compliance coordinator, 251W Walwood Hall.

☐ Expedited: This project is eligible for expedited review because it involves Select one.
Forward the original application to the office of the research compliance coordinator, 251W Walwood Hall.

☐ Full: Forward original application plus 15 copies to the office of the research compliance coordinator, 251W Walwood Hall. If blood products are involved, you must complete and attach the HSIRB collection of blood and blood products form. Your application must be in the research office by 5:00 pm on the first Wednesday of the month in order to be reviewed at the board meeting on the third Wednesday of that month.

IV. CERTIFICATION/SIGNATURE

I certify that the information contained in this HSIRB application and all attachments is true and correct. I certify that I have received approval to conduct this research from all persons named as collaborators and from officials of the project sites. If this proposal is approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, I agree to conduct the research according to the approved protocol. I agree not to implement any changes in the protocol until such changes have been approved by HSIRB. If, during the course of the research, unanticipated risks or harm to subjects are discovered, I will report them to HSIRB immediately.

[Signatures]

[Signature Dates]
Western Michigan University
Department of Educational Studies

TITLE OF THE STUDY: The Use of Quality Indices for Successful Programs for Students with Emotional/Behavior Disorders in the State of Michigan

RESEARCHER: Alice Hoekstra

Contact Address: 5088 ON Ave W.
Kalamazoo, MI 49009
(616) 998-8705

Affiliation: Doctoral Student – Special Education Administration
Department of Educational Studies
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008
(616) 387-5935

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Purpose
The purpose of this dissertation study is to develop from current research and experts in the field the quality indices essential to implementing successful programs for students with emotional and behavior disorders (EBD) in the least restrictive environment. It is also to determine the quality indices currently being used by each school district in the State of Michigan and how the use of these variables affect the placement of students with EBD in general education settings.

Research Procedure
The research questions are three-fold (1) What are the essential and supportive variables needed to be implemented in order for students with EBD to be successful in general education settings; (2) Which quality indices are being implemented by school districts in the State of Michigan; and (3) How successful is each district in placing students with EBD in partial and full inclusion settings?

This study will use “The Quality Indices Survey” created by the researcher from the literature review to determine the use of the quality indices in each local education agency (LEA) in the State of Michigan. In addition, the survey will ask questions regarding the placement of students with EBD in partial and full inclusion settings. Finally, supervisors from five urban, five suburban, and five rural school districts will be randomly selected to participate in a follow-up interview to provide an opportunity for extension on answers given in the survey.
The survey will be uploaded onto the internet on a web page. Emails will then be sent to each participant requesting participation with a link to the survey web page. Follow-up emails will be sent out in two-week increments in order to guarantee a good return rate.

Interviews will be conducted once all survey data has been collected.

Research Design
Quantitative survey research will be the method used to gather the data for this study. The survey will be comprised of questions regarding demographic information, special education placement information regarding students with EBD, the use of quality indices in programs currently implemented the district, and the percentage of students with EBD in general education settings. In addition, participants will be asked to complete a written section of the survey. These questions will request information regarding district philosophy, barriers, successful areas, and areas to improve on in regard to services provided to students with EBD. Qualitative research will be used in the follow-up interviews of administrators in five urban, suburban, and rural school districts in order to extend information provided by the survey.

Data collected from the survey will then be coded and analyzed using quantitative data analysis including descriptive statistics, correlations, and dependent t tests. In addition, a qualitative analysis will be used to seek out themes pulled from the written part of the survey including the interviews completed with the supervisors from five urban, suburban, and rural districts.

Location and Duration
The data from the survey will be collected and analyzed during the 2002-2003 school year. This research study will take place from approximately September 1, 2002 to April 26, 2003.

BENEFITS OF RESEARCH

One benefit of this research study is the development of a research and expert based quality indice list regarding the essential variables needed for programmatic success for students with emotional/behavior disorders. This list can be very useful for administrators across the country in their attempts to create programs that not only comply with federal law and state rules and regulations, but programs that allow opportunities for students to reach their maximum potential.

Another benefit will be to document the essential strategies, support systems, and quality indices currently being used in school districts throughout the State of Michigan. Additionally, this research will determine baseline data regarding current placements of students with EBD in mainstreamed and inclusive general education settings. This data will allow the state to identify regions within the state that are in need of support in order to better meet the needs of students with EBD and reach full compliance.
SUBJECT SELECTION
Participants will be selected based on their position as director/supervisor of special education in local education agencies in the State of Michigan. There are approximately 744 public school districts in the state, therefore, data will be analyzed from surveys returned from the administrators in these 744 districts. An email list of the director/supervisors will be obtained from the Department of Education. Subjects will be taken from this master administrator list. Administrators from five randomly selected urban, suburban, and rural school district, who have previously completed the on-line survey, will then be interviewed for follow-up information by this researcher.

RISKS TO SUBJECTS
Although there are no potential physical risks in the participation in this research study, there is however some inconvenience of time. Special education directors/supervisors are very busy people who balance the use of their time on a daily basis. The researchers have taken this fact into consideration and determined an online survey would be much more convenient than a paper and pencil version. Not only will it take less time to complete, but the results can be returned immediately. There is no potential for disclosure of sensitive information. The survey does not ask for any information already obtained by the State Department of Education. In addition, the confidentiality of data will ensure personal names are not associated with school district data.

PROTECTION FOR SUBJECTS
Names of the administrators selected to participate in the survey and interviews will not be used in association with the data. Survey respondents may withdraw their participation in the survey or interview at any time. If this request is made after the surveys have been administered, the respondent should submit a written request to the researcher and her doctoral committee.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA
In order to assure the confidentiality of data, each district in the state will be given a number when the survey is returned to the researchers. Numbers will be coded along with the district name. The survey form will not ask for participants' names only job title and district name. Comments regarding results of service delivery will be referred to by geographical area (Southwest Michigan, Northern Michigan, etc.) or by school size (urban, rural, or suburban). Hard copies of the surveys will be stored in the principal researcher's office in the Department of Educational Studies in locked file cabinet for the federally mandated three-year period. Results of the online surveys will be sent to an email address set up by the researcher for the purpose of this research. When the data collection is complete, the data and email address will be erased and deleted.
INSTRUMENTATION
Two instruments will be used in this study. The two instruments used are “The Quality Indices Survey” and the “Follow-Up Interview Form” designed by the research of this doctoral student. Please see attachment for copies of both of these instruments.

INFORMED CONSENT
All participation is voluntary and consent is going to be obtained from participants by filling out the survey. Participants may withdraw their consent at any time during the research process by notifying the researcher and/or her doctoral committee.

CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION
All participants must be administrators in a school district in the State of Michigan. All must be actively engaged in their professional activities. They must have knowledge of special education programming in the district in which they work. If they do not meet these criteria, they cannot participate in this study.
Appendix E

Quality Indices Survey Cover Letters
September 16, 2002

Dear Special Education Administrators:

My name is Alice Hoekstra and I am a Doctoral Student at Western Michigan University and teacher consultant in the Comstock Public Schools. For my dissertation, I am conducting a survey study on programs and services for EI students in local school districts across the State of Michigan. It is important to collect information from each individual local school district, so I am asking your assistance by completing a survey with information from your district. The purpose of this study is to indicate existing programs and services and the success of these programs and services within our state. Attached to this email is a link to the website that contains the survey. The survey is online and once it is completed, please click on the send button and the results will be submitted.

Please assist me in this project endorsed by the Michigan Department of Education and more specifically the Department of Special Education and Early Intervention Services.

Your support on this project is appreciated. Not only is this supporting research into best practices with students who display emotional and behavior problems, it is supporting the collection of information that will help the State of Michigan support its local school districts serve children with special needs. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to call me at (616) 998-8705 or email at hockstraa@comstockps.org, or contact my advisor and co-investigator, Dr. Elizabeth Whitten at (616) 387-5940 or email at Whitten@wmich.edu.

Sincerely,

Alice Hoekstra
October 20, 2002

Dear Special Education Administrators:

My name is Alice Hoekstra and I am Doctoral student in Special Education Administration at Western Michigan University and a teacher consultant in the Comstock Public Schools. I am currently conducting a survey research study on the programs and services for students with Emotional Impairments implemented in local public school districts in the State of Michigan. This research study is a collaboration between WMU and the State Department of Education. It is important to collect information from each local district, therefore, I am requesting your assistance in this project by completing the enclosed survey with information from your district. The purpose of this study is to determine existing programs and services and placements of students within existing programs across the state.

The survey can also found online. If you feel comfortable using the internet, the survey can be found:


The survey takes approximately 5 minutes to complete. If you complete the paper version, please return the results by using the return envelope provided. If you complete the online survey, you can submit the results by hitting the submit button at the bottom of the webpage.

Your support on this project is appreciated. Not only are you supporting research into best practices when working with students with emotional and behavioral disorders, you are providing data that will help the State of Michigan support its local-school districts serve children with special needs. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (269) 998-8705 or email at s8hoekst@wmich.edu, or contact my advisor and co-investigator, Dr. Elizabeth Whitten at (269) 387-5940 or email at Whitten@wmich.edu.

Sincerely,

Alice Hoekstra

Department of Educational Studies
College of Education
Western Michigan University
November 22, 2002

Dear Special Education Administrators,

My name is Alice Hoekstra and I am a Doctoral Student at Western Michigan University and teacher consultant in the Comstock Public Schools. For my dissertation, I am conducting a survey study on programs and services for EI students in local school districts across the State of Michigan. It is important to collect information from each individual local school district, so I am asking your assistance by completing a survey with information from your district. The purpose of this study is to indicate existing programs and services and the success of these programs and services within our state.

Enclosed you will find a paper copy of the survey. Please assist me in this project endorsed by the Michigan Department of Education and more specifically the Department of Special Education and Early Intervention Services.

Your support on this project is appreciated. Not only is this supporting research into best practices with students who display emotional and behavior problems, it is supporting the collection of information that will help the State of Michigan support its local school districts serve children with special needs. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to call me at (616) 998-8705 or email at hoekstra@comstock.k12.mi.us or contact my advisor and co-investigator, Dr. Elizabeth Whitten at (616) 387-5940 or email at Whitten@wmich.edu.

Please return the survey to at no cost to you to: Alice Hoekstra
Special Education Teacher Consultant
Comstock Northeast Middle School
REMC mail

Sincerely,

Alice Hoekstra
Appendix F

Rationale for Data Clean-Up
Rationale for Data Clean-Up

On the survey used in this dissertation study, there was a category of “other” for some of the questions so districts who felt they did not fit in any of the scaled categories could enter a response. After all of the data was collected the researcher went into the data and cleaned up the “other” responses based on information the districts gave. Below is the rationale the researcher used when cleaning up the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec 1-3</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent marked down in Superintendent category ISD Director marked down as Director of Special Education Related Service Personnel marked down as Teacher Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 1-4</td>
<td>K-8 was defined as elementary and secondary programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 2-2</td>
<td>Districts reporting no inclusion programs were marked as disagreeing they have inclusion available. Districts that have no regular education in the building were marked as disagreeing with having inclusion available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 2-3</td>
<td>Districts describing their self-contained program were marked down as agreeing they had a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 2-4</td>
<td>Districts describing when their resource room was used were marked down as agreeing they had a resource room program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 2-5</td>
<td>Districts describing how they received teacher consultant support were marked down as having teacher consultant support available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 2-6</td>
<td>Districts describing the availability of a center-based program were marked down as agreeing they have a center-based program available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 2-7</td>
<td>Districts stating it their feeling of success depended on things in the district were marked down as feeling somewhat successful with students with EBD. Districts describing their success were marked down as agreeing they were successful with students with EBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec 2-8</td>
<td>Districts stating it their feeling of frustration depended on things in the district or were ½ and ½ were marked down as feeling somewhat frustrated with students with EBD. Districts describing their success were marked down as agreeing they were successful with students with EBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Placements in Programs of Students with EBD
Appendix H

Programs and District Success Versus Frustration
Availability of Programs and Success & Frustration of Districts

The following bar graphs represent the availability of programs in districts in the State of Michigan and the success and frustration regarding progress made with students with EBD in the participating districts. It is important to know the scale with which district administrators or participants rated the availability and the success and/or frustration. Here are the scales for both the availability of programs variable and the reported success and frustration of the district.

1=Strongly Disagree  2=Disagree  3=Somewhat  4=Agree  5=Strongly Disagree

For example, when looking at the graphs presenting data on full inclusion and the district feelings of frustration, you notice the districts that reported they agreed or strongly agreed they had inclusion available also were the districts that reported they were somewhat frustrated or disagreed they were frustrated.
District Frustration with Progress

District Success with Progress

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix I

Use of Quality Indice Categories Frequencies
District Use of Program Indices

Criteria for Placement

![Bar chart showing district responses to use of the quality indice for criteria for placement.]

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

School-wide Inclusion Philosophy

![Bar chart showing district responses to use of the quality indice for school-wide inclusion philosophy.]

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

Key:
0 = Missing Data  1 = Used  2 = Implementation in Progress
3 = Not Available  4 = Not Used
Set Procedures

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

Multiple Placement Options

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice
Administrative Support

% of Districts

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

Interagency Collaboration

% of Districts

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice
Districts

% of Districts

Parent Collaboration

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

Flexible Academic Programs

% of Districts

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice
District Use of General Education Teacher Indices

Trained and Prepared Staff

% of Districts

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

Positive and Willing Attitudes

% of Districts

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

Key:
0 = Missing Data  1 = Used  2 = Implementation in Progress
3 = Not Available  4 = Not Used

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Continuing Education/Professional Development

Flexible Academic Instruction

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
High Teacher Expectations

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

General Education Teacher Collaboration

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

% of Districts

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
District Use of Special Education Teacher Indices

Consultant Support

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

Flexible Classroom Programs

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

Key:
0 = Missing Data  1 = Used  2 = Implementation in Progress
3 = Not Available  4 = Not Used

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
High Teacher Expectations

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice

% of Districts

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indice
District Use of Teaching/Instructing Indices

Use of Self-Management/Self Determination Techniques

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indices

Use of Peer-Tutoring

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indices

Key:
0 = Missing Data  1 = Used  2 = Implementation in Progress
3 = Not Available  4 = Not Used

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Use of Behavioral Strategies

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indices

Use of a Social Skills Curriculum

District Responses to Use of the Quality Indices

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix J

District Use of Quality Indices and Availability of Programs
District Use of Quality Indices and Availability of Programs

The bar graphs presented in this appendix represent the use of quality indices and the availability of each of the programs in the continuum of services in the State of Michigan. It is important to remember when looking at this data that the higher the use of quality indice response rate is, the less the quality indices are used in the district. For example, when looking at the first bar graph you will notice the districts not using the quality indices also indicated they did not have the inclusion program available to them to high degree also. In fact, the lowest bar on that graph which represents the districts strongly agreeing they have inclusion available to them, also scored very low quality indice use values. This indicates, districts with inclusion available to them, in this case, also use the quality indices very frequently. Please see the key below before looking at the bar graphs. This will assist you in drawing conclusions from the data.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Use of Quality Indices Response Values

Availability of Inclusion Services

Use of Quality Indices Response Values

Availability of the Continuum of Services

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Use of Quality Indices Response Values

Availability of Self-Contained Programs

Use of Quality Indices Response Values

Availability of Resource Room Programs

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Availability of Center-Based Programs

Use of Quality Indice Response Values
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