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ABSTRACT

An Indepth Study of the Individual Educational Plan in an Urban School District
September, 1980
Jacqueline Grace Reeves,
B. S., Cheyney State College,
M. A., Kean College of New Jersey
Ed. D., University of Massachusetts
Directed by: Dr. Atron A. Gentry

Mainstreaming is a form of educational programming that integrates handicapped pupils and nonhandicapped pupils in regular classrooms. Traditionally, the major educational alternative for handicapped pupils were found outside of the regular school experience, usually at home, in institutions or in special classes. The objective of mainstreaming is to provide a favorable learning environment for handicapped youngsters.

The impetus of mainstreaming expects the regular class teacher to meet the needs of the handicapped in his or her classroom environment.

In order to make certain that each handicapped child receives an appropriate education, a written Individual Educational Plan (IEP) is developed in accordance with the requirements and regulations of the law. The IEP is a written instructional plan for a pupil who has been
determined eligible for special education and related services. It is the student's educational program which must be implemented by the school district. The IEP provides educators and other personnel with prescriptive techniques and procedures to meet the individual pupil's strengths and weaknesses.

The purpose of this study centers around four areas: 1) What number of the total handicapped population are of minority status? 2) Do teachers view the Individual Educational Plan helpful in the areas of:

   a. Classroom Management
   b. Curriculum Planning
   c. Cognitive Development
   d. Parent/Teacher Relationships?

3) Have teachers and parents participated in an Individual Educational Plan Evaluation within the past year? and 4) Do teachers view the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming?

To secure responses to this information, special and regular teachers in three elementary schools were asked to complete a questionnaire constructed by the investigator. The questionnaires consisted of 28 items for Special class teachers, 28 items for regular class teachers, 7 items for parents of mainstream pupils and an 8 item questionnaire for parents of regular class pupils.
Two statistical procedures were applied to analyze the data:

1. Measures of central tendency, and
2. Cross tabulations.

From the results of the analyzed data, the following conclusions were formulated:

1. Eighty percent of the total handicapped population are of minority status. Studies which indicate a higher proportion of minority students in special classes were conformable with the investigator's observations and consistent with studies which show a higher percentage of placement. Administrators are aware of the unusually high proportion of minority class placement.

2. The Individual Educational Plan is helpful in the areas of classroom management, curriculum planning, and cognitive development, although some teachers cannot accept the total Individual Educational Plan.

3. Parent involvement is mandated by Public Law 94-142. Twenty percent of the parent population has participated in an evaluation plan. Teacher evaluation of the IEP has been minimal.

4. Teachers presently view the IEP as an adequate tool for mainstreaming with some reservations.
5. A fuller explanation of Public Law 94-142 is needed for teachers and parents.

6. Meaningful short-term workshops and ongoing renewal sessions should be expanded.

7. Interview data reveals the need for an attitudinal study to assist in the implementation of the mainstream study.

Once written, the Individual Educational Plan becomes the student's instructional plan based on the particular needs of the child. This plan is an attempt to assure that the best educational resources are available to teach educationally handicapped children in an integrated regular classroom environment.
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CHAPTER I
MAINSTREAMING: ITS PERSPECTIVES AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The concept of mainstreaming refers to the process of educating handicapped children in the regular classroom setting with their nonhandicapped peers. Mainstreaming expands the opportunities and options available to handicapped children whose mental, physical, or emotional handicap interferes with their ability to benefit from full-time regular classroom instruction. Mainstreaming does not eliminate the special class nor does it guarantee the placement of all handicapped pupils into the regular classroom environment. Rather, it challenges educators to redefine their roles and rethink their places of responsibility for adequately meeting the needs of the handicapped.

The purpose of this study is to examine the use of the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) at the elementary level. Public Law 94-142, the Education for all Handicapped Children Act, enacted by Congress in November 1975, requires that every handicapped child receive at public expense, an educational plan specifically designed to meet his/her unique educational needs. If mainstreaming is to be successful, it will depend upon the implementation of the Individual Education Plan (IEP) and the services necessary to make that plan a reality.
The Individual Educational Plan for urban districts are usually designed by the Child Study Team. This team consists of the school Psychologist, Learning Disabilities Teacher Consultant, and Social Worker. The IEP outlines the educational plan and services to be provided to meet the pupils' needs. It confines itself to keeping within the law's specification that the educational process be provided in the least restrictive environment with nonhandicapped peers whenever possible. The primary goal of mainstreaming is to give children the learning opportunities they need to become self-sufficient and productive as possible.

Under Public Law 94-142, states are eligible to participate in an ongoing program of federal aid to pay part of the additional cost of educating the handicapped. In order to qualify for federal assistance, each state is required to submit a plan to the federal government showing how it will carry out its commitment to the goal of free and appropriate education for all handicapped children.

Many children have mental, emotional, or learning problems that make it difficult for them to be a part of a school program without special help. Often professionals use such words as "slow learner," "exceptional," "emotionally disturbed," "mildly retarded," or "learning disabled" to describe a handicap. In the public school systems throughout our country, words used to describe children who
require special help and education are defined by law. The definitions are used for state and federal government reports for obtaining additional funds that are available for special education services. No definition is an absolute judgment of a child's strengths and weaknesses. Most classifications are based on the results of tests and examinations and the judgment of a variety of professionals.

Although the mainstreaming movement in education is having impact on all handicapped children, its greatest impact falls on a group of handicapped children labeled as "educable mentally retarded" or "special needs." These terms refer to those children whose handicapping condition is one of slow mental development and they are unable to profit sufficiently from the program of the regular school.

The unusual characteristics of educable mentally retarded children provided the bases for the development of an area of education called special education.

Educators became convinced that handicapped children's potentialities and needs could not be met through regular education but required special efforts on the part of teachers and other professional personnel known as ancillary and resource personnel. These services are used to supplement the regular school program. Ancillary and resource personnel may mean a teacher assigned to teach children confined to bed in hospitals or at home; it may mean an itinerant teacher who helps the regular teacher at specific
times; it may mean a class in which handicapped children learn their basic subject matter, but join regular children in class discussions; or it may mean a completely segregated self-contained class in a single room without participation in the regular classroom program. This type of class is commonly referred to as special class.

Historically, the literature of special education reveals that many children who attended urban schools were placed in special classes and in actuality were not in need of such services. Poor and minority students are the major victims of such placement. Parents and educators questioned the efficiency of such a system of inappropriate placement. Special classes were criticized for stigmatizing children, lessening their self-esteem and depriving handicapped pupils of normal interpersonal relationships with their peers.¹

Research suggests (Kirk 1964, Hoelke 1966) that handicapped children in regular class programs function better and learn as much as handicapped children in special classes. Studies by Smith and Kennedy (1967) and Johnson (1962) provide similar data.² Since the passage of Public Law 94-142, educational equity has been, for the most part untested


²Ibid. p. 7.
and unstudied. A need exists to examine the mainstream process, as an alternative mode of education to special class placement, particularly in an urban school setting.

One of the critical problems facing urban communities is the issue of educating minority groups residing in the inner city. The children may be black, white, yellow, red or brown, and may belong to any number of ethnic groups. Terms such as so-called "disadvantaged," "culturally deprived" and "low socio-economic status" are generally applied to inner city populations.

Urban schools have failed to provide the educational experience needed to help overcome the effects of low pupil achievement. From this premise, education must define its curriculum and school community for which it prepares its students. If the schools do not rapidly and effectively solve the problem of failure to educate students in urban schools, the city with critical social problems faced by large urban populations will be exacerbated.

**Special Education: Its Character**

The term special education refers to handicapped children with special needs along with many other labeled children who fall into a broad list of categories. The identifying process has created educational problems by helping as well as hindering the progress of children placed in special education. The label helps in orienting nonhandicapped persons to the fact that the individual is
confronted with one or more obstacles that impede his learning and/or behavioral development. The label becomes a hinderance when people stereotype and neglect the individual's strengths and capabilities.

Special education has tended to rely upon norms as basic tools for identifying children, evaluating their growth, and for individualized instruction. As educators learned more and more about how children learn, about their unique and differing learning styles, they began to recognize a special group of children who were having academic difficulties.

When a child does not succeed in a regular class setting, it is assumed that there is a problem and the child is placed in a special education program and then labeled with some type of learning disorder. Because the terms and labels are used by psychologists, educators and physicians, it is easy to "fit" many children in order to provide them with needed individual attention. The behavior of the pupils fit all or part of all the defined label. Unfortunately, this has reinforced and perpetuated the attitude that if a child is not learning at grade level or using grade level materials, he or she should be receiving special education services.

Special Education: Its Services

Historically, the education of handicapped pupils has not been one of integration into society's mainstream.
Special classes came into being in the United States in the year 1869. Improved, increased services for handicapped children were seen during the 1920's and 1930's. The depression and World War II impeded any progress in special education. By 1940 the demands of parents, educators, federal and state funding gave impetus to special education progress.

Significant attention was directed to special education services during the 1950's and delivery services were advanced. In 1961, President John F. Kennedy committed America's resources to the care of the handicapped.

Statistical review (Mackie 1969) indicated that approximately 90 percent of the retarded children in special education programs were receiving instruction in special classes by 1963.

Criticism of special education services has been expressed in literature as far back as 1960. Johnson (1962) questioned the validity of segregated classes for educable retarded pupils. Dunn (1968) questioned the justification of special education for mildly retarded pupils. Educators could not or would not admit that educable retarded classes

---

3 Frank M. Hewett and Steven Forness, Education of Exceptional Learners (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974, p. 55.
4 Ibid. p. 49.
5 Ibid. p. 50.
6 Jones and MacMillan, p. 55.
had become "holding pens" for many children not prepared to meet the demands of school.

Tests such as intelligence tests have been used as one criteria for special class placement; however, intelligence tests are being attacked on the grounds that they do not fairly sample different cultural backgrounds, (Stattler, 1973); differential ability tests are suspect because of their uncertain relationships with school tasks, (Hammill, 1972; Hammill and Larsen, 1974); and the standardized achievement tests are criticized for their failure to provide adequate information that aids in instructional decision making, (Eaton and Lovitt, 1972; Popham, 1974). 7

When children enter public school and indicate an inability to perform as their so-called normal peers, tests and special categories are set up by educators to channel those children into special educational programs. The special program is designed to accommodate the "learning disability" displayed by the children. Erving Goffman states bluntly the stigmatizing and damaging effects labels and categories can produce upon pupils in special education:

... In an effort to avoid the necessity of radically changing the education system in the black ghetto, the educational establishment has found it expedient to turn to special education, to greatly expand the special education program serving black children. What this

7Anne L. Pasanella and Cara B. Voltmor, Coming Back or Never Leaving (Columbus, Ohio, Charles B. Merrill Co., 1977), p. 11.
effectively does is label a disproportionate number of black children and other minority children as retarded, disturbed, and/or delinquent. By means of this labeling process, the general educational enterprise is allowed to evade the responsibility for its failure to adopt to the needs of its black clientele.

The problems of educational inequities against handicapped pupils were identified in the courts. The legal bases for litigation involving the rights of handicapped students are the due process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. Out of sheer frustration, parents sought help through the judicial process for what they considered as educational inequities against their handicapped children. This action encouraged other parents with handicapped children who had been denied any type of free public education that was appropriate. The formation of parent's groups brought legal suits against boards of education for failing to provide appropriate educational services for handicapped children. These suits resulted in the ruling that all handicapped children have a right to an education.

The banner year came in 1975 when parent action challenged the court which brought about the passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education for all Handicapped Children Act.

---


9 Posanella and Voltmor, p. 10.
commonly referred to as "Mainstreaming." School systems were mandated to take action by correcting past failures in providing appropriate education for handicapped children.

Special Education: Its Assessment

Much of the current research on special education programs focuses on assessing the academic progress and social adjustment of handicapped students in special classes. Few researchers address the topic of the handicapped students who remain in regular classes (Goldstein, Moss, and Jordan, 1965; Smith and Kennedy, 1967; Bradfield 1973; Vacc 1972; Cegelka and Tyler 1970). The data indicate stronger academic gains for students in regular classes than those students in special classes. Because of the results of this data, educators began to question the effectiveness of special class placement. Professionals were forced to stop looking at the peripheral boundaries of special education classes and focus on an indepth analysis of the actual classroom situation.

Racial imbalance was one of the major criticisms stated by author-educator Lloyd M. Dunn (1968) who pointed out that 60 to 80 percent of special class students are from low status backgrounds which included Mexican Americans and Blacks.

Evidence points to the fact that racial imbalance has largely been attributed to the use of standardized intelligence tests, resulting in a disproportionately larger number of minorities (Mercer 1973).

Generally, most intelligence tests reflect the culture and language patterns of Anglo-Americans and most standardized samples are on this population. Both racial and socio-economic differences may place students at a disadvantage and adversely affect performance on these tests. Racial discrimination and desegregation focused on special needs classes predominately composed of students from minority backgrounds.

In carrying out the decision of the Supreme Court in Brown vs. Board of Education, (1954), the United States Office of Civil Rights has required school systems to eliminate special classes which were interpreted to be vehicles to defacto segregation.

A major breakthrough via the judicial process in Williams, et al vs. California Board of Education, (1979) has recently had great impact upon the use of intelligence tests. California educational officials were using standardized intelligence tests to place black children in classes for the

---


12 Pasnella and Volkmor, p. 15.
mentally retarded. The plaintiffs argued victoriously that the use of standardized intelligence tests were culturally biased against Black pupils.

... the judge cited violations of specific Federal laws which should be the basis for Federal actions against schools using similar programs.

... Judge Robert F. Peckham found that California's use of intelligence tests for such purposes violated Federal and state constitutional guarantees of equal protection. He also ruled that the state had violated Federal laws on civil rights and education for the handicapped.13

The enrolling of minority students in special classes on the basis of intelligence test scores has been the "norm" for many years throughout the country. From Judge Peckham's ruling educators should be jolted into re-examining their use of intelligence test scores. It is interesting to note the California statistics showed that in 80 percent of the school districts, 62 percent of the mentally retarded students were Black children. The statistics revealed that Black children scored 15 points below White children on standardized intelligence tests. "Even witnesses from the companies that produce the test admitted we cannot truly define much less measure intelligence."14 Judge Peckham determined

---

14Ibid.
that score differences between Whites and Blacks was the product of cultural bias against Black children which was ingrained in the development of the test.

Test abuse has resulted in psychological damage in American school systems. Whether through ignorance or intent, tests exclude rather than include and have been often used to reinforce a vortex of inferiority, particularly against Blacks and other minorities. Since test results have implication for psychological, emotional, and attitudinal impact on children, it is imperative that test users have an understanding of what the test purports to measure and how the results are to be used.

**Instructional Programs: Change Strategies**

The philosophy of special education and that of Public Law 94-142, are the same--meeting the individual needs of handicapped children. Public Law 94-142 requires the services of a multitude of personnel working together to assess the child's needs, to design a plan for meeting those needs, to implement that plan, to evaluate its effectiveness and to make changes whenever necessary.

The Individual Educational Plan (IEP) is an integral provision of Public Law 94-142. An IEP must be written for each child who is receiving or will receive special education, regardless of the institution or agency providing services. This design gives assurances that children with special
needs will have greater opportunity for successful educational experiences. It also assists educators in designing their teaching and training procedures to the individual's strengths and weaknesses. Abeson and Weintraub (1977) specify the concepts implied by the Individual Educational Program.

Individual means that the program must be addressed to the educational needs of a single child rather than a class or group of children. Education means that the program is limited to those elements of the child's education that are specifically special education and related services as defined by the Act. Program means that the individualized education program is a statement of what will actually be provided to the child, as distinct from a plan that provides guidelines from which a program must subsequently be developed.

The Individual Educational Plan requires teacher involvement and time. If the plan is designed constructively, it can facilitate sound educational planning, student progress and accountability. Success depends on cooperative efforts. Used wisely, the IEP can be the vehicle for communication between special education teachers, administrators and between school personnel and parents.

The mainstreaming process brings about change in the education process. Various strategies and techniques must be considered to precipitate the necessary change that must take place for successful implementation. Mainstreaming

---

16 Ibid., p. 78.
puts demands on counselors, psychologists, special educators, teachers and administrators to develop some new skills in addition to those already possessed. Emphasis must be placed on consultations and co-elaboration between parents and school personnel for successful implementation. Cooperation and collaboration could bring about the new needed strategies and techniques for positive successful change within the urban classroom.

**The Urban School District: A Vignette**

This district is a blighted metropolis located in northern New Jersey. One third of its housing is sub-standard, with a high unemployment rate. The socio-economic level of this district appears to be at its lowest. The public school has an enrollment of 27,000 students. Enrollment decline has only been minimal over a six-year period. Between 1972 and 1977, the school population dropped less than one percent of the total school population of 27,440 students enrolled (see Table 1).

According to the 1970 census, a shifting population is evident in the district, 72 percent of this urban population was White and 22 percent of the 26,000 pupil enrollment were Black or Hispanic.

Change in the racial make-up of the school population has occurred since that report. In 1977-78, over 80 percent of the school population residents were Black or Hispanic.
Table 1

Changes in Resident School Enrollment in an Urban School District, 1972 to 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Pupil Count</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>27,440</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>27,091</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>27,276</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>27,663</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>27,697</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>27,197</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City has become a minority district with its total population remaining predominately White. This change reflects the "white flight" from the public schools.

**Education Expenditures**

In 1974-75, this northern New Jersey school system was disbursing $1,100 educationally per pupil. Per pupil expenditure was 17 percent below the $1,300 state average per pupil medium for Passaic county. Across the state per pupil expenditures averaged $1,900 in 1977-78, an increase of $600 beyond the 1974-75 pupil expenditure. By 1977-78 the administration saw a drop from 17 percent to 36 percent below the state average and from 12 percent to 21 percent below the county average (see Table 3).

The metropolis is a school district in need of dollars. If education is to be valued by its citizens, the value of that dollar should reflect interest and concern for the training of its children leading to a better educational future.

**Pupil Achievement**

The New Jersey Department of Education estimated 40 percent of the students eligible for compensatory education. Students performed at or above the state-wide minimum standard and that performance was the lowest in the county (see Table 4).
Table 2

1977-1978 Racial/Ethnic Enrollment
in an Urban School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Indian/Pacific</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.0%)</td>
<td>(52.0%)</td>
<td>(29.8%)</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Current Expenditures Per Pupil
1974-1975 and 1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Urban School District</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>27.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Average Expenditure per Pupil</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>47.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Average Expenditure per Pupil</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.J.E.R.P. School Finance Data (printouts)
Table 4

County School Districts Ranked High to Low by the Estimated Percentage of Students below the Minimum Standard (District Pupil Achievement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Estimated Percent above Minimum Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloomingdale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haledon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Falls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Milford</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Park</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompton Lakes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanaque</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Paterson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Average</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haledon</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totowa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Average</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated by NJERP from New Jersey Department of Education State Compensatory Education Print-Outs (District Eligibility Levels) and 1977-1978 Enrollment Data.
State-wide Basic Skills Tests administered in 1978 in grades 3, 6, 9 and 11 were among the lowest in the state (see Table 5).

The metropolitan school systems are in a crisis stage. Population shifts, educational neglect and decreases in funding have contributed to this crisis. This all too familiar pattern is characteristic of many urban areas.

The educational role of urban pupils should be redefined for in many ways it appears that the aims and purposes of education for inner-city children are in conflict with other priorities. The city's challenge to the urgent need for educating its students should be in seizing the opportunity to upgrade and shape new educational directions for its urbanized educational society.

Statement of the Problems

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of the Individual Educational Plan (IEP) since the implementation of Public Law 94-142 in a northern New Jersey metropolis, focusing upon the largest existing special needs population in the school system.

Educators view a handicapping condition as a mental, physical or emotional problem that interferes with a child's ability to benefit from full-time regular classroom instruction. It is viewed to mean that the child may need some special help in school.
Table 5

1977-1978 Minimum Basic Skills Test Results
Percent Below Statewide Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Tested</th>
<th>Skill Measured</th>
<th>The Urban District</th>
<th>State Average</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditionally, education of the handicapped child was met by removing him/her from the "mainstream" of regular classes. For some handicapped students, special class placement is still an appropriate alternative, but for many handicapped pupils, there is evidence of a lack of equal opportunities for nonminority children.

Special classes for many handicapped individuals are synonymous with dead-endedness. Teaching methods have limited the possibility of return to regular classes and administrative procedures have made no provision for return. Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, gives strong impetus to educating children in the "least restrictive environment" and provides a basis for the design of this study.

In Public Law 94-142 Congress intended to: a) insure that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate public education which includes special education and related services to meet their unique needs, b) to insure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected, c) to assist states and localities to provide for the education of all handicapped children, and d) to assess and insure the effectiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children."17

The least restrictive environment concept endorsed by Public Law 94-142 is one of great significance. This concept specifically states that handicapped children should be educated with nonhandicapped children to the maximum possible extent. School systems are required to monitor the restrictiveness of their educational placements and advance students from more to less restrictive environments whenever possible. This advancement is to be determined by the student's ability to function within the least restrictive placement. Implementation of this concept should result in a decrease of inappropriate educational placement.

The primary procedure provided in Public Law 94-142, which ensures an appropriate education for the handicapped is a written Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). The written IEP is an attempt to assure that the best available educational methods are used in teaching handicapped children. The content of the IEP as outlined in Public Law 94-142 and published by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped must contain these basic requirements:

1. A statement of the present level of educational performance.
2. The annual goals.
3. Short-term instructional objectives with specific time lines for accomplishment.
4. The specification of the extent to which a child will participate in a regular educational program.
5. The dates during which the IEP will be applicable.
6. The procedures for evaluating the program's effectiveness.

Although individualized instruction is familiar to most educators, the specific requirements of Public Law 94-142 will be new to most teachers, administrators, and parents. The development of IEP's should be an invaluable tool for educators involved in the mainstream process.

**Basic Assumptions**

It is assumed that the Individual Educational Plan has not been successful in some schools. It is also assumed that the IEP has not been a complete failure for many mainstreamed pupils. The interaction between the teacher, parent, and child are important factors which give impetus and strength for indepth study to assess any changes in the implementation of the Individual Educational Plan as it is achieved in an urban school district.

Through observation and program monitoring, the IEP will be assessed as to its affect upon the school curriculum, parent/teacher participation in the design of the plan and its effectiveness as an educational tool based on assumptions to the affirmative.

Minority groups are concerned about the over-representation of minority children in special education classes. It is assumed that a disproportionate number of minority
children in special classes are a result of biased assessment practices. It is the intent of this study to provide pertinent information based on these assumptions.

**Significance of the Study**

Although special education is specialized to meet the needs of the handicapped, criticism of special education has been expressed in educational literature and surveys. Black Americans, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, low socio-economic and other low status groups argue that minority children are doubly penalized. They are victims of discrimination because of race and social class, and they are affected by placement in the stigmatizing special class. Other studies identify educational inequities against handicapped pupils as culturally biased tests, inadequate special education programming and psychological damage resulting from labeling.

A need exists for more effective learning skills and techniques for providing educational equity for handicapped students. Teachers need to be equipped to deal with the special problem of instructing the handicapped child without adversely affecting other students in the classroom. Clearly, effective changes are needed if handicapped students and others are to benefit from the range of services mandated in Public Law 94-142. This change should involve the cooperative efforts of students, teachers, parents, and administrators.
In The Culture of the School and the Problems of Change, Seymour Sarason presents an account of change as behavior remaining the same on the surface, because ways of thinking and viewing problems have not changed. Mainstreaming is an innovated change process for pupils, teachers, and parents. If the Individual Educational Plan is to be successful in urban school districts, administrators, teachers, pupils, and parents should be coherent and consistent in their thinking and viewing of the school culture. The Individual Educational Plan can be the catalyst for successful mainstreaming in urban schools.

The IEP should bring about change in the make-up of many urban classrooms throughout the country. School systems should be alert to act and react directing that action to the successful implementation of the Individual Educational Plan.

This study is significant for there are few relevant models of the Individual Educational Plan and this study attempts to provide such a model.

This study hopes to provide the framework for regular teachers and special education personnel vis-a-vis the mainstreaming process.

This research may be of special value in facilitating information to colleges and universities involved in the training of education majors to meet the demands of Public Law 94-142.
Specific Statement of the Problem

Specific statements relevant to the study are, a) the number of handicapped pupils of minority status; b) teachers' view of the Individual Educational Plan in the area of classroom management, curriculum planning, cognitive development and parent/teacher relationships; c) teacher and parent participation in IEP development; d) the effectiveness of the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming.

Limitation of the Study

Limitations of the study exist in the following areas:

The research population will be drawn from three elementary schools in a northern New Jersey school system with concentration on Individual Educational Plans for four students. The Board of Education policies, teacher time and input, current teacher strikes and the Superintendent's mandate may inhibit some factors of the study.

Summary

The problems associated with educational inequities against handicapped students have been identified as culturally biased tests, inadequate education programming, and psychological damage resulting from labeling and special education placement.

Vocal demands of dissatisfaction from minority groups as well as teachers and administrators have forced some changes,
most noticeable the special education classes are being questioned. In the past, the structure of classes for mildly handicapped children was a short-term stay. Learning skills were to be developed to upgrade the pupils' academic achievement which would permit return to regular class programs as soon as feasible. In actual practice, special classes became entombments for special needs or mildly handicapped pupils. This action revealed educational inequities against handicapped pupils with mild learning disabilities. In 1962, Johnson called attention to the lack of achievement of special class children in spite of smaller class size, trained teachers and specialized curriculum. Dunn (1968) expressed concern about over-representation of minority children in special classes. Dunn wrote:

. . .In my best judgment about 60 to 30 percent of the pupils taught by these teachers are from low status backgrounds—including Afro-American, American Indians, Mexicans, and Puerto Rican Americans; those from non-standard English speaking broken, disorganized and inadequate homes; and children from non-middle class environments. This expensive proliferation of self-contained special schools and classes raises serious education and civil rights issues which must be squarely faced. It is my thesis that we must stop labeling these deprived children as mentally retarded. Furthermore we must stop segregating them by placing them into our alleged special programs.18

Dunn stirred the thinking of educators about minority special class placement, but it was Johnson (1969) who powerfully articulated concerns from a minority viewpoint.

Johnson wrote:

I am suggesting that the educational system has failed in its responsibilities to Black Americans . . . . Recent sophistication in labeling has added such terms as learning disability, slow learner, learning and adjustment problems, and conduct disorder to the more shopworn phrases as mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed. The rule of thumb for Black children is: I.Q. below 75 = learning problems or stupidity, I.Q. above 75 = behavior problem or crazy . . . . Special education has continued blithely initiating special classes, work study programs, resource rooms, and other stigmatizing innovations which blame the poor, Black child for the failure of the dominant educational system (p. 244).19

Black educators were not the last in expressing their concerns. In 1970, the Association of Mexican American Educators recommended:

That school districts place Mexican Americans in special classes (for both the gifted and the retarded) at the same proportions (or percent) that the school districts are placing majority children in special classes.20

Few educators argue with the basic principles of mainstreaming as it relates to the idea of equality and justice. Many educators view mainstreaming as an innovation with the potential for changing the system to better serve all children.

The advocates of mainstreaming support their position on both social and academic grounds. They maintain that the isolation of handicapped children results in their stigmatization and exclusion from opportunities for personal independence

---


20 Ibid. p. 8.
and social and academic interaction with nonhandicapped peers.

Critics of mainstreaming accept the fact that special education classes have not been successful from an academic point of view. They argue that the decision to divert the current special education system and replace it with another should be considered with caution, although the judicial process has spelled out the guidelines for change in its implementation.

The greatest challenge educators face because of Public Law 92-142, is the redefinition of roles for both special education and regular teachers. The responsibility for development and implementation of the Individual Educational Plan must be shared among parents, regular classroom teachers and specialists.

The mainstreaming process affords educators the opportunity to take the lead in developing principles, strategies, and techniques for integrating handicapped children into mainstream settings. Such leadership responsibility requires a careful inventory and re-examination of the role of the educators rather than the student. Each individual must examine his/her own role in his/her own contribution to a system that is repressive, discriminatory, culturally and racially biased, and in many instances not responsive to the needs of children. This type of critical assessment is
essential as a minimum commitment if effective accountability is to be established for the handicapped.

Each educator is summoned to scrutinize the current law and decide whether he/she is part of the problem for change or a part of the solution. Each individual must decide whether he/she will continue dealing with the symptom or begin working on the cause. In the words of Johnson (1969):

... Special education is helping regular school maintain its spoiled identity when it creates special programs ... for the "disruptive child" and the "slow learner" many of whom, for some strange reason, happen to be Black and poor and live in the inner city. (p. 245)

The term handicapped has been used as an all inclusive term encompassing the complete scope of physical, mental and emotional states which interferes with a child’s academic performance. Specialized programs have been developed to meet the child's handicapped condition.

Handicapping conditions are widespread among the poor. Other minorities along with Blacks are over-represented in low socio-economic levels. Educators recognize the seriousness of the problems and should uphold every principle that will lead to more appropriate and effective programming for handicapped students.

---

Chapter II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter Two focuses upon a discriminating review of the literature in the following areas:

1. The history and application of special classes for handicapped children.

2. The concept of mainstreaming and its implementation in an urban setting.

3. Problems associated with minority class placement in urban schools.

The search of the literature in addition reveals that the core of the problems facing public schools is the difficulty of diagnosing educational handicaps. The ambiguity of educational terms, and the organizational process of categorizing vary within school districts, resulting in inadequate education for handicapped children. However inconsistent, education of the handicapped is headed towards integration with their nonhandicapped peers.

The History and Application of Special Education Classes

Historically, when children were born with any kind of physical or mental defect, they were considered by society to be cursed by God or by the devil. These
children were placed in institutions and isolated from society. European pioneers demonstrated that handicapped children were capable of learning and special education became a reality in residential schools.

The first day school program provided for educable mentally retarded was started in Providence, Rhode Island in 1896. The program aimed to provide instruction for children excluded from the public schools. Even though there were limitations of such placements, special education developed as the primary means of providing special education assistance to retarded children. 22

At the turn of the century, educational programming moved slowly into the public schools. This movement was, in part, the result of parental influence on school boards demanding that communities provide programs for children with handicaps. Education for handicapped individuals took the form of special classes and special schools which were separate from the regular education of so-called "normal" children. As services increased, school systems amplified the definition of retardation. Categories of handicaps were expanded to include those children deemed difficult to teach or culturally different as assessed by the school system.

In 1961, the then President John F. Kennedy committed the nation's resources to the cause of the handicapped with particular emphasis upon the mentally retarded. The President's Committee on Mental Retardation gave impetus to the special education movement. Its recommendations were reflected in Public Law 88-164, which allocated federal funds for training educators in the field of special education and for supporting projects in special education.

By 1963 about 90 percent of mentally retarded children were receiving instruction in self-contained classrooms. Birch refers to the self-contained special education class as "a class conducted by a certified special education teacher wherein handicapped children exclusively report and spend the majority of the school day." 

State and Federal Legislation

Establishment of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) acted as a legislation entity within the United States Office of Education. It was viewed as a unified voice for special education within the federal bureaucracy. Martin (1976) reveals that "special education


funds at the federal level increased tenfold from 1966 to 1976 and that federal programs during the 1960's were expressions of the national conscience striving to serve state and local consciences.\textsuperscript{25}

The Handicapped Children's Education Project, (HACHE), a federally funded arm of the states Education Commission, has a monitoring system on all new state legislation. In 1972, Arkansas, Idaho, Maine, New Mexico, and Oregon passed legislation regarding rights to education. By the close of 1975 legislative sessions, forty six states had some form of mandatory legislation.\textsuperscript{26}

Abeson indicates that whereas almost all states have some type of mandatory legislation for at least a portion of their handicapped population, exemption provisions and other such loopholes prevent the realization of full services in some cases.\textsuperscript{27}

The large number of exceptional children in the United States with its diverse areas of exceptionalities (see Table 6) stimulated interest groups to push for the


Table 6
The Number of Exceptional Children in the United States

Prevalence of Exceptional Children Ages 5-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visually disabled</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Handicap</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cripple &amp; Other Health Impaired</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Disturbed</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Retarded (educable &amp; trainable)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and/or Creative</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7,260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

many separate federal laws concerning the education of the handicapped to be brought together under Public Law 91-230 which gives assistance to the states for the Education of Handicapped Children.  

The impact of federal legislation on local school programs has become much more pronounced by the passage of Public Law 94-142, which authorizes additional funds and detailed local and state administrative requirements. "The Education for All Handicapped Children Act," adds full service goals by specifying a "free appropriate public education for all children ages three to eighteen as of September 1, 1978 and for ages three to twenty-one by September 1, 1980 unless the extension of services is contrary to state laws. The law mandates that states give priority in using federal funds on two groups of children: 1) handicapped children who are not receiving an education and 2) those with severe handicaps, within each disability, who are receiving an inadequate education. Whether the law is implemented in detail will perhaps depend on the degree of appropriate funding. The law states that each child classified as handicapped must have a written prescription for education and treatment. Millions of

---


29 Ibid., p. 48.
manpower hours and dollars will be required to develop the process, and police the implementation of the law. Cronin points out that "by 1980 the phenomenon of "federal takeover" may appear to be the understatement of the problem. 30

The Urban Influence

In 1900 nine out of ten of the nation's Black population lived in the rural south; today only 50 percent are in residence. The remaining fifty percent live in large cities (see Table 7). New York State is populated with more Blacks than any other state in the nation. 31

Census Statistics reveal that the living areas for people are in urban areas and it is greater than at any time in history.

The United States Census Bureau has classified the nations' urban areas for the purpose of defining the urban concept, it states: The urban population comprises of all persons living in places of 2,500 inhabitants or more incorporated as cities, boroughs, villages and towns. 32


Table 7

Urbanization in the United States: 1940-1970, by Percentage of Population; Places of 100,000 or More and 25,000 or More; and Total Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Places of 100,000 or more</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Places of 25,000 or more</strong></td>
<td>411</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population (1,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>74,424</td>
<td>96,468</td>
<td>125,269</td>
<td>149,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>57,246</td>
<td>54,230</td>
<td>54,054</td>
<td>53,887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of the nation's population and the presence of a large number of people concentrated in specific areas of the country is what is basically meant by the "urban concept." "By 1980, the number of persons living in communities of at least 20,000 is expected to rise 1.3 billion, and to exceed even that in the 2000's, when one person out of every three on earth will be the inhabitant of a place having no fewer than 20,000 residents."33

Because of the size of their populations, large cities make industrial and commercial specialization possible thereby attracting people into the city which boosts their production capacity. Urban concentration fosters efficiency in production and places demands on marketable items. These combined factors make up an organizational system in which production and consumption are continuously reinforced.

Although the social and material benefits have flourished due to advanced urbanism, the inadequacies of urban life trouble the inhabitants who would normally benefit from its surplus.

The specific complaints against the major cities are well-known. Daily news briefs inform the public concerning environmental damage, inner city business loses,

33Ibid., p. 6.
social decay, criminal violence and educational inopportunities. The fact that many educational injustices have been methodically revealed through the nation's judicial process attests to the fact that the American educational system is in dire need of democratic re-evaluation. The socio-economic embalance of Blacks, Hispanic, and the poor are now the focal point of reform of resistance in the nation's schools. Particularly affected are the public schools of our metropolitan areas.

Many children because of their minority and poor status are placed in classes for the mentally retarded. Wakefield's study (1964) revealed that a large number of educable mentally retarded children in public schools came from families with characteristics of low intelligence, poor schooling and low economic status. He concluded that a very large number of the children studied might blame their retardation on environmental factors.\textsuperscript{34} Despite the odds, much can be done by dedicated concerned educators to produce an effective learning environment for the poor and minority of our nation.

Appropriate Public Education

Since the creation of the idea of mainstreaming, the principle of least restrictive environment or placement has been applied. This principle holds that:

1. students should be placed in special education services based on their unique educational needs,
2. a broad array of possible special education services should be available to any given student, and,
3. placement of students in a special education arrangement should assure that the children are removed from the educational mainstream only as necessary to meet their specific educational needs. 35

The principle of least restrictive environment or placement is actually stating that placement in the regular class curriculum is preferable to placement in special class or a special school. It also states that any movement to a more isolated or restrictive environment must be justified on the basis of the learner's individual educational needs. 36

36 Ibid.
Essential to the concept of least restrictive placement is the premise that a variety of special education delivery services will be available. Reynolds (1962) was the first educator to describe a framework for a "continuum of services." Deno (1970), (see Figure 1), and Dunn (1973), later expanded on the concept. As seen in Figure 1, it is assumed by Deno that each level of service in the cascade will be needed by less children than the level which precedes it, and that the system applies to mild or severe exceptionalities.

Schools must create programs at the "less restrictive" end of the cascade and each student should be prepared for each level as a challenge to his/her education.

**Parental Rights**

Ideally, mainstreaming gives parents an opportunity to nurture movement towards a society that values individuals regardless of their potentials. Parents need no longer accept their children's exclusion from the educational opportunities. However, parents need to be fully aware of the exclusionary tools used in dealing with "special" children.

As a part of the special education services, a "referral" system is used in dealing with children who do

---
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### Appropriate Special Education Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Children in regular classes, including those &quot;handicapped&quot; sole to get along with regular class accommodations with or without medical or counseling supportive therapies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>Regular Class Attendance Plus Supplementary Instructional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>Part-time Special Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td>Full-time Special Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level V</td>
<td>Special Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level VI</td>
<td>Homebound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level VII</td>
<td>Instructional in hospital or domiciled settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Noneeducational&quot; Service medical and welfare care and supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-Patient Programs (Assignment of children to facilities governed by health or welfare agencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out-Patient Programs (Assignment of Pupils by the School System)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 1.** The cascade system of special education.  
not conform to classroom expectations. It is the exiting "pass" from regular class implying that specialized help beyond what is offered by the classroom teacher is necessary to meet the child's needs.

Classifying is a process in the referral maze which may have nothing to do with learning problems or a student's special need. In many instances it makes for possible value judgments about a child's family history, economic status or race. Silberberg and Silberberg presents an example:

If a Black and a White child are not learning well, the chances are that the Black will be called mentally retarded and the White will be called learning disabled. The latter term has much more of a positive image, suggesting that the learning disabled White child is average but needs extra remedial help to fulfill his potential. The Black child is seen as inferior and needs much less of a challenge, including much less of the monies set aside for special programs.38

The process of referring children for special services lends itself to exercising personal judgments and discrimination. Because this problem is attitudinal in nature, some parents may not detect it and the system continues.

Many parents have been led to believe that referral of their children from regular class to special class is

panacea for their children's problems. Over the years they have found this belief to be a fallacy and they have fought and continued to fight for change. The reality of mainstreaming and its implementation in urban schools can be that needed successful change for handicapped students. Parents have suffered from disillusionment and they are discouraged. Although mainstreaming is not a cure-all, parents must be encouraged to participate, to follow their children's progress and to be program monitors.

Most mainstream legislation provides parents with mechanisms for intervening on behalf of their child's education. The Individual Educational Plan Component of Public Law 94-142 is the provision for parents to have active involvement in the decisions regarding their child's educational program. Local school boards are required to encourage parent participation at IEP meetings.

The development and use of the Individual Educational Plan assures that children with special learning needs will have greater opportunities for successful educational experiences. The IEP is the planned educational process which attempts to move away from categorical labels, thus placement decisions will be based on educational planning as well as parental approval (see Figure 2). The use of the IEP along with other evaluative techniques provide educators with excellent vehicles to monitor the
Individualized Educational Plan

Implementation Instruction

1. Specific Program Objectives
2. Strategies and Instructional Techniques
3. Specific Materials and Resources
4. Criteria for Achievement

Total Service Plan

1. Statement of Goals
2. Short term Objectives
3. Ongoing Measurements

Annual Review Evaluation

1. Review of Total Plan
2. Revisions
3. Completion of New Total Plan

Figure 2. Source: Thomas Fairchild and Judy Schrag, pp. 22-24. Design: Jacqueline G. Reeves.
effectiveness of special education services based on the educational planning and the progress made by each learner.\(^3^9\)

**The Concept of Mainstreaming and its Implications in an Urban Setting**

In 1973, 10 percent of the nation's children were enrolled in 23 of the country's largest cities. In these same cities, 30 percent of the children were of Black, Chicano and Indian nationality and qualified as disadvantaged. The United States Office of Education reveals that the minority group of children have been placed in special classes for the educable mentally retarded at two to four times the rate of placement for White children.\(^4^0\) It is widely known that special classes are and have been used as places to isolate "disruptive" pupils to keep order in the regular class rather than develop a specialized program to meet that particular need.

The largest cities are those with the most serious financial problems. There are too few books, supplies, and resources with continuous budget cuts (see Table 8).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Kindergarten grade 8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12 and post-graduate</th>
<th>Classroom teachers</th>
<th>Pupils per teacher</th>
<th>Total expenditure(^2)</th>
<th>Annual expenditure per pupil in thousands</th>
<th>Average daily attendance(^2)</th>
<th>Other professional educational staff(^3)</th>
<th>Classroom teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>44,335,000</td>
<td>10,012,000</td>
<td>14,321,000</td>
<td>2,193,000</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>$78,806,266</td>
<td>$15,199</td>
<td>$13,467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 large cities, total</td>
<td>4,691,458</td>
<td>43,950</td>
<td>5,303</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>14,864</td>
<td>11,689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md</td>
<td>159,038</td>
<td>113,008</td>
<td>43,950</td>
<td>5,303</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>126,339</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>14,864</td>
<td>11,689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Mass</td>
<td>91,973</td>
<td>223,081</td>
<td>22,7</td>
<td>2,182,789</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>14,583</td>
<td>14,583</td>
<td>14,583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill</td>
<td>524,221</td>
<td>320,060</td>
<td>154,161</td>
<td>6,668</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>224,603</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>122,727</td>
<td>64,905</td>
<td>37,022</td>
<td>8,847</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>406,966</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>19,132</td>
<td>18,617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>141,407</td>
<td>93,249</td>
<td>43,158</td>
<td>6,668</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>211,823</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Mich</td>
<td>236,779</td>
<td>174,544</td>
<td>61,735</td>
<td>9,237</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>259,202</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Tex</td>
<td>210,025</td>
<td>152,222</td>
<td>57,803</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>110,095</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>18,638</td>
<td>12,939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Ind</td>
<td>82,102</td>
<td>50,832</td>
<td>32,270</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1,207,155</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>20,190</td>
<td>17,399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, Calif</td>
<td>601,429</td>
<td>408,373</td>
<td>193,056</td>
<td>28,700</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1,271,155</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>20,190</td>
<td>17,399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, Tenn</td>
<td>120,132</td>
<td>83,349</td>
<td>36,783</td>
<td>5,675</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>132,160</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>17,326</td>
<td>12,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, Wis</td>
<td>109,151</td>
<td>73,998</td>
<td>35,153</td>
<td>5,366</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>126,931</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>21,802</td>
<td>19,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, La</td>
<td>93,366</td>
<td>60,167</td>
<td>33,197</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>135,346</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>21,139</td>
<td>19,399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>21,707,445</td>
<td>211,222</td>
<td>256,223</td>
<td>251,980</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>2,615,700</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>24,609</td>
<td>21,099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, Pa</td>
<td>260,787</td>
<td>117,812</td>
<td>175,968</td>
<td>13,957</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>690,643</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>16,505</td>
<td>15,959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Ariz</td>
<td>217,204</td>
<td>127,334</td>
<td>251,830</td>
<td>7,969</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>275,431</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>15,386</td>
<td>13,511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Mo</td>
<td>82,804</td>
<td>58,307</td>
<td>24,497</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>132,346</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, Tex</td>
<td>65,929</td>
<td>45,958</td>
<td>19,971</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>80,765</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>12,751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, Calif</td>
<td>120,667</td>
<td>83,052</td>
<td>37,615</td>
<td>25,600</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>234,068</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>16,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, Calif</td>
<td>80,716</td>
<td>44,056</td>
<td>36,650</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>246,951</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>19,256</td>
<td>16,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>123,848</td>
<td>89,225</td>
<td>34,223</td>
<td>6,057</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>246,951</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>19,256</td>
<td>16,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Data include nursery schools and kindergartens operated as part of the regular public school system.

\(^2\)Estimated.

\(^3\)Includes salaries of curriculum specialists, counselors, librarians/media and remedial specialists only. Salaries of classroom teachers, supervisors, and principals are not included except as otherwise footnoted.

\(^4\)Not available.

\(^5\)Includes salaries for assistant principals, counselors, psychologists, social workers, speech therapists, supervisors.

\(^6\)Salary data reported as median salary.

\(^7\)Includes salaries of assistant principals, librarians, and counselors.


This in itself magnifies the disorder in the lives of children. There is no doubt that a large proportion of children with serious learning problems are crowded into large cities. Yet, the state departments of education and institutions of higher learning operate as if unaware of this distinct and alarmingly massive problem.

There are a few cities that have organized programs for the handicapped. Boston schools have completed a major reorganization of its special education programs (Johnson, Gross, Reynolds, and Nash, 1975); Philadelphia has developed new programs for the severely handicapped and mainstreaming programs are implemented (Young, 1976). The schools cannot handle all the economic resources needed for the handicapped student, but it can give opportunity for change.

Funding

The funding of all specialized school programming is a challenge to every major urban school system. The courts mandates are for newly developed special education programs, but the monies are not provided. The dollar gap between legislation and appropriation remain enormous.

Another concern to educators is that as programs emerge for mainstreaming, the eligibility of the schools

41 Ibid., p. 675.
for state special education financial aid are frequently unclear and uncertain. In many states special education assistance are categorical and are available only when children have been labeled and placed into specialized programs. Hobbs (1975) suggests a system in which cost for specialized services could be reimbursed to the local school district from state or federal treasuries. Examples of this envisionment has emerged in some states. The master plan, developed in the state of California offers state financial assistance for programming rather than children placed in categories. In Minnesota, reimbursement deals with the "necessary personnel" for the program (Bernstein, Kirst, Hartman and Marshall, 1976).

Under Public Law 94-142, priority is given to the severely handicapped students who have never attended school. Because of severe handicaps many students may not be enrolled in an integrated environment, yet the law emphasizes the education of handicapped children with non-handicapped children whenever feasible. It will be interesting to see whether the dollars from P. L. 94-142 will float towards severely handicapped programs or flow to mainstream programs. If federal dollars fail to be

---

42 Ibid., p. 676.
43 Ibid., p. 677.
used for the development of mainstream programs, the implementation of the law will drown.

Problems Associated with Minority Special Class Placement in Urban Schools

Special education classes were composed of a disproportionate number of minority students. Some parents interpreted transfer into special classes as discriminatory and viewed placement as stigmatizing to their children. In addition, educators and professional organizations of minority groups are voicing their concerns over minority placement, biased testing practices, stigmatizing labels and negative attitudes held by teachers towards the potentials of minority children. These views serve to highlight in their judgment that institutional racism pervades many educational practices.

Many minority children are systematically deprived of their rights to an equal, integrated education. Mercer (1970) studied the process of special class placement in the public schools of Riverside, California. She found, "three times more Mexican American and two and a half times more Negroes than would be expected from their percentage in the population tested at an IQ of 79 or below on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test." Dunn

---

(1968) contends that minority students compose over half of those enrolled in America's special education classes. Chenault (1970) discovered that once placed in an educable mentally retarded class, it is less likely that the Black child will leave the class than the White: the exit pattern . . . was found to vary as a function of race. From these studies, it is clear that handicapped children have been treated less than full-fledged citizens and because of their disabilities and that minority children have endured a long history of discrimination.

Assessment Practices

Intelligence tests are under attack for their unfair treatment of racial and cultural minorities. Intelligent test scores along with other criteria used for special class placement separate children of ethnic and socio-economic minorities when the educational system determined did not possess the necessary skills for achievement in the White middle class society.

The composition of the tests are generally standardized on White, middle class student population. The tests are verbally packed and contain questions easily

---

answered successfully by White middle class students. These factors give impetus in producing IQ scores which are primarily based on cultural and/or socioeconomic backgrounds of students and are not a true indication of learning ability.

Even if proper test instruments existed, many public school personnel are ill-equipped to administer the test and are not qualified to interpret the results properly. The test examiner should be aware of the background of the children, any language barrier and any anxiety created by the testing situation. Technically an examiner may be able to administer a test and yet obtain results which are not accurate indications of a child's abilities.

The debate concerning standardized tests and test scores of minorities have intensified and lawsuits are flourishing. The Association of Black Psychologists, the American Personnel and Guidance Association and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) are calling attention to the pervasive and potentially harmful influence tests have on the individual's life.  

The claims made by their study of the effects of categories revealed:

1. There is a tendency to stereotype or to ascribe characteristics of the group to individuals.

2. The category labels tend to become stigmatic and to be attached inedibly in scapegoating. Sometimes a child's label becomes a poor excuse for educational programs.

3. People who work with exceptional children may associate the categories with negative expectations . . .

4. An assumption is made frequently about an easy isomorphism between categorical and educational classification. 47

The inappropriate use, misuse and misunderstanding of labels have created the development of negative feelings. Negative feelings prevent one from developing constructive, positive attitudes toward helping handicapped children. Negative attitudes stifle programs and tend to discourage and even disillusion the educator who is providing the services for the handicapped.

In addition, Blatt (1971) related that in spite of overdue progressive developments "... children continue to be labeled and stigmatized . . . some to be placed in segregated programs while others to be excluded or exempted from public schools." 48 Hurley substantiates with the


statement, "there are many issues in education today but the "Hottest" by far is the issue of labeling children and its corollary, the elimination of traditional categories of special education."49

Teacher Attitude and Expectations

Teacher attitudes play an influential part in student achievement with minority and poor students. They are perhaps the single most potent influence on pupil behavior and learning. Teachers who have negative attitudes may see children as silly, untrustworthy, unteachable and irresponsible. Teachers who have positive attitudes may see the same children as being responsible, willing to produce, and capable of self-discipline. There is evidence that teacher attitudes significantly influence their behavior and classroom interaction. Rosenthal and Jacobson argue that teachers elicit inadequate behavior from some children by expecting less of them.50

The study by Garrison and Hammill (1971) has pointed out that in many instances the pupils in special classes for the educable mentally retarded are not as different as their isolation would lead educators and others to


believe. Their study discovered that over two-thirds of the children in special classes met three or less of the five criteria that the authors assumed necessary for placement in special classes. If handicapped children are to be integrated into the regular school program, the attitude of regular class teachers as well as the administration emerges as a major concern in the implementation of P. L. 94-142.

It is assumed that the key person for instituting change is the school building principal. If the principal is supportive of the mainstreaming process, he can help insure the success of an integrated plan. If the principal is non-supportive, the chances for developing a mainstream program are nil. Payne and Murry (1974) examined the attitudes of elementary principals toward the placement of handicapped children into the regular classroom environment. The results indicated that urban elementary principals are more reluctant to integrate handicapped children into regular school programs than their suburban counterparts (see Table 9).


Table 9

Urban and Suburban Elementary Principal's Acceptance of Integration of the Handicapped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Handicapped</th>
<th>Percent of Acceptance Suburban Principals</th>
<th>Percent of Acceptance Urban Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visually Handicapped</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Handicapped</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabled</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Handicapped</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educable Mentally Retarded</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainable Mentally Retarded</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reed and Murry, p. 124.
Before a handicapped child can enjoy his right to respect and peer acceptance, the total school organization must change for the better.

Special Class vs Regular Class

The Question of Efficacy

School systems have expanded their operation in terms of the numbers and types of children they serve. (see Tables 10 and 11) Since the early 1960's special educators have voiced agreement for increased regular class experiences for students in special classes. Three primary methods are advanced by Lilly (1979) for achieving this goal.

1. Partially self-contained special classes in which students spend the majority of their day in the special class but attend selected regular classes with other children (often non-academic classes, such as physical education, art and shop.)

2. Resource rooms, in which children receive short-term special help, usually on a tutorial basis, while spending the major part of the day in the regular classroom.

3. Consulting teacher programs, in which children spend all or nearly all of the school day in the regular classroom, and the classroom teacher receives help from a special education "consulting teacher" in planning and implementing programs in the classroom to help the child.54

Special educators are seeking to develop the attitudes and skills necessary to accommodate the special needs of

__________

Table 10—Enrollment in special education programs for exceptional children: United States, February 1963 and 1970-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of exceptionality</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total enrollment</td>
<td>Local public schools</td>
<td>Public and private residential schools</td>
<td>Total enrollment</td>
<td>Local public schools</td>
<td>Public and private residential schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,682,351</td>
<td>1,570,370</td>
<td>111,981</td>
<td>3,158,000</td>
<td>3,025,000</td>
<td>133,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually handicapped</td>
<td>21,531</td>
<td>13,962</td>
<td>7,569</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf and hard of</td>
<td>45,594</td>
<td>28,551</td>
<td>17,043</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hearing</td>
<td>802,197</td>
<td>802,197</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>1,237,000</td>
<td>1,237,000</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled and special</td>
<td>64,842</td>
<td>64,842</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>269,000</td>
<td>269,000</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally and</td>
<td>79,587</td>
<td>30,871</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socially maladjusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally retarded</td>
<td>431,890</td>
<td>393,237</td>
<td>38,653</td>
<td>830,000</td>
<td>784,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other handicapping</td>
<td>22,039</td>
<td>22,039</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditions</td>
<td>214,671</td>
<td>214,671</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>481,000</td>
<td>481,000</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Pupils were reported according to the major type of exceptionality for which they received special education.

2Estimated on the basis of State reports to the Office of Education.

3Not included in survey of residential schools.

4Includes education programs in public hospitals for the mentally ill.


Grant and Loeb, p. 41
Table 11--Pupils with handicaps, pupils receiving special instruction or assistance, and professional staff for the handicapped in local public elementary and secondary schools: United States, spring 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handicapped pupils</th>
<th>Handicapped pupils served(^1)</th>
<th>Professional staff for the handicapped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Total}^2)</td>
<td>4,752,000</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech impaired</td>
<td>1,793,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disabled</td>
<td>1,160,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally retarded</td>
<td>916,000</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally disturbed</td>
<td>556,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially sighted</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>((^3))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Includes pupils receiving instruction or assistance from one or more of the following: Separate (special) classes, special instruction from regular teachers in regular classes, and individualized instruction from specialized professional personnel.

\(^2\) The totals may be somewhat less than the figures shown because some pupils and teachers may have been reported in more than one category.

\(^3\) Less than 0.05 percent.

Note: Data are based upon a sample survey and are subject to sampling variability. Percentages were computed from unrounded data. Because of rounding, details may not add to totals.

handicapped individuals into regular classroom environment. Efficacy studies of special classes for the handicap constitute the need for change. Kirk (1964) suggests that handicapped children make as much progress in the regular grades as they do in special education. Hoelke (1966), and Smith and Kennedy (1967) provide similar evidence. Although many studies have focused on the efficacy of special class placement versus regular class placement, various ways of educating the handicapped child with his nonhandicapped peers has not been examined. In addition, there is no research that bears directly on the impact of mainstreaming on regular class pupils. In many instances it may be difficult for parents and teachers to help children acquire openness, individual acceptance and mutual respect free of ethnic and racial forms of stereotyping and prejudicial judgments. Follow-up research would be of value to educators in the field.

Summary

In the past educators recommended "Special Education" as a separate entity of regular education. Currently, attention is focused upon the right of each child to

receive an appropriate education within the contexts of the regular school program.

The series of court cases involving the poor and minority, particularly in urban areas of concentration, indicate that minority and poor parents are dissatisfied with the criteria used for special class placement.

Parents as well as educators are attacking discriminatory testing practices, educational programming, stigmatizing labels and negative teacher attitudes. Needless to say, the educational climate must change for successful implementation of a mainstream program.

Most teachers have had little contact with handicapped children. Our mechanism of societal exclusion has worked all too well. The lack of familiarity and human interaction with handicapped persons will call for special renewal training if teachers, administrators and paraprofessionals are to help handicapped children learn.

What will happen to handicapped children in this decade depends on the leadership role that special educators are willing to perform inside the confines of education as well as outside of the school domain. Change is inevitable and should be desired on every level of the educational strata.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN, PROCEDURE, METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine educational impacts of the use of the Individual Educational Plan in elementary schools.

Each year New Jersey state and local agencies have instituted new guidelines for the execution of this plan. The guide presently used within New Jersey public schools has been prepared by the New Jersey Department of Education, Branch of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services. The guide does not reflect the position or policy of the United States Office of Education and is not officially endorsed by that office.

Since the enactment of Public Law 94-142, many changes have occurred in the educational programming for the handicapped. One of the most significant impacts of the federal and state legislation has been the mandate for the development of the Individual Educational Plan (IEP). The IEP Guide in New Jersey provides direction and help in an effort to meet the requirements for an educational plan for each individual pupil eligible for mainstream placement in a regular classroom environment.
The Social-Ecological Setting of The Study

This study was conducted in three elementary public schools in an urban district. A description of the locale of each school will provide some insight into the setting, its problems, and the frustrations of teaching in the inner city.

Many problems faced by the teaching staff in this urban district are similar to those in other major cities. Inadequate housing is evident, unfinished construction, traffic congestion, and polluted air reveal the economic and social conditions. The inhabitants are of the poorest, mainly Black and Hispanic who are the suffering minority. These conditions are further aggravated by inadequate education (see Tables 2-5).

The city has 31 elementary schools, grades kindergarten through grade eight, one elementary school, kindergarten through grade two, two high schools and one junior high school. The total school enrollment is 27,197 pupils.

Schools A and B are located three blocks from the main business district. These schools are opposite each other and the students share the same playground. The play areas are filled with broken glass and debris.

School A was built in 1920. It services a total of 837 pupils, grades kindergarten through grade eight.
Ninety-nine percent of the youngsters are Black and Hispanic. Five special classes are housed in the building in addition to 30 regular classes, staffed by 38 teachers; one principal, and one vice-principal. The school population is serviced with related personnel in the areas of music, home economics, Title I, physical education, art, comprehensive education, guidance and special education services. Originally, School A was used as a junior high school. The school has five floors, no elevators, long corridors to walk and high, wide steps for little legs to climb. The upper grades are placed on the top floors. The rooms are very small with wooden flooring and aged desks with attached seats.

Lunch was served to some classes in their classrooms while others ate lunch at the cafeteria located in the basement.

School B is a two story modern structure, 17 years old and houses 843 pupils, with five special classes and 30 regular classes, grades kindergarten through grade eight. Its Ethnic composition is similar to that of School A. It has a teaching staff of 105 which includes related health services, guidance, art, special education services, industrial arts, home economics, comprehensive education, Title I, physical education and a work-study program. The administrative staff consists of one principal, one vice-principal and one secretary.
A security guard is on duty in School B. The guard allows one to enter and a visitor must sign the register and state the nature of his or her business before proceeding ten yards. Classroom doors are locked from the outside and one must knock to gain entrance. Pupils are not allowed to open the door unless directed by the teacher and the teacher must first recognize the visitor before the door is opened. A story was related to the investigator by a teacher, concerning an intruder who broke the glass of a locked classroom door to steal a teacher's pocketbook (in view) when the classroom was occupied. It was further reported that this intruder was supporting a drug habit. Other similar stories were reported and the school appears to operate with a constant looking over one's shoulder.

Across from these two schools are four high rise apartment buildings which make up a large portion of both schools' population. Neighborhood streets are narrow and lined with dilapidated houses. Boarded up houses and stores long gone out of business is a scene of dismay. Small Hispanic businesses selling candy, soda and potato chips can be found in the area. Not more than two grocery stores are available in the community, and prices for their products are higher as compared to supermarket prices.
School C was not originally included in the study. School A and B were slow in implementing the mainstreaming process and data was not forthcoming at the time for survey questionnaire distribution. In conferences with the Superintendent and Director of Special Services, School C was chosen to participate in the study since the mainstreaming process had been implemented.

This school is located at the opposite end of the city in a Puerto Rican neighborhood. It sits in a narrow dead-end street which is nearly impossible for parking a car, but there is space for handicapped marking in front of the building. The building is old, steam heated, and extremely hot.

The population of School C has reached a maximum of 550 students. Two-thirds of its students are of Spanish origin and one-third is evenly divided between Blacks and Whites. Families are poor and most qualify for the government-sponsored subsidized lunch program. Less than 1 percent of the total school population pays for the daily lunch that is provided.

School C is the only school with an elevator. It houses 13 special classes and 18 regular classes, grades kindergarten through grade eight. It is staffed with 31 teachers.
This school has been known as a special school or school for the handicapped since its inception. Toilets and sinks have been upgraded for handicapped use, doors have been widened for wheel chair entrance and exits and ramps, guardrails and handrails have been provided. The roof of the building is fenced in and used as a play area.

The principal reports that mainstreaming began at least ten years before the law came into effect because the present principal and his predecessor believed in the concept and put it into action.

Two male and two female students were observed in the implementation of their education program in School A. Two students were members of a regular fifth grade class and two students attended the special class for the neurologically impaired. This class is also referred to as the "brain injured" class. Pupils in this class are labeled as children having impaired or abnormal brain functioning. Urie Bronfenbrenner points out that "many of these abnormalities entail neurological damage resulting in impaired intellectual function and behavioral disturbances, including hyperactivity, distractibility, and low attention span."56

56Urie Bronfenbrenner, "The Psychological Cost of Quality and Equality Education" Cornell University, E-8632, p. 6 (Mimeographed undated).
The female student from this class was mainstreamed into a sixth grade gym class. Teacher selection for mainstreaming from this class were based on:

1) the classroom teacher's evaluation,
2) what class the student wanted to be assigned,
3) if the pupil would be able to cope in the particular situation, and
4) if the selected class instructor was willing to accept the pupil in his or her class.

The Individual Educational Plan for these two students were observed.

A regular class program designed for two fifth graders was also observed by the investigator to compare whether or not both regular class and special class students were receiving adequate educational instruction.

Four pupils in School B in special and regular classes were observed. Two youngsters in educable special class and two pupils in grade five.

The students in the educable special class were mainstreamed to gym and art. Students were given a choice as to which class they would like to attend. Half of the class attended gym classes the first semester of the school year and the remainder of the class received opportunity the second half of the school year. The "so-called" mainstream class was composed of other special classes.
Informal interviews were held with five special class teachers, three principals, one vice principal, ten special class teachers, ten central office personnel (e.g., social workers, guidance director, psychologist, affirmative action officer, etc.), to address problems of mainstreaming, concerns associated with minority class placement, and the specific problems which are the core of this study.

**Design**

The construction of the Individual Educational Plan is a relatively new procedure for special as well as regular class teachers in assisting in its development. Guidelines for programming have varied in local school districts and research has not revealed any data or evaluative instruments.

In order to make inquiry of the clarity and effectiveness of the Individual Educational Plan, the investigator designed survey schedules for parents of mainstreamed pupils, parents of regular class pupils, teachers of regular class students and special class teachers. An interview schedule was designed for mainstream pupils and regular class students. Questions for school personnel were constructed around the four specific problems upon which this study is built:
1. What number of the total population is of minority status?

2. Do teachers view the Individual Educational Plan helpful in the areas of:
   a. Classroom Management
   b. Curriculum Planning
   c. Cognitive Development
   d. Parent/Teacher Relationships

3. Have teachers and parents participated in an Individual Educational Plan Evaluation within the past year?

4. Do teachers view the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming?

Procedure and Methodology

The schools selected for the study were chosen on the basis of successful operation of a mainstream program within the past year.

Each school principal was contacted by the Superintendent and Director of Special Services. The investigator followed these contacts with a letter and telephone call to discuss the nature and purpose of the study, another follow-up letter was sent confirming dates for classroom observations and personal interviews.

A 28 item questionnaire was developed for regular class teachers which sought information regarding the
clarity of Public Law 94-142 and their view of the Individual Educational Plan. Special class teachers were given a 28 item questionnaire which revealed data in the areas of special class classification, eligibility for special education parent/teacher participation, evaluation, recommendations and instruction. The last two sections of the questionnaire was the same for both groups of teachers since it sought to determine the effectiveness and use of the IEP in the mainstream process.

Students delivered questionnaires to their parents. Parents of mainstreamed pupils received a seven item instrument and parents of regular class pupils completed an eight item schedule. Each questionnaire sought to discover the parent involvement in the educative planning process and the comprehension of that process.

**Sample Population**

Survey schedules were sent to educators in Northern New Jersey for review. The schedules were reviewed by special education staff and teachers. The responses received was that the questions did not need any change.

A total of 35 teachers and specialists participated in the sample with no revisions needed. Some teachers requested a space for comments.
Research Population

Survey schedules were disseminated by each principal to special class teachers, regular class teachers and any specialists in their respective schools.

Parent survey schedules were only disseminated in School C, since that was the only selected school with parent involvement. Parents were contacted via telephone calls and the project was explained. At that time requests were made for their participation. A cover letter along with the survey was sent home with each consenting parents' child. A total of 25 parents returned their surveys, out of a total of 35 schedules sent to homes. Eighty-six school personnel returned their surveys from a total distribution of 100 schedules.

Table 12 depicts the areas of classroom exception-alities in each school, covering the categories listed. Table 13 reveals the number of school personnel participating in the study and Table 14 portrays the ethnic population of each participating school staff personnel responding to the survey. (See Tables)

In summary this study was undertaken to assist educators, parents and members of state and federal agencies in developing a systematic and standardized guide which would be beneficial to handicapped students and the teachers who are involved in their learning programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptionalities</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neurologically Impaired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre. K. Handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedically Impaired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiply Handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13

Number of School Personnel Participating in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Special Class</td>
<td>1. Special Class</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher or Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher or Teacher</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher or</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regular Class</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total 86

### Number of Parents Participating in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Ethnic Background of Teachers in Participating Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number White</th>
<th>Number Black</th>
<th>Number Puerto Rican</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>White Female 9, 42.4%</td>
<td>Black Female 15, 54.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 Female Japanese</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Male 5</td>
<td>Black Male 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>White Female 6, 34.6%</td>
<td>Black Female 11, 65.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Male 3</td>
<td>Black Male 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>White Female 10, 70%</td>
<td>Black Female 1, 10%</td>
<td>White Female 2</td>
<td>1 Female Cuban 1 Female Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Male 4</td>
<td>Black Male 1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37, 46.8%</td>
<td>37, 46.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The investigator looks to the data analysis to reveal:

1. the teacher's positive or negative view of the Individual Educational Plan as an effective tool.

2. the clarity of the IEP.

3. teacher involvement in the design of the plan.

4. parent/teacher relationships.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The statistical data was analyzed via the SPSS computer program and organized around four areas of inquiry. The four major questions are addressed: 1) What number of the total handicapped population are of minority status? 2) Do teachers view the Individual Educational Plan helpful in the areas of:

a. Classroom Management
b. Curriculum Planning
c. Cognitive Development
d. Parent/Teacher Relationships?

3) Have teachers and parents participated in an Individual Educational Plan within the past year? 4) The effectiveness of the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming.

Since Public Law 94-142 mandates parent involvement in the design of the Individual Educational Plan, the investigator elected to delete that data.

The data obtained was classified into four areas of response:

1. Special Class Teachers
2. Regular Class Teachers
3. Parents of Mainstream Pupils
4. Parents of Regular Class Pupils.
Parent questions are posed to examine what relationship exists in the clarity of the plan among regular class teachers, special teachers and parents themselves.

The first section of the analysis deals with the demographic data. The second and third sections address the major inquiry questions and the four sections of the analysis presents a summary.

Demographic Data

Table 15 presents the total years of the respondents' teaching service tabulated by race and sex. It reveals the staff hiring pattern over a 36-year period. The statistics show that White personnel have been working in the school system longer than Black, Puerto Rican, and Mexican Americans.

The age of the respondents from each school is depicted in Table 16. School A has the youngest teaching staff, School B ranks in the middle age level and School C has many veteran teachers.

Tables 17 and 18 present a racial breakdown of teaching staff respondents by school. Schools A (77.8%) and B (71.4%) are highly populated with Black personnel, while School C dominates the chart with White staff members (91.7%). School C has 10 percent more Puerto Rican and Mexican American personnel (10.5%).

Note: For the purposes of generalities and the protection of the subjects studied, I am reporting common inequities found in urban communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years In Profession</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36+</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N=19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=9</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Over 20 less than 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Over 30 less than 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Over 40 less than 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Over 50 less than 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Over 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total Number | 26   |
| Total Percent | 44.8% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>N=7</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent = 77.8</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td>N=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent = 13.3</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18
Regular Educators Racial Breakdown By School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>N=15</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent = 57.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent = 38.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent = 3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic data of the mainstreamed pupils observed reveals eight participants ages 12 through 14, six Black students, one White student and one Hispanic student (see Table 19).

**Parental Response**

In order to gain some insight into the clarity of the IEP, parents of mainstreamed pupils responses to questions in Table 20 disclosed parental agreement (53.8%) that sufficient contact had been made by the child study team to assist the parents in comprehending their child's disability. In addition, 46.2 percent received a clear explanation of the educational services, 38.5 percent believed the child study team followed through on their child's program and 46.2 percent saw noticeable improvement in their child since being a part of the program. The investigator noticed that 23.1 percent were undecided that sufficient contact was offered in assisting the parents understanding of their child's disability and 23.1 percent disagreed. The same is true concerning program follow-through, 30.8 percent disagreed that the child study team followed through on the child's program.

In telephone conversations with parents who elected to participate in the survey, parents were apprehensive towards participation and wanted assurance that their participation would not be detrimental to their child's educational program. In an interview with the Director of
Table 19

Mainstreamed Pupils By School, Age, Race, Sex and Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstreamed</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Present Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N.I.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N.I.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Pupil Participants 8

N.I. = Neurologically Impaired Class
Educ. = Educable Mentally Retarded Class
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Child Study Team made sufficient contact and offered assistance in my understanding of my child's disability</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clear explanation of the educational services for my child was stated.</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Child Study Team carried through the program that was stated for my child.</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been a noticeable improvement in my child since he/she has been a part of the program.</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pupil Services, Mr. Brockington remarked that parents desire to help their children, but the process is not comprehended. Psychologist, Robert Kelly, infers that parents have difficulty in participating in the planning of their child's education.

Parents of regular class pupils are in the need of a greater understanding of the mainstream process as indicated in Table 21. Fifty percent of parental response display a desire to know more about mainstreaming. In the area of change, 58.3 percent are undecided as to whether or not there has been any noticeable change in their child's social behavior and 50 percent are undecided that there has been any noticeable change in the child's school interest and achievement.

Mainstream Pupils' Response

Table 22 shows the noncompetitive classes in which pupils are mainstreamed. Individual interviews revealed that each child was happy in his or her class and had a positive attitude about being mainstreamed (see appendix).

Educators' Responses

The crosstab method has been used throughout the remainder of the tables to compare data between schools. Table 23 exhibits a positive response from regular teachers to the need for inservice training to further clarify the IEP. Fifty-seven point seven percent strongly agree in
Table 21
Parents of Regular Class Pupils' Response
To The Mainstream Process

N=12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like to know more about mainstreaming.</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since my child has been a part of the mainstream process, I think there has been noticeable change in my child's:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Social Behavior</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School Interest</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Achievement</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22
Pupils Mainstreamed Into Non Competitive Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>No. of Periods with Mainstreamed Pupils</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gym</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Industrial Art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23
Regular Class Teachers' Response To The Need For InService Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rank Order Response</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inservice training sessions are needed to further clarify the IEP.</td>
<td>1. Strongly Agree</td>
<td>*57.7%</td>
<td>*69.2%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Agree</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>*57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Undecided</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* High percentage of agreement in each school.
School A, 69.2 percent in School B and 57.9 percent agree to the need for training.

In Table 24, regular class teachers recognize the need for more communication between the regular class teacher and the special class teacher, School A strongly agrees 53.3 percent, School B 76.9 percent, and School C agrees 68.4 percent. In School B, 69.2 percent and School C 52.6 percent indicate that the regular class teacher and the child study team should communicate more.

Table 25 manifests that the implementation of the pupil's program was not clearly defined, 28.6 percent disagreed in School A, 45.5 percent in School C and 57.1 percent strongly disagreed. In School C 42.9 percent found the pupil's program was clearly defined. All three schools in Table 26 disagreed to the clarity of the evaluation of the pupil's program, School A 71.5 percent, School B 57.2 percent, and School C 81.9 percent.

Responses to the first question of the major survey questions are shown in the administrative interviews. Eighty percent of the handicapped population are of minority status as reported by the Director of Pupil Services (see appendix).

Tables 27-29 describe the evaluation of the IEP by regular and special teachers in the areas of classroom management, curriculum planning, and cognitive development. Regular teachers (57.7%) in School B, 38.5 percent and 51.1
Table 24

Regular Class Teachers' Response to IEP Implementation Through Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rank Order Response By Percentage</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For successful implementation there is a need of IEP for more communication between:</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The regular class teacher and the special class teacher.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The regular class teacher and the Child Study Team.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25
Implementation Procedures Clarified
For Special Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rank Order Response</th>
<th>By Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation of the pupil's program was clearly defined.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>*28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>*57.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* High percentage of disagreement.
Table 26

Evaluation Clarity Response By Special Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rank Response</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation of the pupil's program was clearly defined.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>*71.5%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>*81.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High percentage of total disagreement.*
Table 27
Evaluation of Plan by Special and Regular Educators
In The Area of Classroom Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Regular Class Teachers</th>
<th>Special Class Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that the Individual Educational Plan is helpful in the area of classroom Management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank In Order of Response</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
Evaluation of Plan by Special and Regular Educators
In The Area Of Curriculum Planning

Question

Do you believe that the individual educational plan is helpful in the area of curriculum planning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in Order of Response</th>
<th>Regular Educators</th>
<th>Special Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29

Evaluation of Plan By Special and Regular Educators
In The Area of Cognitive Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Special Educator</th>
<th>Regular Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that the Individual Educational Plan is helpful in the area of Cognitive Development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank In Order of Response</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percent in School C agree that the IEP is helpful. Thirty-three point three percent of special educators in School A, 42.9 percent in School B and 33.3 percent of the special teachers in School C agree that the IEP is helpful in the area of classroom management. Regular teachers view the IEP helpful in the area of curriculum planning. Table 28 portrays School A as 53.8 percent in agreement, School B 46.2 percent, and School C 68.4 percent with concurring decisions. Special educators favor the IEP helpful in area of curriculum planning, School A 33.3 percent agree, School B 42.9 percent and School C 50.0 percent. The data also reveals that 44.4 percent of the special educators in School A strongly disagree to the help of the IEP in the area of curriculum planning. In the area of cognitive development, Table 29 displays 33.3 percent of the special educators strongly agree to the helpfulness of the IEP as compared to 22.2 percent of the teachers who strongly disagree. In School B, 57.1 percent of the educators agree and in School A 41.7 percent agree with 33.3 percent who strongly disagree, leaving an 8.4 percent difference in opinions. Regular educators' views are favorable, and percentages are slightly higher. In School A, 53.8 percent, School B 30.8 percent and School C 63.2 percent, although in School B 30.8 percent are undecided as to the helpfulness of the IEP and 26.3 percent hold this same view in School C. These percentages cannot be overlooked in such a significant area in the student's educational process.
In Table 30, the last of the major questions reveal regular and special teachers' viewpoints on the IEP as an adequate tool for mainstreaming. In School A, 50.0 percent regular teachers agree, yet 38.5 percent are undecided, in School B, 23.9 percent agree, and 41.7 percent are undecided. In School C, 18.8 percent agree that the IEP is an adequate tool for mainstreaming, yet 75 percent of the regular teachers are undecided. The opinions of the special class teachers show 22.2 percent in favor in School A with 22.2 percent of the teachers in disagreement. Forty-two point nine percent of the teachers agree as opposed to 28.6 percent of the teachers who disagree. School C has 8.3 percent of its staff in agreement and 41.7 percent of the staff strongly disagree.

Table 31 exhibits the successful performance of pupils in the mainstream program. Fourteen point three percent of the special educators in School A are undecided about pupil performance, 28.6 percent are in disagreement of any successful performance and 57.1 percent of the educators strongly disagree to any performance of success. In School B, 42.9 percent of the teachers are undecided, 14.3 percent disagree and 28.6 percent strongly disagree as to successful performance. Eighteen point two percent are undecided in School C, 9.1 percent disagree and 54.5 percent of the special educators strongly disagree to the mainstream program leading to successful performance of mainstreamed pupils.
Table 30
The IEP As A Tool For Mainstreaming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Regular Class Teacher</th>
<th>Special Class Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Rank in Order of Response</td>
<td>School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mainstream program is leading to successful performance of mainstreamed pupils.</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>*57.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31

Performance of Mainstreamed Pupils Evaluated By Special Class Teachers
Summary

School A is the least experienced in the mainstream process, personal interviews give supporting data (see appendix). The data depicts School B at the semi-level of school experience in the mainstream process and School C is the veteran school that has had the most experience in the process.

The data reveals that parents of mainstream pupils, regular class pupils and educators are in need of clarity of procedures and training for successful mainstreaming (see Tables 20, 21, 23-26). This data shows the existing relationship between teachers and parents. The data shows that basically teachers hold a positive view of the IEP in the area of classroom management, curriculum planning, and cognitive development. There are indecisions as to viewing the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming (see Table 30).

The data also demonstrates the validity of the basic assumptions of this study:

1. The Individual Educational Plan is an effective tool for educating handicapped pupils in an urban classroom.

2. Implementation of the IEP affects the total school curriculum.

3. Parent and teacher participation in the evaluation of the Individual Educational Plan is a necessary
prerequisite to its effective implementation.

4. There is a disproportionate number of minority children in special education classes.

Every educator with the responsibility for providing education and related services to handicapped students will encounter developing and implementing an Individual Educational Plan. The rules and regulations resulting from federal and state regulations set forth guidelines in creating this program. The competencies of educators involved with IEP development and implementation will to a great extent, determine an appropriate education to handicapped students if it can be effectively translated into educational practice.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

First a summary of the results are presented. Second, the major conclusions are stated and finally a discussion of the recommendations for further research.

Summary

The practice of providing educational plans for handicapped pupils in environments that maximize contact with nonhandicapped pupils has been referred to as mainstreaming. This practice reflects recent changes in attitudes about educating the handicapped. Court decisions with federal mandates require that handicapped students have access to social and educational opportunities that are afforded their nonhandicapped peers.

The literature on mainstreaming is limited and the information redundant. The literature presented on the studies of the efficacy of special classes presented evidence that mildly handicapped students do as well or better in the regular classroom as they do in special classes. This evidence suggests that the placement and classification procedures have been less than accurate.
Many of the traditional testing devices have shown to be culturally biased and discriminatory against minorities and the poor. As issues related to inappropriate assessment and placement for minority youngsters are resolved, as curriculums are made relevant for each individual, mainstreaming should provide a more suitable educational environment for all children.

The negative and stigmatizing effects of educational labels have also been a source of concern. Many educators believe that such labels negatively used destroy a pupil's self concept and penalize minority group youngsters who are already discriminated against because of their racial or ethnic identity.

One of the most compelling reasons for urgency in mainstreaming handicapped pupils with their nonhandicapped peers is in the domain of attitude. Professionals in special education are concerned about the attitudes of their colleagues. If the child is not accepted by his or her peers or teacher, there is apprehension that the child will suffer great emotional harm. A lack of acceptance could be a factor in overrepresentation of minority children in special classes. Limited research has been attempted in this area.

Although the term "mainstreaming" does not appear in Public Law 94-142, the law does direct that handicapped
youngsters are to be educated with children who are not handicapped to the maximum extent possible and that this extent will not produce harmful effects on the pupil.

Public Law 94-142 permits each state to develop its own plan for placement of students in the least restrictive environment and it is the state's responsibility to enforce the plan. The "least restrictive environment" clause should not be interpreted as automatic placement of all handicapped students in the regular classroom.

From a socio-cultural perspective, mainstream classes provide the educationally or physically handicapped with positive peer models and positive reinforcements. The curriculum in an integrated classroom can offer all children a wide range of individualized learning experiences and exposure.

Generally, a handicapped pupil should be mainstreamed into a regular classroom only if that class is able to meet the student's educational needs. In addition, the youngster should be able to meet the criteria of profiting from and contributing to the mainstreamed classroom.

One of the most significant challenges facing educators is the redefinition of roles for special and regular teachers. The findings of this study suggests that this is not the case. Responsibility for developing and implementing educational plans should be shared with parents, regular classroom teachers and specialists.
Traditionally, special education has been delivered primarily in self-contained settings with trained teachers in specific areas of disabilities. As a result of mainstreaming, the majority of youngsters labeled "educable mentally retarded," "intellectually or physically handicapped," or "special needs" will be attending regular classroom sessions for a major part of the day.

Classroom teachers who have not acquired any basic skills to effectively instruct these children will need the assistance of specialists in designing, implementing, and evaluating instructional procedures.

The primary mechanism provided in Public Law 94-142 for insuring that each handicapped or special needs child receive an appropriate education is a written Individual Educational Plan. The written IEP is a program designed for the provision of services and the evaluation of the pupils' progress. The IEP is based on the particular needs of the pupil, determined by school personnel, parents, and the pupil, where appropriate. It describes the special education components and the methods of instruction that must be provided.

The IEP consists of two parts, the basic plan and the instructional guide. All areas of the curriculum in which a pupil is to receive special education should be included in the plan as well as any modification in the regular education program.
After all necessary procedures from identification through classification have been completed, the IEP is developed by the Child Study Team, parents, the pupil, if appropriate, and any other personnel who has knowledge regarding the pupil's educational performance. As mandated by regulations, classroom teachers should share in the development of the IEP. This program is an attempt to assure that the best educational resources are available to teach handicapped children. The IEP is not just a penned document. Once written, it becomes the students' program which must be implemented by the local school district. The findings of this study reveal that 50% of the parent respondents want to know more about mainstreaming (see Table 21). Although the school system already has an active inservice training program, it should address itself to the implementation of the Individual Educational Plan (see Table 23). Teachers see the need for more communication between the regular class teacher and the special class for successful implementation of the IEP (see Tables 24 and 25). The findings in Table 26 strongly emphasize the need for clarification of the evaluation of the pupil's plan.

The Individual Educational Plan must be developed annually and is considered to be the shared responsibility of the school's educational team and the child's parent.
Parents are a significant member of the team who develop the IEP.

There are certain advantages and disadvantages of the Individual Educational Plan. An effective IEP could advantageously bring about the following:

1. A move beyond categorical labeling as a result of interaction between teachers and students.
2. Provide for accountability in the development of a written IEP.
3. Provide for more communication between special education teachers and regular class teachers.
4. Provide for improvement of attitudes towards special needs students.

Disadvantages which arise from the program are:

1. The requirements of training and experience on the parts of administrators, parents, and teachers that is necessary for smooth implementation of the program.
2. Deficiency in monitoring and the updating IEP's.
3. Inadequate communication and organizational skills necessary to coordinate the written program.
4. Insufficient time for joint planning and inservice training.

The purpose of this study is to: 1) investigate what total number of handicapped pupils are of minority status,
2) if teachers view the Individual Educational Plan helpful in the areas of classroom management, curriculum planning, cognitive development, parent/teacher relationships and,

3) the effectiveness of the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming.

This information was substantiated via a questionnaire designed by the investigator proceeded by the statistical analysis of the data.

Conclusion

The present research revealed 76.3% of staff respondents need the mainstream process clarified. Teachers responded favorably to the IEP, yet informal interviews revealed that teachers are unprepared to write the most important phase of the educational plan. Educators (60%) reveal the need for inservice training.

Independent observations noted discrepancies between an educator's concept of mainstreaming as compared to an administrator's construct of mainstreaming in comparison to the intent of the law. For example, there were discrepancies between what was verbally reported by educators and what was actually observed.

✓ From the results of the analyzed data, the following conclusions were drawn concerning the four major survey questions.
1. A fuller explanation of Public Law 94-142 is needed for teachers and parents.

2. Meaningful short term workshops and ongoing staff renewal sessions should be expanded.

3. The Individual Educational Plan is helpful in the areas of classroom management, curriculum planning and cognitive development although some teachers cannot accept the total plan.

4. Teachers presently view the IEP as an adequate tool for mainstreaming with some reservations.

5. Eighty percent of the total mainstream population are of minority status.

6. Parent involvement is mandated by Public Law 94-142. Twenty percent of the parent population in this study indicated such involvement.

7. Interview data reveals the need for an attitudinal study to assist in the implementation of the mainstream process.

**Implications For Further Research**

Current research in the area of mainstreaming is minimal. There is a need for systematic research on the mainstreaming process. The investigator recommends:

1. Inservice training to bridge the gap between special and regular educators in order to develop a comprehensive support system.
2. Explore strategies for equipping handicapped and nonhandicapped youngsters with skills for peer teaching.

3. A revamping of College and University training centers in the general education department to equip potential teachers in planning for the education of the mainstreamed child.

4. The assessment of pupil and teacher attitudes towards the handicapped.

5. The use of the special class teacher as a consultant, skilled at educational diagnosis, creative in the remediation of problems and competent in behavioral management techniques.

6. This study did not address itself to language difficulties incurred by children of other nationalities, it is recommended that the IEP contain such a component.
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APPENDIX
The following statements have been selected to provide insight into your personal feelings regarding the Individual Educational Plan.

The specific goal of this questionnaire is to find out how clear the Individual Educational Plan is for implementation.

Directions:

A list of statements will be given after which the following choices will be listed:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Undecided
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

Please circle the appropriate response.

I. Classification

1. The referral information included:
   a. The source of referral
   b. An explanation of the presenting problem
   c. Descriptive information of the student
II. **Individual Descriptive Findings**

The findings of the Child Study Team included adequate information about the child's:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. **Eligibility for Special Education**

1. The report provides a fair way of establishing eligibility for special education.  
2. I received a clear statement of the decision by the Child Study Team on non-classified students.

IV. **Parent and Teacher Participation**

1. I was encouraged to participate in determining pupil classification.  
2. I was encouraged to participate in follow-up meetings about the classification established by the Child Study Team.

V. **Annual Goals and Objectives**

1. The annual goals and objectives have been related to the handicap.
2. The objectives have been sequential steps which integrated present educational performance and annual goals.

VI. Recommended Program/Placement Services

1. The recommended program placement and services:
   a. Have been based upon the needs of the pupils and the objectives developed.
   b. Have led to the least restrictive environment for the pupils.
   c. Have met the students' educational needs.

VII. Evaluative Criteria and Implementation

1. The implementation of the pupil's program:
   a. Was clearly defined
   b. Was supervised by knowledgeable persons designated by the Child Study Team.

2. The evaluation of the pupil's program:
   a. Was clearly defined
   b. Was supervised by knowledgeable persons designated by the Child Study Team.

3. The responsibilities of all persons involved are clearly defined
VIII. Instructional Guide

1. Sufficient guidance has been given in developing the instructional guides.

2. The program is leading to successful performance of mainstreamed pupils

IX. Professional Evaluation of the Plan

1. Do you believe that the Individual Educational Plan would be helpful in the areas of:

   a. Classroom management
   b. Curriculum Planning
   c. Cognitive development
   d. Parent/Teacher relationships

2. Do you view the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming?
Public Law 94-142 is the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. It is called Mainstreaming. Mainstreaming means moving handicapped children from their segregated place in special education and integrating them with "normal" children in regular classrooms.

An education plan must be designed to meet the child's educational needs. This special plan is the Individual Educational Plan.

This survey has been designed for assessing your understanding of the Individual Educational Plan and your evaluation of the mainstream process.

Please do not sign the questionnaire.
# Survey Questionnaire B

Please circle the correct number based on whether you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A fuller explanation of Public Law 94-142 is necessary for the success of the mainstream process.  

2. Mainstreamed pupils should receive Related Services (*LDT, Learning Center, Speech Therapist, etc.*) in order to reach maximum learning potential.  

3. Regular class teachers can provide adequate instruction for mainstreamed pupils.  

4. Handicapped pupils could benefit academically from placement in a regular class.  

5. Handicapped pupils could benefit socially from placement in a regular class.  

6. Class size should be smaller for the mainstream process.  

7. Regular classroom teachers should have support and help from the special education teachers.  

*LDT stands for Learning Disability Teacher*
8. Instructional personnel responsibilities should be clarified more in implementing the IEP.

9. For successful mainstreaming the administration should provide support in the form of:
   a. Flexible scheduling
   b. Release time for teacher planning
   c. Encouragement for innovative change

10. Inservice training sessions are needed to further clarify the IEP.

11. More creative strategies for implementing the IEP should be explored.

12. Students in regular classes should be prepared before mainstreamed pupils arrive.

13. Specially trained personnel, i.e., psychologists, LDT, social workers, etc., rather than the classroom teacher should direct the major plan for the IEP.

14. The availability of Related Services for the pupil's IEP should be clarified for the regular classroom teacher.

15. Curriculum should be designed to meet the needs of each mainstreamed pupil.

16. Systematic ongoing evaluation should be part of each pupil's IEP.

*IEP stands for Individual Educational Plan
17. There is a need for more joint planning time for special class teachers and regular teachers.

18. For successful implementation of the IEP, there is a need for more communication between:

   a. The regular class teacher and the special class teacher.
      
   b. The class teacher and the Child Study Team.
      
   c. The regular class teacher and parents, guardians or adults in households.
      
   d. The special class teacher and parents, guardians or adults in households.
      
   e. The Child Study Team and parents, guardians or adults in households.

19. Do you believe that the Individual Educational Plan would be helpful in the areas of:

   a. Classroom management
      
   b. Curriculum planning
      
   c. Cognitive development
      
   d. Parent/Teacher relationships

20. Do you view the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming?
Appendix C

Taped Personal Interview Questionnaire
for Mainstreamed Pupils

Directions: The interviewer states:

"I am going to ask you a few questions about your school work, your classmates, and about yourself. Your answers will help your teachers make learning much more fun for you."

1. Are you happy in class?
   Response:

2. Are your lessons the same or different from your classmates?
   Response:

3. Do you receive any special help with your classwork? (i.e., speech therapy, tutor, learning center/resource room, transportation, etc.).
   Response:

4. What do you like best about your educational program?
   Response:

5. Do you believe you are learning more since you have been in this class?
   Response:

6. How does it make you feel to be in this class?
   Response:

7. Do you have many school friends?
   Response:
### Survey Schedule C

**Taped Interview Questionnaire for Mainstreamed Pupils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Total Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Recapitulation of Responses and Pupil Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Are you happy in your class?                   | 4                          | Pupils are happy in their classrooms.  
                          |                             | "Yes, I like it."                             |
| 2. Are your lessons the same or different from your classmates? | 2                          | In these cases the lessons are sometimes the same and sometimes different.  
                          | 2                          | Lessons are different.                        |
| 3. Do you receive any help with your classwork?   | 4                          | All pupils receive help.  
                          |                             | "I go to the math center."                    |
                          |                             | "The teacher helps me, you help me and so does Mr. Barnes." |
                          |                             | "The reading teacher helps me."               |
| 4. What do you like best about your educational program? | 1                          | "My job. I work in the cafeteria after lunch. I eat all I want. I like industrial arts and gym.  
                          | 1                          | "I like industrial arts best of all and I go to gym." |
                          | 2                          | "Going to gym and music."                     |
Recapitulation of Responses and Pupil Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Total Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Recapitulation of Responses and Pupil Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you believe you are learning more since you have been in this class?</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>Responses were candid. Yes Undecided No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How does it make you feel being in this class?</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>Affirmative responses were expected with one negative response. Okay &quot;I don't like special class, but I like Mr. Roy and Mrs. Arnold and my friends in my class. I like Mr. Brooks and Mr. Flynn.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you have many school friends?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pupils responded favorably. Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directions: The interviewer states:

"I am going to ask you a few questions about your school work, your classmates, and about yourself."

QUESTIONS:

1. Do you like your class?
   Response

2. Do you understand your class lessons?
   Response

3. Do you receive any help with your classwork? (Learning Center, Tutor, Resource Room, etc.)
   Response

4. What do you think about a handicapped pupil being in your class?
   Response

5. Do you believe you are learning just as much since mainstreamed pupils are in your class?
   Response
Survey Schedule D

Taped Interview Questionnaire for Regular Class Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
<th>Recapitulation and Pupil Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you like your class?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pupils liked their class. &quot;Yes I like my class very much, in fact I enjoy school. I hate it when I have to miss it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you understand your class lesson?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lessons are sometimes understood and sometimes not understood. &quot;Sometimes I don't, I am from Puerto Rico and I am still learning new things.&quot; &quot;Yes&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What do you think about a handicapped pupil being in your class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All students gave favorable responses. &quot;It's okay they have to learn too.&quot; &quot;My teacher says this is good. I think it is good too.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Total Number of Responses</td>
<td>Recapitulation and Pupil Excerpts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. What do you think about a handicapped pupil being in your class? | 1                         | "I think they should have a chance to learn like anybody else. I saw a movie on t.v. about handicapped kids, other children made fun of them. I don't think that's fair. They are just like anybody else. We talked about it in our class. It's alright for them to be in our classes. They want to learn too."
| 4. Do you believe you are learning just as much since mainstreamed pupils are in your class? | 4                         | Responses were genuinely favorable. Yes "Well, so far I have art and music and gym with handicapped kids and we're learning together, so, I'm learning just as much."
| 5. How do you feel being a member of this class?     | 4                         | The students expressed "good" feelings.                                                                                                                      |
| 6. Do you have many school friends?                 | 4                         | Students have lots of friends.                                                                                                                             |
Appendix E

Survey Questionnaire for Parents, Guardians, and Heads of Households of Mainstreamed Pupils

In accordance with the Board of Education's School Policy, this plan has been designed to discover the impact that the Individual Educational Plan has had upon your child as being a part of the Mainstream Process.

The enclosed questionnaire will assist in the planning and implementation of the IEP research study. Your response to each statement is of great importance. Please respond to each statement by circling the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My child's referral notice explained and answered questions I had concerning his/her handicapping condition.

2. The Child Study Team made sufficient contact and offered assistance in my understanding of my child's disability.

3. I was encouraged to participate in determining my child's eligibility for special education.

4. The Child Study Team informed me of all other meetings concerning my child's program.

5. A clear explanation of the educational services for my child was stated.
6. The Child Study Team carried through the program that was stated for my child.

7. There has been a noticeable improvement in my child since he/she has been a part of the program.

PLEASE DO NOT SIGN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
Appendix F

Survey Questionnaire for Parents, Guardians, and Heads of Households of Regular Class Pupils

The Board of Education has implemented mainstreaming in your child's class. The enclosed questionnaire will assist in evaluating this process. Please do not sign the questionnaire. Circle the correct number as to whether you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My child can benefit socially from placement with a handicapped pupil. 1 2 3 4 5

2. My child receives adequate instruction in his/her regular class. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Class size should be smaller for the mainstream process. 1 2 3 4 5

4. My child was prepared for the arrival of the mainstreamed pupil. 1 2 3 4 5

5. I would like to know more about mainstreaming. 1 2 3 4 5

6. Since my child has been a part of the mainstream process, I think there has been a noticeable change in my child's:
   a. Social Behavior 1 2 3 4 5
   b. School Interest 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Achievement 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix G

Taped Personal Interview Questionnaire for School Personnel.

1. What number of the total school population is of minority status?

2. Do teachers view the Individual Educational Plan helpful in areas of:
   a. Classroom Management
   b. Curriculum Planning
   c. Cognitive Development
   d. Parent/Teacher Relationships?

3. Have teachers and parents participated in an Individual Educational Plan evaluation within the past year?

4. Do you view the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming?
## Survey Schedule G

### Taped Interviews of Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Recapitulation and Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What number of the total school handicapped population are of minority status?</td>
<td>Director of Special Services</td>
<td>&quot;There are 3,200 kids in Special classes. Most of them are of minority status. About 60% are Black, 20% Spanish and 20% White.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do teachers view the Individual Educational Plan helpful in the areas of classroom management, curriculum planning, cognitive development and parent/teacher planning?</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Responses from 16 administrators discloses that teachers have had sporadic participation in the development of the Individual Educational Plan. &quot;Teachers are informally being prepared, but we haven't incorporated the regular classroom teacher who is to receive the mainstream child into the program planning as yet.&quot; &quot;Teachers are not involved in the development of the plan, but they do look for a plan to accompany the mainstream child they receive. Plans are general and not specific enough.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Recapitulation and Excerpts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Have teachers and parents participated in an Individual Educational Plan evaluation within the past year? | Psychologist, Learning Disability Consultant, Guidance | "Regular class teachers must be educated. Teachers must be taught how to utilize children's strengths. If the IEP is used in that manner with all specialists using the same approach, the IEP will work in all areas."
"Time must be spent to train teachers in the use of correctly utilizing the IEP. More consulting is needed. Workshops have been given in mainstreaming as a choice option, but if teachers want to be successful, they must take advantage of these workshops in order that the IEP can be effective in all areas."
Data reveals parent participation has been limited yet favorable. "It is difficult to get parents to participate when they must work, but they are interested in their kids no matter how poor they are."
4. Do teachers view the IEP as an adequate tool for mainstreaming?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Recapitulation and Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>&quot;We find that parents have input in the educational plan. They get involved in the section dealing with the time spent in regular class. Parents know subject areas and what their kids like, but they are not as aware of levels of intellectual or academic functioning, remediation techniques or perceptual difficulties. We discovered that parents find it difficult to participate. About 20% of the parents have participated.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Special Services</td>
<td>In Schools B and C, the IEP is viewed as an adequate tool for mainstreaming as indicated by building principals. Fourteen administrators see the need for training, interpretation and adequate planning in order that the IEP become an effective tool for mainstreaming. &quot;Not really! Mainstreaming is so dependent on the attitude of the regular class teacher. Teachers must be receptive. Urban classrooms are overcrowded and teachers don't need another problem as they see it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Taped Personal Interview Questionnaire for School Personnel.

1. What number of the total school population is of minority status?

2. Do teachers view the Individual Educational Plan helpful in areas of:
   a. Classroom Management
   b. Curriculum Planning
   c. Cognitive Development
   d. Parent/Teacher Relationships?

3. Have teachers and parents participated in an Individual Educational Plan evaluation within the past year?

4. Do you view the Individual Educational Plan as an adequate tool for mainstreaming?
Survey Schedule H
Taped Interviews of Seven Special Class Teachers

Questions

1. Do teachers view the IEP helpful in the areas of classroom management, curriculum planning, cognitive development and parent/teacher relationships?

2. Do teachers view the IEP as an adequate tool for mainstreaming?

3. Have teachers and parents participated in an Individual Educational Plan evaluation within the past year?

Recapitulation of Responses

Four of seven teachers have not seen the IEP. Teachers feel that the plan can be helpful if they are adequately planned. One teacher summarizes the views of the Special education teachers. "Teachers view the plan as another chore, although special ed teachers plan all the time, the plans are made by the regular class teacher and I believe he or she needs guidance in creating the plans. There should be time for the special and regular class teachers to get together and not just after school. The plan can be used in all areas if correctly designed.

5 "no" responses
1 undecided response
2 "yes" responses

7 "yes" responses
COVER LETTERS
October, 1979

Dear Principal:

I am conducting a survey on the use of the Individual Educational Plan for mainstreaming.

As a follow-up of our October 1 telephone conversation, I shall be visiting your school to observe mainstream classes beginning October 15, 1979.

Thank you for the extended invitation and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline O. Reeves
Graduate Student

JGR/ke
Dear Parents:

The Board of Education is carrying out mainstreaming in your child's class. Mainstreaming means integrating educationally of physically handicapped children from special class into regular class.

I am conducting a survey on the mainstream process. You can help by answering the survey questionnaire enclosed. Please do not sign the questionnaire and return it to your child's teacher.

Thank you for your time and cooperation. All of the questionnaires will be destroyed after the information has been tabulated.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline J. Reeves
Graduate Student

Enclosure
Dear Parents,

Public Law 94-142 is the Education for all Handicapped Children Act. It is called mainstreaming. Mainstreaming means integrating educationally or physically handicapped children from special classes and integrating them into the regular classroom.

An education plan must be developed to meet the child's educational needs. Parents have helped in developing this plan.

The Board of Education has implemented mainstreaming in your child's class. I am conducting a survey on mainstreaming through the use of the Individual Educational Plan. The enclosed questionnaire will assist you in the evaluation of this plan. Please do not sign the questionnaire and return it.

Thank you for all of your help.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline G. Reeves
Graduate Student

Enclosure
Dear Principal:

Thank you for a wonderful education experience this month. I appreciate the time and input you shared along with your staff and students during my visitations. The cooperation from all staff was fantastic.

The next scheduled visits are November 12-16th, December 3-7, 10-14, 1973 and January 14-18, 1980.

On December 3rd I would like the survey schedules distributed to your staff.

I am looking forward to the next visits.

Sincerely yours,

Jacqueline J. Reeves
Graduate Student

saj