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PREFACE

Ten years ago I started teaching special education in a small school system in Decatur, Georgia. Decatur is located 15 miles North West of Atlanta.

My first full time job experience was in a self-contained classroom for students who were labeled "mentally retarded." The term self-contained means that students spend the entire school day in one classroom with one teacher who is expected to meet the needs of each student. There were sixteen students with sixteen sets of individual needs, referred to by some educators as the "garden variety" type. A third of those students' needs could have been met in a regular education program.

The special education teacher was responsible for the diagnosis, prescription, and treatment of each student. There were no special school supplies, no aides, no Individual Educational Plans (IEPs), no special counseling, no mainstreaming and very little interest in the needs of special education students or their teachers.

Since that time many changes have taken place as a result of parent involvement, federal and state legislation, and civil action suits. But the courts do not concern themselves with the day-to-day operations of schools, or the complex problems of change in local school settings.
With the passage of Public Law 94-142 and the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Special Education Law, both special and regular education teachers are being faced with significant challenges. Both laws require the services of a multitude of personnel working together to identify and 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 identification and placement procedure of students in special education classes, referred to in the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Law as the Pre-Referral Process (Regulation 314.0), is one procedure that is not in wide use. The Pre-Referral Process provides a chance to eliminate unnecessary and inappropriate placement of students before students are referred for a special education evaluation. Teachers and administrators have not spent time investigating or implementing this process.

Various strategies and techniques must be considered to precipitate the necessary change that must take place for implementation. One of those techniques is staff development. This writer believes that a lack of familiarity with the procedures and the persistance of old patterns of behavior account for the disuse. Most teachers are not accustomed to participating in making educational decisions and require some training to do so effectively.
This study was designed to assess the training needs of special and regular education teachers related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process. The study will provide teachers, parents, university-based educators, state education agencies, and public school administrators with information for structuring the format, content and delivery of inservice training programs and workshops. This study will contribute to the current focus of inservice needs for special and regular education teachers mandated by Public Law 94-142 and the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Special Education Law.

Chapter I will present an outline of the legal guidelines of the referral, evaluation and placement procedures of Public Law 94-142, also known as the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. An outline of the placement procedures of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Special Education Law is also presented.

One of the main differences between the two laws is the Pre-Referral Process, regulation number 314.0 of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Law. The Pre-Referral Process is designed to eliminate unnecessary and inappropriate referral, evaluation and placement of students in special education classes. In addition, Chapter I provides the purpose of the study, questions to be answered, significance of the survey, limitations of the survey, and definitions of the terms.
Chapter II provides a brief historical review of the development of public school special education classes, a summary of federal and state legislation enacted to assist in the area of special education and the past record of identification and placement of students in special education classes. In addition, precedent setting court cases associated with special class placement are presented.

Chapter III provides a description of the development of the questionnaire, the population and the sites from which the population was drawn and the procedures for data collection.

Chapter IV presents the statistical analysis of the data via SPSS computer program.

Finally, Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions and implications for further research.

I would like to extend my thanks to the people who contributed to the development and completion of this dissertation. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Byrd L. Jones, for his guidance, critical evaluation, feedback and editorial assistance during the entire project. Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Castelano Turner for his suggestions, thought provoking questions, and his perceptive review of this dissertation. My thanks to Dr. Patricia Gillespie-Silver for her helpful observations, cooperation and assistance
when I needed her. I am also grateful to Dr. Jane Miller for sharing her knowledge and experience and for the reinforcement she gave me. To the teachers who took the time to respond to my survey and made this study possible, I thank you. A special expression of appreciation is owed to my typist Mrs. Debbie Brescia, who painstakingly prepared this dissertation from the draft to the final copy.
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Recent changes in Massachusetts and federal mandates for special education have established procedures for placing students. Massachusetts' requirements of a Pre-Referral Process varies from federal requirements and has not been thoroughly understood.

The Pre-Referral Process provides opportunities to eliminate unnecessary and inappropriate placement before the student is referred. The Pre-Referral Process defined in paragraph 314.0 of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Regulations involves attempts to resolve the student's problem in the regular classroom setting.
Once a child is enrolled in public school, it is usually the regular classroom teacher who identifies the child in need of educational intervention. The special teacher intervenes only after the child has been identified. As a result, emphasis has been placed on using the skills of the special teacher only after the placement has been made. Underlying such an emphasis is the acceptance that the role of the regular classroom teacher is simply to identify students experiencing difficulty in school. Educators have not concerned themselves with the role of the regular classroom teacher in implementing strategies in the regular program before the student is referred for special education.

This study asked for: (1) Guidelines teachers are familiar with related to the Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process. (2) The role of the special and regular education teacher during the Pre-Referral Period. (3) Procedures teachers use before referring a student. and, (4) Inservice training needs of special and regular education teachers related to the Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process.

Special and regular education teachers in six elementary and four secondary schools completed a questionnaire designed by the investigator. Data was analyzed by one-way frequency distribution, and cross tabulation.
Conclusions:

1. Teachers have not had adequate inservice training activities related to Chapter 766 or the Pre-Referral Process.

2. Regular education teachers should modify instruction, utilize school services, and analyze student's learning and behavioral needs as part of Pre-Referral activities.

3. Special education teachers should assist regular education teachers.

4. Special teachers recognize the training needs of regular teachers.

5. Inservice training is an effective method for increasing teachers knowledge.

Much of the needed instructional service can and should be carried on within regular classrooms. Teachers, however, need some assistance in the use of alternative means to manage the diverse needs of children.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Public Law 94-142

In November 1975 Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, also known as Public Law 94-142. Handicapped is defined in this Act to mean those children identified as being mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, other health impaired, deaf-blind, multi handicapped, or as having specific learning disabilities, who because of these impairments need special education and related services.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 94-142, the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped (1976), estimated that there were eight million handicapped children of public school age. Of these identified handicapped children, one million received no services from public education sectors and four million were inappropriately served. Inappropriate is defined as not meeting the individual needs of the student.

Congress in enacting the law established the Federal Government as an advocate of handicapped children and their parents. The law provided significant evidence of the Federal Government's leadership position in assuring the
availability of free appropriate education for all handicapped children. P.L. 94-142, the "Bill of Rights for the Handicapped" seeks to correct inequities by providing appropriate education and related services for all handicapped children. Policies and procedures have been developed and responsibilities have been delegated to state education agencies as per the provisions of P.L. 94-142.

Under Public Law 94-142, each public agency or school system must insure that handicapped children are educated with non-handicapped children to the maximum extent possible. Referred to as the Least Restrictive Alternative with placement appropriate to their individual learning abilities.

The law provides many parents and teachers a chance to push for eliminating evaluation procedures which result in misclassification. It also establishes procedural safeguards to allow parents and guardians opportunities to express opinions and make decisions on evaluation and placement of their children. Schools were required to begin to provide the services to all handicapped children age 3 through 21, in September 1978.

Figure 1, outlines the identification and placement procedure of Public Law 94-142.
Figure 1
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Massachusetts Law Chapter 766

The Massachusetts Chapter 766 Comprehensive Special Education Law ("Chapter 766") is a set of rules, regulations and by-laws developed at the state level to provide instruction and guidance to state and local education agencies serving children with special needs. Briefly Chapter 766 endeavors to:

Provide an adequate publicly supported education to every child resident therein, it is the purpose of this act to provide for a flexible and uniform system of special education program opportunities for all children requiring special education; to provide a flexible and non-discriminatory system for identifying and evaluating the individual needs of children requiring special education; requiring evaluation of the needs of the child and adequacy of the special education program before placement and periodic evaluation of the benefit of the program to the child's needs thereafter; and to prevent denials of equal educational opportunity on the basis of national origin, sex, economic status, race, religion and physical or mental handicap in the provision of differential education services (Section 1; p.1).

Massachusetts, as other states, has amended its special education law to meet the specifications of P.L. 94-142. Both laws have the same intent—quality educational services for exceptional children in the least restrictive environment.

Chapter 766, was one of the first pieces of legislation to call for the integration of the special
education student into the regular classroom. With the enactment of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended in 1974, and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142), the terms "mainstreaming" and "least restrictive environment" or "least restrictive alternative" have assumed a dominant role in defining the nature of the implementation of special education. Both laws require, as does Chapter 766 that:

(1) handicapped persons between the ages of 3 and 21 be provided a free appropriate public education, (2) handicapped students be educated with nonhandicapped students to the extent appropriate, (3) educational agencies identify and locate all unserved handicapped children, (4) evaluation procedures be adopted to insure appropriate educational services, (5) parents have a substantial role in the consent and approval of evaluation and placement, and (6) procedural safeguards be established.

Figure 2, provides a framework of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 procedural safeguards used for the identification and placement of special needs students.
Figure 2
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The Pre-Referral Process - Major Differences

Figure 3 outlines the major differences between the two laws. One of the major differences between Public Law 94-142 and the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Special Education Law is the Pre-Referral Process.

Figure 3
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The Pre-Referral Process provides a chance to eliminate unnecessary and inappropriate placement of children before the student is referred. The Pre-Referral Process as defined in paragraph 314.0 of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Regulations involves classroom teachers in attempting to resolve the student's problem in the regular classroom setting. The paragraph states:

Prior to referral of a child for an evaluation, all efforts will be made to meet such child's needs within the context of the services which are part of the regular education program. In addition, all efforts shall be made to modify the regular education program to meet such needs. Such efforts and their results shall be documented and placed in the child's record. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to limit or condition the right to refer a child for an evaluation.

During the Pre-Referral Period, the teacher attempts to meet the needs of the student in the regular class before making a referral. The teacher should begin this process by first gathering available student information so that the student's strengths and weaknesses can be identified. Once these are established, the teacher devises and implements strategies to meet the student's needs by modifying instruction and/or utilizing regular school services. The teacher then evaluates the strategies employed. If the problem is not solved, the teacher implements an alternative strategy. When all alternative strategies have been exhausted, a referral is made. The desired role of the classroom teacher during the Pre-Referral Period is outlined in Figure 4.
Figure 4
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According to the Massachusetts Center for Program Development (1976), there are two major reasons for including a Pre-Referral Procedure in the identification process.

1. Individual student problems that can be resolved within the regular classroom setting without special services, save the school system time and money, and eliminate unnecessary and inappropriate placement of children.

2. If a problem cannot be resolved in the regular classroom setting, the collection of specific information by the teacher about the child (e.g., present educational performance levels, identification of strengths and weaknesses, behavior pattern) will serve as a valuable guide for an evaluation. The evaluation team will be able to select the types of assessment devices needed based on the information presented by the teacher.

The intent of the legal guidelines represents a sincere effort to insure just identification and placement procedures of school age children in special education classes. However, these guidelines fail to address a very critical issue--the role of the regular classroom teacher in attempts to meet the needs of the student in the regular education program before making a referral.

Once a child is enrolled in a public school, it is the regular classroom teacher who initially identifies the child in need of educational intervention. The special education teacher intervenes only after the child has been identified. As a result, emphasis has been placed on how best to use the skills of the special education teacher and
the development of educational materials for children only after the special placement has been made. Underlying such an emphasis is the acceptance that the role of the regular classroom teacher is simply to identify students experiencing difficulty in school and in need of educational intervention. Educators have not concerned themselves with the role of the regular classroom teacher in implementing strategies in the regular education program before the student is referred for special education.

The "regular educator" is responsible for the Pre-Referral Process. Utilization of regular school services (e.g., cumulative records, routine vision and hearing screening, Title 1, remedial reading, school adjustment counselor, special subject teachers) should be attempted and documented in an effort to resolve the student's problems before a referral is made for an evaluation.

In order to insure more fair and just identification and placement procedures for children in need of educational intervention, all facets of the identification and placement process must be carefully examined and understood. Consequently, the regular classroom teacher's role before a student is referred for special education placement, warrants more investigation since they are the key figures in the educational process of such children once they are enrolled in public schools.
The National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped estimates that 260,000 special education personnel and over 2 million regular educators require inservice training to implement the provisions of Public Law 94-142. Staff development programs to prepare teachers to work with special needs children in their classes should be available prior to placement of the students, and continuous support and training are necessary to meet problems as they arise. Special education teachers specialize in certain areas and may require inservice training when assigned children with unfamiliar disabilities. Inservice training also is needed for paraprofessionals and other support personnel.

Staff development programs for regular education similarly is of increasing importance, particularly toward enhancing the ability of regular administrators and teachers to establish and maintain the concept of placing handicapped children in classroom situations that provide the least restrictive environment to meet their needs. In addition, training to introduce the classroom teacher to his/her role during the Pre-Referral Period is very critical.

This study will survey regular and special educators concerning their roles and activities during the Pre-Referral Period in an attempt to identify events leading to unnecessary and inappropriate referral of students. Unless school people understand the issues involved and are aware
of appropriate strategies, there can be little assurance that the concept of the Pre-Referral Process will be properly applied.

**Purpose of The Study**

The purpose of this study is:

1. To determine extent of teacher awareness of the section of Massachusetts Chapter 766 Special Education Laws related to the Pre-Referral Process.
2. To determine the extent to which teachers attempt to resolve the student's problems within the context of the regular education program in order to avoid inappropriate referral and evaluation of students.

**Questions to be Answered**

1. What does the regular education teacher define as her/his role during the Pre-Referral Period?
2. What does the special education teacher define as her/his role during the Pre-Referral Period?
3. Are teachers familiar with the legal regulations of Chapter 766 regarding the Pre-Referral Process?
4. Determine from study data what inservice training activities focusing on special education and the Pre-Referral Process teachers have participated in.
5. Have inservice training activities focusing on special education and the Pre-Referral Process affected referrals, if so, how?

6. How do teachers attempt to resolve the student's problems within the context of the regular education program?

**Significance of the Survey**

The role of the special and regular classroom teacher during the Pre-Referral Process has not been thoroughly investigated. The resulting data from this study will assist in identifying how special and regular classroom teachers define their roles during the Pre-Referral Period. Data from this study will help explain if the regular classroom teacher attempts to resolve the student's problems within the context of the regular education program.

In addition, the study will provide teachers, parents, university based educators, state education agencies, and public school administrators with information for structuring the format, content and delivery, of inservice training programs and workshops. The study will contribute to the current focus of inservice needs for special and regular education teachers mandated by the Chapter 766 Special Education Law.
The results of the study will also have some implications for designers of pre-service training programs for prospective teachers. The results will provide instructors with information that will assist them in planning their programs of study.

Limitations of the Survey

This study is limited in the following respects:

1. The survey only focuses on the inservice training needs related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process. This process involves the classroom teacher in attempting to resolve the student's problems in the regular classroom setting. If the student's problems can be resolved within the regular education program without special services, it eliminates unnecessary and inappropriate referral and evaluation of children, and saves the school system time and money.

2. The survey only solicits information from special and regular education teachers; it does not solicit information from counselors, administrators and other support staff.

3. All of the teachers are from the Springfield and Ludlow, Massachusetts Public School Systems. The Springfield System was chosen because of its;
(1) urban setting, (2) blend of racial and cultural background of teachers and students, and (3) Springfield was also named in June, 1978, by the Massachusetts Advocacy Center as one of nine communities in the state with a large number of minority students who may have been disproportionately placed in Chapter 766 special education classes. The Ludlow Public School System was chosen because of its: (1) small town setting, (2) and its limited blend of racial and cultural background of teachers and students. Together these two school systems will provide a good representation of data needed to complete this survey.

4. The questionnaire is concerned with ascertaining information to assist in designing inservice programs for special and regular education teachers.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this survey, the following definitions are used:

1. Special education: Defined in Public Law 94-142 (5121a.14) as the specially designed instruction at no cost to parents or guardians, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions.
2. **Regular education program**: The school program and pupil assignment for children without need of special education. Such program is that which normally leads to college preparatory or technical education or to a career and which has a typical progression from kindergarten to high school. Such a program is also that which offers a full range of supportive services which are normally provided to children without need of special education.

3. **Pre-Referral**: Defined in paragraph 314.0 of the Massachusetts 766 Regulations as follows:

> Prior to referral of a child for an evaluation, all efforts shall be made to meet such child's needs within the context of the services which are part of the regular education program. In addition all efforts shall be made to modify the regular education program to meet such needs. Such efforts and their results shall be documented and placed in the child's record. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to limit or condition the right to refer a child for an evaluation.

4. **Least restrictive program**: The program that, to the maximum extent appropriate, allows a child to be educated with children who are not in need of special education.
5. **Inservice**: The process of professional development of educational personnel on the job. The fundamental purpose of inservice education is the improvement of educational programs for students. The idea is that schools will improve and students will learn better when teachers learn to teach better or learn more themselves.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Special Education:
An Historical Perspective

Two hundred years ago, society often viewed mental, physical or emotional handicaps as signs of divine retribution. Children with handicaps were considered uneducable and untrainable, and consequently, they were completely dependent upon either their family or charity. While the local community might sympathize with parents, they could offer no facilities or special services. At best, handicapped children faced a monotonous, useless existence in a state institution (Quirk, 1978).

During the first half of the twentieth century, programs for handicapped children were gradually established in local schools at the request of concerned parents. At first, many children were excluded or admitted for short periods only. Some school systems organized "special classes" or "opportunity" rooms for exceptional children. By 1930, the term "Special Education" was widely used in America to indicate educational programs for the handicapped.

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 public schools (Buinink and Rynders, 1971).

Although programs for handicapped children expanded during the 1960s, they were still lacking in three respects. First of all, they provided separate facilities and separate teachers. By 1963 about 90 percent of mentally retarded children were receiving instruction in self contained classrooms (Hewett and Forness, 1974). Birch (1974), 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." Consequently, many handicapped students were labelled as "different." Such labels followed and often hindered students during their entire lives.

Another problem was lumping all handicapped students, particularly mentally handicapped ones, under one category. As educators soon discovered, many suffered from environmental factors such as poverty or physical abuse, but they had not been born mentally deficient. A third problem rested on the lack of federal or state funds allocated to programs for handicapped students.

**Federal and State Legislation**

In 1961, 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.

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 1960s were expressions of the national conscience striving to serve state and local consciences."

Abeson (1974) 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.

The 1970s has shown the greatest progress towards helping handicapped children. In framing the new Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, the United States Congress pointed out that about one half of the Nation's eight million handicapped children do not receive an adequate education, and almost a million are excluded from the public school system.

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," added 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" (Burrello and Sage, 1979).

The new national commitment to serve every handicapped child by 1980, of course, gave rise to new and better programs. One current direction is mainstreaming--the placement of exceptional children into regular classrooms.

Perhaps the most significant change apparent today is a greater awareness of the handicapped person's rights. Education is, of course, one of these fundamental rights. Attaining this right has been a slow and difficult process.

The Past Record of Identification and Placement Procedures of Students in Special Education Classes

The use of IQ tests for decades was the sole criterion for determining special class placement. It was assumed that intelligence tests accurately assessed and predicted the intellectual abilities of all children (Kirk, 1971). Based on scores made by children on the widely used Stanford-Binet
Intelligence Scale, Terman and Merrill (1960) concluded that children scoring 60-69 were mentally defective, 70-79 borderline defective and 80-85 low average. As a result, any child scoring between 60-85 on an IQ test was placed in a special education class; however, the specific upper limit constituting such placement varied from state to state (Van Osdol & Shane, 1975).

While Terman's and Merrill's distribution appeared elementary and the most pragmatic way to determine special class placement, it did not adequately identify all children with special educational needs, or identified too many. Many children who had average and above average scores (90-130) on IQ tests experienced learning difficulties in the regular classroom setting. This factor led to a dependence on teacher identification of special needs children and the development of more comprehensive and diversified tests. These more comprehensive and diversified tests were developed to assess other areas of mental functioning in addition to overall intelligence, i.e., language development, academic achievement, speech development, perceptual motor skills, and social and emotional development. These various tests were standardized, administered by specially trained persons, and usually given in settings other than the classroom (Hammill, 1971).

The most commonly used tests to determine special class placement (Hammill, 1971; Loehlin, Linzey and Spuhler, 1975; Polser, 1972) were:
Intelligence Tests

Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale
Slosson Intelligence Test for Children and Adults
Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Adults (WAIS)
Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Children (WISC)

Language Tests

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA)
Mecham Verbal Language Development Scales

Individual Achievement Tests

Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity and Achievement Test
Gates Reading Readiness Scales
Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)
Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)

Group Achievement Tests

California Achievement Tests (CAT)
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT)
Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test
School and College Ability Test (SCAT)
Sequential Test of Educational Progress (STEP)

Speech Test of Articulation

Templin Darley Tests of Articulation

Perceptual Motor Tests

Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test
Benton Visual Retention Test
Frostig Development Test of Visual Perception
Graham-Kendall Memory for Design Test
Oseretsky Motor Development Scales
Purdue Perceptual-Motor Survey
Social Development
Adaptive Behavior Scales
Vineland Social Maturity Scales

Auditory Test
Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test

The use of intelligence tests as the major assessment tool to identify special needs students has been a controversial issue for years. The controversy revolves around four major issues: (1) the validity of intelligence tests, (2) the use of intelligence test results to identify borderline special needs students, (3) the inability of intelligence test results to provide diagnostic and remediation information, and (4) the use of intelligence tests as an assessment tool for minority group members.

The validity question. Do intelligence tests measure what they purport to measure? Based on definitions given for intelligence, the validity of intelligence tests is suspect.

Intelligence has been defined as:

The term that refers to intellectual ability. It can be defined specifically as what an intelligence test measures or more generally as an ability, or pattern of abilities influencing intellectual functioning (Kendler, 1963, p.690).

Intelligence is the potential of the organism to acquire symbols, to retain those symbols, and to communicate meaningfully by means of those symbols (Newland, 1971, p.136).
The ability of the organism to adjust itself adequately to new situations (Stern, 1941, p.13).

The sum total of all those thought processes which consist in mental adaptation and self-criticism as characterizing intelligence in action (Terman and Merrill, 1960, p.15).

The aggressive or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively (Wechsler, 1958, p.12).

The definitions cited by Terman and Merrill (1960) and Wechsler (1958), the authors of the most widely used intelligence tests, focus on the individual's ability to adapt to new situations and rational thought processes. Yet, the contents of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale and the Wechsler Intelligence Scales focus on the skills and knowledge that students have already acquired (Buros, 1972). Testing procedures on these and other intelligence tests do not afford children the opportunity to explain their rationale for answers given (thought processes) or place them in new situations to examine how they would adapt. Such inconsistencies between definition and test content gives rise to serious questions concerning the validity of intelligence tests.

IQ testing and the borderline exceptional child. The use of IQ test results to identify and place the borderline exceptional student (those with IQ scores below 85) has created much concern among parents and educators. As stated earlier, students with IQ's below 85 were placed in special
education classes with the exact upper limit varying according to the state or school district in which the child resided. Consequently, in some states a student with an IQ of 75 would be classified as mildly retarded, a slow learner, or educable mentally retarded; yet, the same student would be placed in a regular classroom and considered "normal" in another state. By merely crossing a state line or in some instances by merely changing school districts, a child who had been classified as retarded could suddenly become "normal."

Another problem with the use of IQ test results to identify the borderline exceptional student has been the interpretation of test scores. As Anastasi (1961) pointed out, all scores have standard errors of measurement and therefore should not be interpreted as absolute values. For example, the standard errors of measurement for the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale and the Wechsler Intelligence Scales are six and five respectively. Translated in terms of individual IQ's this means that a child's true score on either test could vary between twelve and thirteen points above or below the given score. Subsequently, a child scoring 82 on the Stanford-Binet could in actuality have a score between 76 and 88 if the standard error of measurement were considered. The difference of six points would warrant regular class placement rather than special class placement. On the other hand, a child scoring 88 could in actuality have a score of
76 if the standard error of measurement were considered. Such a child could possibly muddle through regular classroom placement without ever receiving remedial or corrective intervention. Failure to consider the effects of the standard error of measurement and the lack of standard, unified cut-off points to determine special class placement clearly worked to the disadvantage of the child.

So much confusion and inconsistency exist concerning the borderline exceptional child that the term "six hour retarded child" (President's Committee on Mental Retardation, 1969) is currently used to describe such children. The term "six hour retarded child" refers to the child who demonstrates adequate behavior in his/her community yet is concurrently identified as educable mentally retarded for purposes of school placement.

**IQ tests: Diagnosis and remediation.** While IQ test scores determined whether or not students were retarded, average, or gifted, the scores provided absolutely no diagnostic type information that enabled teachers to construct academic programs of study to assist in remediating learning problems or providing enrichment activities (Jones & MacMillan, 1974). For example, when a teacher is told that a student has an IQ of 75, he or she still does not know the specific reading, arithmetic, perceptual-motor, and/or reasoning skills that the student has not yet acquired.
IQ scores only indicate the child's knowledge of the content included in a particular test. In order for teachers to develop effective remediation strategies, goals, and objectives, they need diagnostic type information related to specific learning modalities, areas of specific strengths and weaknesses, through processes employed to deduct answers to questions, and former instructional approaches used to teach skills. IQ test scores do not provide such information. The dependence on IQ scores as the sole criterion determining special class placement has deprived regular classroom teachers of the task for which they were best suited.

Regular classroom teachers were and are in the best position to assess the educational problems of children since they could readily observe the entire range of the child's academic and behavioral performance (Smith, 1969). This belief was also supported by Hammill (1971) when he wrote:

I have reached the conclusion that the regular classroom teacher of learning-disabled children must assume responsibility for a considerable portion of the total diagnostic effort; and, that it is unreasonable to expect the school psychologist to write an "educational prescription," which the teacher dutifully implements in the classroom. Few psychologists possess teaching experience in learning disabilities, nor do they have familiarity with the wide variety of potential intervention strategies, nor do they see the child long enough to identify with surety subtle aberrations of educationally significant behavior—all of which are fundamental to the preparation of a viable "prescription" (p. 120).
IQ tests and minority groups. Many minority children are systematically deprived of their rights to an equal 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 the percentage in the population tested at an IQ of 79 or below on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test." Dunn (1968) contended that minority students composed over half of those enrolled in America's special education classes. Chenault (1970) discovered that once placed in an educable mentally retarded class, fewer Black children left the class than White: the exit pattern ... was found to vary as a function of race.

The use of intelligence tests to assess the intellectual ability of minority group members, particularly Afro-Americans, has been an embittered controversy since the initiation of such testing during World War I (Samuda, 1975). First of all, it is generally accepted that IQ tests have a white middle class bias, meaning that they tend to tap the learning experiences and behaviors peculiar to the white middle class (Anastasi, 1967; Barnes, 1969; Gray, 1968; Klineberg, 1963; Ross, DeYoung, & Cohen, 1971; Semler & Iscoe, 1963).

Although research studies have consistently demonstrated that IQ tests are culturally biased and an unfair
criterion measure on which to base special class placement, it was Judge Skelly Wright's landmark decision resulting from the Hobson vs. Hansen suit (1967) that legally terminated the practice. In a lengthy decision, Judge Wright wrote:

Because these tests are primarily standardized on and are relevant to a white middle-class group of students, they produce inaccurate and misleading test scores when given to lower class and Negro students. As a result, rather than being classified according to ability to learn, these students are in reality being classified according to the socio-economic or racial status, or—more precisely—according to environmental and psychological factors which have nothing to do with innate ability (p.514).

Secondly, some socio-economic deprived children, particularly Mexican-Americans and Puerto Rican Americans, encountered language barriers when taking IQ tests. For these students whose dominant language in the home was Spanish and for whom English was a second language, low IQ scores often resulted from a lack of proficiency in the English language rather than mental deficiency (Mercer, 1970). The language barrier issue was addressed in the Diana vs. State Board of Education, a case filed in the District Court for the Northern District of California in 1970. This case, filed on behalf of nine Mexican Americans who had been improperly placed in classes for the mentally retarded, resulted in the following practices:
1. All children whose primary home language is other than English must be tested in both their primary language and English.

2. Such children must be tested only with tests or sections of tests that do not depend on such things as vocabulary, general information, and other similar unfair verbal questions.

3. Mexican-American and Chinese-American children already in classes for the mentally retarded must be retested in their primary language and must be reevaluated only as to their achievement on nonverbal tests or sections of tests.

4. State psychologists are to work on norms for a new or revised IQ test to reflect the abilities of Mexican Americans so that in the future Mexican-American children will be judged only by how they compare to the performance of their peers, not the population as a whole.

5. Any school district which has a significant disparity between the percentage of Mexican-American students in its regular classes and in its classes for the retarded must submit an explanation setting out the reasons for this disparity (p. 24).

Although tried in Northern California, the practices set forth to be observed in the future set a precedence that extended far beyond the immediate geographical jurisdiction.

At the heart of the issue concerning minority groups and IQ testing was the interpretation and demeaning implications of IQ test results for minority group members. Historically, minority group members, particularly Afro-Americans, have illustrated a mean score of one standard deviation below that of their white counterparts on intelligence tests (Samuda, 1975). This factor led to a widespread and readily accepted belief that Afro-Americans
are genetically inferior to whites. The Coleman Report (1966), and highly publicized articles authored by Jensen (1969), Herrnstein (1971), and Bane and Jencks (1972) rather subtly endorsed the inherent genetic deficiency theory in their explanations of the correlations between race, socio-economic status, and school achievement. Several organizations representing minority group members (American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1970; Bay Area Association of Black Psychologists, 1968; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1974) viewed the genetic causation theory to explain the difference between races as racist and the use of IQ scores to place students in special education classes as perpetuating illegal segregational patterns in public schools. These groups called for a moratorium on the use of IQ tests to assess the intellectual ability of minority groups.

Categorization and Labeling

Initially, the delivery of special education services to children with special needs was based on the categorization of learning difficulties, hence the term "categorical special education." Categories were established for the: (1) blind, (2) deaf, (3) mentally retarded, (4) emotionally disturbed, and (5) orthopedically handicapped (Chalfant & Scheffelin, 1969). For students who did not fit neatly into these
categories, Kirk (1963) popularized the term "learning disabilities." The learning disabled excluded children belonging to the traditional categories and included only those children with disorders in language and speech development, reading, and associated communication skills needed for social interaction. Clements (1966) cited eight characteristics peculiar to learning disabled children:

1. Hyperactivity
2. Perceptual-motor impairments
3. Emotional liability
4. General coordination deficits
5. Disorders of attention (short attention span, distractibility)
6. Impulsivity
7. Disorders of memory and thinking
8. Specific learning disabilities
   (a) Reading
   (b) Arithmetic
   (c) Writing
   (d) Spelling
   (e) Equivocal neurological signs and electroencephalographic irregularities (p.13).

The categories developed for public school based special education programs served a variety of additional purposes. First of all, categorization allowed for easier administration of special education programs in that they provided a sense of closure to the problem (Kirk, 1963). Secondly, categorization at the public school level also enabled college based preservice and inservice teacher education training programs to design and implement their programs with little difficulty; public schools hired special education personnel according to their categorical training.
Thirdly, the categories were easily transformed into labels for the students.

**From Categorical to Non-Categorical Approaches**

The categorical approach to the delivery of special educational services failed to enhance the quality of instruction provided for children with special needs. Labels and categories, like IQ tests, offered little information of diagnostic and instructional value (Zubin, 1969). Furthermore, research has indicated that labeling students tended to create additional problems rather than eliminate old ones or as Menninger (1964) stated: "... the label applied to the illness becomes about as damaging as the illness itself" (p.12).

While investigating the effects of clinical labels on the attitudes of teachers toward the students, Combs and Harper (1967) found that labels did effect the attitudes of teachers toward exceptional children. Although some labels had neutral or even positive effects, others elicited negative attitudes. The researchers felt that these negative attitudes could result in teachers behaving in a manner that would foster rather than eliminate the child's problems. Along this same vein, studies by Beez (1968), Jones (1972), and Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) indicated that the negative connotations of labels influenced teaching behavior and reduced teacher expectations of exceptional children.
Those researchers who examined the effects of labels of the pupils themselves found that labels did not represent badges of distinction. Meyerowitz (1965) concluded that students labeled as educable mentally retarded showed increased feelings of self-derogation after one year in special education classes. Later, Meyerowitz (1967) found that labeling students adversely affected the attitudes of peer groups toward the exceptional child. McDonald (1962) addressed the issue of family attitudes toward exceptional children and noted that the negative attitudes attached to the labels were transferred to the child.

Dyck and Jones (1969) found that the stigma associated with labels and the feelings of self-derogation remained with students after graduation or school termination. In a post-school follow-up study of 450 individuals who had been labeled educable mentally retarded while in school, 65 percent of the respondents would tell no one or only a few people of their former special class placement out of fear of potential ridicule or public misunderstanding.

The debilitating effects and resulting stigmatization associated with categorization and labels paved the way for the current non-categorical approach to special education in both teacher training and the actual delivery of services to children with special needs (Blackhurst, Cross, Nelson & Tawney, 1973; Christopolos & Renz, 1969; Garrison & Hammill,
This non-categorical approach is currently referred to as "mainstreaming."

Remediation Procedures: Homogeneous Grouping

After identifying the etiology of the learning difficulty, assigning an IQ, and affixing an appropriate label to the exceptional child, remediation became the next area of concern. Educators believed that remediation or the "cure" would occur more rapidly in homogeneous classroom settings (Bruininks & Runders, 1971). Underlying this belief was the supposition that children with similar IQ scores had similar instructional needs (Reynolds, 1970). This assumption gave rise to the concept of "self-contained classrooms" or special education classes.

Self-contained classrooms were established in public schools to accommodate any and all students who were unable to adapt academically or behaviorally to the regular classroom setting. Students usually spent the entire school day in self-contained classrooms and seldom returned to the regular classroom regardless of the circumstance or reasons surrounding the initial placement. In addition, the student-teacher ratio was usually decreased to facilitate more individualized instruction. Also, more monies were invested
per pupil on special education students than those students in regular classrooms (Johnson, 1962).

The Efficacy of Homogeneous Grouping

Contrary to the belief that grouping all low IQ students together in self-contained classrooms would enhance the rapidity of their cure, it has been found that homogeneous grouping in self-contained classrooms tended to work to the disadvantage of exceptional children. Studies by Coleman (1972), Goldstein (1967), Hoelke (1966), Kirk (1964), and Smith and Kennedy (1967) have consistently demonstrated that exceptional children make as much or more progress in the regular classroom setting. Perhaps Johnson (1962) accurately summarized the seriousness of this situation when he stated:

It is indeed paradoxical that mentally handicapped children having teachers especially trained, having more money (per capita) spent on their education, and being designed to provide for their unique needs, should be accomplishing the objectives of their education at the same or at a lower level than similar mentally handicapped children who have not had these advantages and have been forced to remain in the regular grades (p. 66).

The retrogression or lack of progress experienced by exceptional children in self-contained classrooms stemmed in part from the belief that instructional homogeneity existed among children with special needs. MacMillan (1971) found that more heterogeneity existed among exceptional students in self-contained classrooms than "normal" students in regular
classrooms. Other studies by Fuchigami (1969), Kirk and Johnson (1951), Kolburne (1965), Simches and Bohn (1963), and Stevens (1971) have found that curricula designed for exceptional children in special classes were "watered down versions" of regular curricula rather than individualized programs to remediate specific learning deficits.

The failure of children with special needs to progress academically or to change undesirable modes of behavior after special class placement has also been attributed to the exclusionary process inherent in such placement (Gallagher, 1972). Once placed in self contained classrooms, exceptional children were denied the opportunity to interact on a regular basis with other children in the regular classroom setting. This exclusion was also extended to extra-curricular activities. Consequently, exceptional children were also denied the opportunity to participate in the cognitive and affective learning experiences peculiar to peer group interaction.

Court Cases Associated With Special Class Placement

Since the beginning of the early 1960s, parents have increasingly relied on the Courts to affirm their children's rights in the face of discriminatory educational practices used to identify and place children in special education classes.
Civil action suits have been filed against school districts and/or superintendents regarding criteria and procedures used to identify and place their children. The court decisions resulting from these precedent setting cases have been instrumental in determining the direction of public school special education programs throughout the United States. Five cases that have had the most impact on the delivery of services to children with special needs have decreed that identification and placement procedures must include:

1. An identification process that excludes the use of one criterion measure (Hobson v. Hansen, 1967).


The danger of practices and procedures which results in the inappropriate placement of children was reiterated in the important Larry P. v. Wilson Riles, Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of California (1972) decision which enjoins the State of California from utilizing
standardized intelligence tests for the identification of Black Educably Mentally Retarded children or their placement into Educable Mentally Retarded classes. In its summary, the decision states:

In violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, defendants have utilized standardized intelligence tests that are racially and culturally biased, have a discriminatory impact against Black children, and have not been validated for the purpose of essentially permanent placements of Black children into educationally dead-end, isolated and stigmatizing classes for the so-called educably mentally retarded. Further these federal laws have been violated by defendants' general use of placement mechanisms that, taken together, have not been validated and result in a large overrepresentation of Black children in the special Educable Mentally Retarded classes. (p.104).

Such findings as early grade retention, over ageness, low reading scores, high drop out rates, and overrepresentation of minorities in Educably Mentally Retarded classes among the minority and limited English speaking population, identified in hearings held by the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights and by various Senate and House sub-committees in the 1960s, indicated that the schools were not providing limited English speaking students and minority students with equal educational opportunity. Specifically, these findings contributed to an awareness that the practice of monolingual English instruction and the use of standardized tests to
determine placement of students in special education, where there were non-English, limited English speaking and minority students, was discriminatory.

The Diana v. State of California, was a landmark case in legal challenge to school systems with disproportionate numbers of Hispanic children in Educable Mentally Retarded classes. The case was brought in 1973, by the California Rural Legal Assistance Agency on behalf of "Diana" a Mexican American girl, living in Salinas. The judgement of the court was that Mexican American and Chinese speaking children already in classes for the mentally retarded must be retested in their primary language.

Statutory and judicial mandates have incorporated procedural safeguards and due process as the key method of assuring parental rights and the appropriate diagnosis and educational placement. In practice, however, this has not been sufficient protection for minority children as is evident from the continued succession of such recent court cases, on the United States District Court level, as Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School children et al. v. Ann Arbor School District Board, F. Supp. 1371 E.D. Michigan 1979. The following is a brief history of the case.

In 1977 three mothers filed a lawsuit on behalf of their children at the 500 student school. The complaint alleged that students with academic difficulties that result
from plaintiffs' "economic, social, and cultural backgrounds" have been treated by school officials as though they're handicapped and placed in classes with students having problems caused by physiological and psychological conditions. The complaint further alleged that school officials had not attempted to determine whether unsatisfactory academic performance was the result of "cultural, social or economic factors" and that where such factors existed, the plaintiffs sought to require defendants "to provide necessary educational materials and resources including eye glasses and hearing aids . . . newspapers, magazines, television programs and film assignments, trips, in service teacher training." (p.572)

Another issue in the case was the role of so-called Black English in the schools. The plaintiffs held that teachers and administrators viewed pupils who used so-called Black English as having learning disabilities, often erroneously assigning them to special education classes. As a result of the landmark ruling, teachers and administrators attended five training sessions to sensitize them to the nuances of those students who have a Black English dialect background and to help them recognize when learning problems are caused by the dialect rather than educational disabilities.

The essence of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School v. Ann Arbor School District Board case is the decision that the failure to provide support services within regular
education prior to referral and placement in special education effectively forecloses numbers of students from any meaningful educational opportunity.

Federal legislation has addressed itself to this problem. Public Law 94-142, The Education Of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 requires:

...procedures to assure the testing and evaluation materials and procedures utilized for the purpose of classification and placement of handicapped children will be selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory (Section 612, 5c).

The National Association of School Psychologists also developed and adopted resolutions with regard to standards for assessment techniques. These include:

- Assessment procedures and program recommendation are to be chosen to maximize the student's opportunities to be successful in the general culture;

- All student information is to be interpreted in the context of the student's cultural background; and,

- Training of psychologists needs to include an understanding of diverse cultures and an implementation of unbiased assessment practices (NASP, 1976).

In May 1978, the Delegate Assembly of the Council for Exceptional Children approved a set of Minorities Positions Policy Statements (C E C, 1978). Among the many policies and positions in this extensive document is "Section 300 Identification, Testing and Placement." Concerns expressed
in this section of the Position Policy Statements, include
the fact that tests exaggerate group differences and under-
score group inferiority. Secondly, data from these tests are
frequently used to place minority children in lower ability
groups or special education programs.

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 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.

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 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." Judge Peckham determined that score differences between Blacks and Whites was the product of cultural bias against Black children which was ingrained in the development of the test.

While associations of parents of handicapped children are seeking to expand the services of special education for their children, minority group members are tending to take strongly negative attitudes toward almost every activity conducted in the name of special education which involves negative labeling of children. This opposition is particularly a problem in our largest cities where the future of special education as a separate service has been placed in doubt.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN, PROCEDURE, METHODOLOGY

Context of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to examine the inservice training needs of special and regular education teachers related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process.

The Pre-Referral Process as defined in paragraph 314.0 of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Regulations involves the classroom teacher in attempting to resolve the student's problem in the regular classroom setting. The paragraph states:

Prior to referral of a child for an evaluation, all efforts will be made to meet such child's needs within the context of the services which are part of the regular education program. In addition, all efforts shall be made to modify the regular education program to meet such needs. Such efforts and their results shall be documented and placed in the child's record. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to limit or condition the right to refer a child for an evaluation.

The study data will be used to determine if teachers are familiar with the legal mandates of Chapter 766 regarding the Pre-Referral Process and what inservice training activities focusing on special education and the Pre-Referral Process have teachers participated in.

The roles and activities of regular and special educators during the Pre-Referral Period in an attempt to
identify unnecessary and inappropriate referral of students has not been thoroughly investigated. These factors led to the development of the questionnaire.

Development of Questionnaire

The questionnaire is divided into two parts (See Appendix A). Part one, Information Related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process, consists of eight statements participants were asked to complete by checking the appropriate response(s).

The options listed under statements one, two, three, four and five represent a combination of both the theoretical assumptions underlying the role of the special and regular education teacher during the Pre-Referral Process and the research findings. They also cover the legal guidelines of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process that have resulted in the current focus of the procedures used before referring students to be evaluated for special education.

The options listed under statements six, seven and eight represent the inservice training activities that the participants have or have not received related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process.

In addition, the respondents are asked to specify other options that might be appropriate in questions two, three, four, five and six.
Part two of the questionnaire, Demographic Information, consists of 12 questions that solicits demographic data related to the individual respondents and the schools in which the respondents teach.

Selection of Sites

All the teachers were from the Springfield and Ludlow, Massachusetts Public School Systems. The Springfield System was chosen because of its; (1) urban setting, (2) blend of racial and cultural background of teachers and students, and (3) Springfield was also named in June 1978, by the Massachusetts Advocacy Center as one of nine communities in the state with a large number of minority students who may have been disproportionately placed in Chapter 766 special education classes. The Ludlow Public School System was chosen because of its; (1) small town setting, (2) and its limited blend of racial and cultural background of teachers and students. Together these two school systems provided a good representation of data needed to complete this survey.

Description of the Springfield, Massachusetts Public School System. The Springfield Public School System consists of thirty-one elementary schools, seven junior high schools and five high schools serving approximately 22,732 students
and employing approximately 1,658 regular classroom teachers (See Table 1). The teacher population is 88% White, 8.7% Black and 3.1% Hispanic. The student population as of October 1, 1981 was 49.69% White, 29.38% Non-White and 20.93% Spanish Surnamed Americans.

In Springfield, the Special Education Program is designed to comply with the Bartley-Daly Act of 1972, commonly referred to as Chapter 766. Students are placed in school based special education programs in the following manner.

1. Students may be referred to the Special Education Department by any school official, parent, guardian, social worker, physician, judicial officer, or the student himself/herself if he/she is 18 years of age or older.

2. The Special Education Director receives the referral and assigns an Evaluation Team Chairperson to the student.

3. Parents' permission for testing is obtained and the evaluation process and parent/student rights under the law are explained.

4. Upon completion of all assessments required by the regulations, a Team Evaluation Meeting is scheduled. Participants in this meeting include student, parents, and where necessary, individual specialists, or their designees.
5. Following a full discussion of the results of the assessments, the Team recommends special education programs and services which seem appropriate to meet the student's individual special needs.

6. An Individual Educational Plan (IEP) is then developed and forwarded to the parent, or the student himself/herself if he/she is 18 years of age or older, for approval.

7. Parents have the option of either accepting the IEP, rejecting it, or asking for a review meeting with the Team participants in order to seek changes in the recommended services. They may also postpone their decision until an independent evaluation can be conducted.

8. Regular progress reports are submitted to parents during the school year. In addition, each child's program is reviewed annually and recommendations for the coming school year are submitted to the parents for their approval.

Finally, the Springfield School System employs the following special education personnel:
49 Learning Center Teachers
33 Pupil Adjustment Teachers
22 Itinerant Speech Therapists
15 Counselors (Individual Educational Plan)
13 Transitional Special Education Teachers
10 Work-Study Teachers
11 Early Childhood Special Education Teachers
 9 Trainable Special Education Teachers
 6 Learning Disabilities Teachers
 6 Home Teachers
 5 Teachers of the Physically Handicapped
 2 Teachers of the Developmentally Handicapped
 2 Adaptive Physical Education Teachers
 3 Itinerant Teachers of the Visually Impaired
 2 Family Counseling Teachers
 1 Full Time Teacher of the Hearing Impaired
 2 Itinerant Teachers of the Hearing Impaired
 1 Occupational Therapist
 1 Physical Therapist
100.5 Special Education Teacher Aides
 6 Licensed Practical Nurses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Junior High Sch.</td>
<td>175.5</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Senior High Sch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7 Junior High Schs.</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>22,732</td>
<td>293.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Senior High Schs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Springfield the questionnaire was issued by the Research Department of the Springfield School System, collected, and returned to the investigator.

Description of Ludlow Massachusetts Public School System. The Ludlow Massachusetts Public School System consists of three elementary schools, one junior high school and one senior high school serving approximately 3,041 students and employing approximately 175.5 regular classroom teachers (See Table 1). Both the teacher and student population is 95% White.

The Special Education Program in Ludlow, Massachusetts was also designed to comply with the Bartley-Daly Act of 1972 (Chapter 766).

Procedural steps for student enrollment in school based special education programs are as follows:

(See Appendix B)

1. Students may be referred to the Special Education Department by any school official, parent, guardian, social worker, physician, judicial officer, or the student himself/herself if he/she is 18 years or older.

2. The referral is submitted to the principal who in turn submits the forms to the Director of Special Education.

3. Parents' permission for testing is obtained and the evaluation process and parent/student rights under the law are explained.
4. Upon completion of the evaluations a Team meeting is scheduled, consisting of student, parents and individual specialists or their designees. The Team is chaired by the principal on the elementary level and by the Adjustment counselor on the secondary level.

5. Based on the results of the assessments the Team recommends special education programs and services which seem appropriate to meet the student's individual needs.

6. An Individual Educational Plan (IEP) is then developed and forwarded to the parent, or the student himself/herself if he/she is 18 years of age or older, for approval.

7. Parents have the option of either accepting the IEP, rejecting it, or asking for a review meeting with the Team participants in order to seek changes in the recommended services. They may also postpone their decision until an independent evaluation can be conducted.

8. Regular progress reports are submitted to parents during the school year. In addition, each child's program is reviewed annually and recommendations for the coming year are submitted to the parents for their approval.
The Ludlow, Massachusetts School System employs the following special education personnel:

13 Special Education Teachers
3 Speech Therapists
3 Adjustment Counselors
1 School Psychologist

In Ludlow, Massachusetts, the questionnaire was issued by the Director of Special Education and returned to the investigator.

Selection of the Population

All of the special and regular classroom teachers from Ludlow were asked to complete the questionnaire. However, the size of the Springfield School System necessitated selecting a smaller population of teachers. The special and regular education teachers from three elementary schools, one junior high school and one senior high school were asked to complete the questionnaire. The schools chosen matched closely with those in Ludlow in the areas of: (1) size of student and teacher populations, (2) distribution of grade levels, (3) number of regular classroom teachers employed, and (4) number of school based special education programs and special education personnel.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The statistical treatment of the data was accomplished via SPSS computer program. Due to the brevity of the questionnaire, the uncontrolled conditions under which the data were collected, and the circumscribed purpose of the questionnaire, statistical analysis of the data was minimal. The investigator did not want to report or draw conclusions from in depth statistical analyses that would have been misleading or beyond the scope of the intent of the instrument.

To obtain answers to the eight questions that this survey sought to answer, one-way frequency distributions were ascertained by treating each option listed under each question in Part One of the instrument as a separate variable.

Summary of Demographic Information. A summary of the demographic information sought in Part Two of the questionnaire is represented in Tables 2 and 3. A total of 6 elementary schools and 4 secondary schools participated in the survey. From those schools a total of 162 regular education classroom teachers and 24 special education classroom teachers answered the questionnaire. Most of the respondents (67%) were female between the ages of 25-35 (34%) or 36-45 (31%). Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the respondents
### Table 2

Demographic Information on Sample for Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Junior High Sch.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Senior High Sch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Junior High Sch.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Senior High Sch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Schools  
186 Teachers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>Below 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ethnic Group</td>
<td>Afro-American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Educational Background</td>
<td>B.S./B.A.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.A.G.S.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Response Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Certification</strong></td>
<td>Elementary (K-6)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary (7-12)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Special</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Special</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Certified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Teaching Status</strong></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term Substitute</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Years Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-21 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Grade Level(s) Presently Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Teachers responded to being certified in many areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Spec. Ed. Teachers Only)</td>
<td>Center Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Room</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/language spec.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grading System (Progress</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports)</td>
<td>Non-graded</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*11. Number of Students</td>
<td>One to five</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred for Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>Five to ten</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Ten to fifteen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the last two years</td>
<td>More than fifteen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 9. Based on total number (24) of special education teachers.

*11. Based on total number (162) of regular education teachers.
answering the survey were Caucasian, seven percent (7%) Afro-Americans, and three percent (3%) Hispanic. The number of teachers with a master's degree (45%) was slightly higher than teachers with a bachelor's degree (40%). Sixty two percent (62%) of the respondents were certified to teach grades K-6 and most had permanent teaching status (94%). A total of 54% of the respondents were presently teaching at the elementary school level and the years of teaching experience receiving the highest percent (31%) was 11-15 years. More than half of the respondents (58%) reported using a graded system to report the progress of their students. Most of the special education teachers (45%) answering the survey taught in the special education learning center. The majority of the regular education teachers (63%) had referred one to five students for a special education evaluation within the last two years.

Legal Mandates Subjects Are Familiar With Related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre Referral Process.

Most respondents (95%) said they are familiar with the regulation requiring teachers to make all efforts to meet the student's needs within the context of the regular education program, before making a referral, as indicated in Table 4. Seventy nine percent (79%) are familiar with the regulation concerning modification, and sixty two (62%) are familiar with the documentation of effort requirement.
### TABLE 4

**SUMMARY OF RESPONSE TO LEGAL MANDATES SUBJECTS ARE FAMILIAR WITH RELATED TO THE MASS. CHAP. 766 PRE-REFERRAL PROCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Prior to referral of a child for an evaluation, all efforts will be made to meet such child's needs within the context of the services which are part of the regular education program.</td>
<td>Yes 177</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. In addition, all efforts shall be made to modify the regular education program to meet such needs.</td>
<td>Yes 146</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Such efforts and their results shall be documented and placed in the child's record.</td>
<td>Yes 115</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 71</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Procedure(s) Subjects Feel Should Be Part of the Regular Education Teacher's Role During the Pre-Referral Period. Most respondents feel the role of the regular education teacher should include modifying instruction (70%), utilizing regular school services (86%) and analyzing student's learning and behavioral needs (72%), as revealed in Table 5.

Procedures Subjects Use Before Referring a Student for a Special Education Evaluation. A high percentage of teachers modify instructions to meet the student's needs (79%), utilize the regular school services (84%) and analyze the student's learning and behavioral needs (71%) before making a referral for a special education evaluation, as indicated in Table 6.

Role of the Special Education Teacher During the Pre-Referral Process. Assisting the regular education teacher in analyzing the student's needs (80%), making recommendations (69%) and assisting the regular education teacher with modifications (73%) were overwhelmingly viewed as being the role of the special education teacher, according to Table 7.

Areas in Which Regular Education Teachers Need the Most Assistance. Teachers need the most assistance in the areas of analyzing student's needs (60%) and modifying instruction (42%). Fewer teachers reported needing
TABLE 5
SUMMARY OF RESPONSE TO THE PROCEDURE(S) SUBJECTS FEEL SHOULD BE PART OF THE REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER'S ROLE DURING THE PRE-REFERRAL PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Modify instruction to meet student's needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Utilize Regular School Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Analyze student's Learning &amp; Behavioral Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Adjusted Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* A. Modify instructions to meet student's needs</td>
<td>Yes 126</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Utilize the regular school services</td>
<td>Yes 135</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Analyze student's learning and behavioral needs</td>
<td>Yes 114</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 46</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other</td>
<td>Yes 17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 143</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 160 responses from regular education teachers since special education teachers do not make referrals.
TABLE 7
SUMMARY OF RESPONSE TO THE STATEMENT(S) WHICH BEST DESCRIBES SUBJECTS RESPONSE TO THE ROLE OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER DURING THE PRE-REFERRAL PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. To assist the regular education teacher in analyzing the student's needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. To make recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. To assist the regular education teacher in modifying instruction to meet the student's needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8
SUMMARY OF RESPONSE TO AREA REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS FEEL THEY NEED THE MOST ASSISTANCE IN DURING THE PRE-REFERRAL PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Analyzing a student's learning and behavioral needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Modifying instruction to meet student's needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Utilizing regular school services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Documenting effort to help the student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 159 responses from regular education teachers since special education teachers are responsible for the Pre-Referral Process.
assistance in utilizing regular school services (22%) and documenting efforts (26%), as shown in Table 8.

Training Activities Related to Chapter 766 Subjects Have Participated In. Only forty two percent of the respondents have participated in seminars or workshops related activities, only twenty four percent (24%) have had college related course work, six percent (6%) have received information through local or national conferences, ten percent (10%) have participated in other kinds of activities and a total of forty one percent (41%) of the respondents have not participated in any training activities related to Chapter 766 (See Table 9).

Training Activities Related to Massachusetts Chapter 766. A high percentage of teachers (59%) agree that training activities focusing on special education have increased their knowledge of Chapter 766 (See Table 10). Teachers also agree that the training has made it easier to identify children with special needs (54%) and has stimulated them to learn more about such children (46%).

How Adequate Training Has Been In Relation To The Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process. Almost half (46%) of the respondents surveyed think their training related to the Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process is not adequate. Thirty one percent (31%) report training activities to be adequate, fourteen percent (14%) quite adequate and eight percent (8%) think training has been very adequate, as shown in Table 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Seminars/ Workshops</td>
<td>* Yes 66</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 91</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. College Course Work</td>
<td>Yes 38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 119</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Local/National Conferences</td>
<td>Yes 10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 147</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other</td>
<td>Yes 15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 142</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Received no training</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 157 responses from regular education teachers. Respondents may have participated in more than one activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Rank Order Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A. Stimulated interest to learn more about spec. ed.</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*B. Increased knowledge of special education</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*C. Made it easier to identify children with special needs within the regular classroom</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A.* Based on 114 responses from regular education teachers.

*B.* Based on 118 responses from regular education teachers.

*C.* Based on 116 responses from regular education teachers.
### TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE TO HOW ADEQUATE SUBJECTS THINK THEIR INSERVICE TRAINING HAS BEEN IN RELATION TO THE MASSACHUSETTS CHAPTER 766 PRE-REFERRAL PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Very Adequate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Quite Adequate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adequate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Not Adequate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 169 responses from special and regular education teachers.
Discussion of the Data

The results of the data reveal that the regulation which teachers are least knowledgeable about is the mandate which requires the teacher to document the effort to meet the child's needs in the regular class before making a referral and to place the documentation in the students records. Modifying instruction and utilizing school services are the regulations teachers are most familiar with (See Table 4).

The data also reveal that teachers believe the role of the regular education teacher should include modifying instruction to meet students' needs in the regular classroom, utilizing regular school services as an alternative strategy and analyzing the students' learning and behavioral needs before making a referral. The special education teacher's role, according to the data, is to assist the regular education teacher with these strategies (See Tables 5 and 7).

Teachers indicated that before making a referral they do attempt to modify instructions to meet students' needs, utilize school services and analyze students' learning and behavioral needs. The area or modification teachers need the most assistance with is analyzing the students' learning and behavioral needs during the Pre-Referral Period (See Tables 6 and 8).

The data also demonstrates the validity of the basic assumptions of this study:
1. Many teachers have not participated in any training activities related to Chapter 766 (See Table 9).

2. More teachers participate in inservice workshops than any other training activity, which makes it a principal method for providing teachers with more opportunities for learning (See Table 9).

3. Teachers who have participated in inservice workshops or other training related activities increased their knowledge of Chapter 766, made it easier to identify children with special needs and stimulated them to learn more about such children.

4. Teachers' inservice training activities related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process is not adequate. Teachers need assistance with learning and developing alternative strategies to help in solving the student's problems within the context of the regular education program (See Table 11).
Crosstabulation Data

The crosstab method has been used throughout the remainder of the tables to compare data between the two schools. The selected demographic variables used were location and special versus regular education teachers.

A high percentage of teachers from both Springfield and Ludlow School Systems are familiar with the legal mandates, according to Table 12. The regulation which teachers are less familiar with, however, is the mandate which requires documentation of effort to be placed in child's record. Thirty-five percent (35%) of Springfield teachers and forty-three percent (43%) of Ludlow teachers are not familiar with this requirement.

A high percentage of agreement between teachers in Springfield and Ludlow on the role of the regular education teacher during the Pre-Referral Process, as shown in Table 13. The role of the regular education teacher receiving the highest percentage was utilizing regular school services (Springfield 84%, Ludlow 89%).

Special education teachers (88%) as opposed to regular education teachers (67%), show a slightly higher percentage of agreement on the role of the regular education teacher during the Pre-Referral Period, as demonstrated in Table 14. Analyzing learning and behavioral needs as a role of the regular education teacher exhibited the most significant
## Table 12

Legal mandates subjects are familiar with related to Chapter 766 pre-referral process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ludlow</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Prior to referral all efforts will be made to meet the child's needs within the context of the regular education program.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. All efforts shall be made to modify the regular education program to meet the child's needs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Efforts shall be documented and placed in the child's record.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Modify instruction to meet student's needs.</td>
<td>Yes 71</td>
<td>No 29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Utilize regular school services</td>
<td>Yes 89</td>
<td>No 11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Analyze learning and behavioral needs.</td>
<td>Yes 71</td>
<td>No 29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Regular Education Teachers</td>
<td>Special Education Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Modify instruction to meet student's needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Utilize regular school services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Analyze learning and behavioral needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
difference. Ninety-six percent (96%) of the special education teachers agreed as opposed to sixty-nine percent (69%) of regular education teachers.

Ludlow teachers modify instructions to meet student's needs (83%) at a slightly higher percentage than Springfield teachers (75%), as indicated in Table 15. Both school systems show a high percentage of teachers utilizing regular school services (Springfield 85%, Ludlow 83%) and analyzing student's learning and behavioral needs (Springfield 72%, Ludlow 70%).

Teachers in Springfield and Ludlow agree that the role of the special education teacher during the Pre-Referral Period should include assisting the regular education teacher in analyzing student's needs (Springfield 78%, Ludlow 83%), making recommendations (Springfield 70%, Ludlow 70%) and assisting regular education teachers with modifying instruction (Springfield 74%, Ludlow 73%), as indicated in Table 16.

Special education teachers as opposed to regular education teachers, show a slightly higher percentage of agreement on the role of the special education teacher in assisting the regular education teacher in analyzing student's needs (regular education teachers 79%, special education teachers 92%), making recommendations (regular teachers 68%, special teachers 79%) and assisting regular teachers with modifying instruction (regular teachers 73%, special teachers 79%), according to Table 17.
### TABLE 15

PROCEDURES TEACHERS USE BEFORE REFERRING A STUDENT
FOR A SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th>Ludlow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Modify instruction to meet students' needs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Utilize the regular school services.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Analyze the students' learning and behavioral needs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on a total of 160 responses from regular education teachers since special education teachers do not make referrals.
**TABLE 16**  
**TEACHERS' RESPONSE TO THE ROLE OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER DURING THE PRE-REFERRAL PERIOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ludlow</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Assist the regular education teachers with analyzing students' needs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Make recommendations.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Assist regular education teachers with modifying instruction.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on a total of 184 responses from both special and regular education teachers.
### Table 17
**Teachers' Response to the Role of the Special Education Teacher During the Pre-referral Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Regular Education Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Assist the regular education teacher with analyzing students' needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Make recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Assist regular education teachers with modifying instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on a total of 184 responses.
Teachers in Springfield need more assistance in analyzing student's learning and behavioral needs (66%) than do the teachers in Ludlow (54%), as revealed in Table 18. Both systems show a total percentage of agreement in needing assistance with modifying instruction (Springfield 42%, Ludlow 42%). Ludlow showed a higher percentage of agreement for needing assistance in utilizing regular school services (Springfield 19%, Ludlow 25%) and documenting efforts (Springfield 22%, Ludlow 32%).

Over half of the teachers in Ludlow (51%) as opposed to 35% of Springfield teachers, have participated in seminars or workshops focusing on Chapter 766 as shown in Table 19. More Ludlow teachers have also had more college course work (29%) than Springfield teachers (21%). The data also reveals that almost half of the Springfield teachers (46%), as opposed to (34%) of the Ludlow teachers, have not participated in any training activities focusing on Chapter 766.
### Table 18

**Areas Teachers Feel They Need the Most Assistance With**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ludlow</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Analyzing students' learning and behavioral needs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Modifying instruction.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Utilizing regular school services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Documenting efforts.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on a total of 159 responses from regular education teachers since special education teachers do not make referrals.
TABLE 19
TRAINING ACTIVITIES SUBJECTS HAVE PARTICIPATED IN FOCUSING ON CHAPTER 766

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Springfield</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ludlow</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Column Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* A. Seminars/Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. College course work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* No</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Local/National Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* No</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. None (No training)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on a total of 157 responses from regular education teachers.
Summary of Data From Cross Tabulation

Using location and special versus regular education teachers as demographic variables, the data exhibited the following:

1. Many teachers in Springfield and Ludlow are not familiar with the legal mandate which requires teachers to document efforts to modify instruction in the regular education program and place documentation in the child's records (See Table 12).

2. Teachers from both school systems agree on the role of the regular education teacher during the Pre-Referral Period (See Table 13).

3. The data also indicates that special education teachers show a higher percentage of agreement on the role of the regular education teacher particularly in analyzing the student's learning and behavioral needs (See Table 14).

4. Ludlow teachers modify instruction to meet student's needs slightly more than Springfield teachers. However, teachers in both systems demonstrate a high percentage of agreement in utilizing regular school services and analyzing student's learning and behavioral needs (See Table 15).
5. Both special and regular education teachers agree that the role of the special education teacher should be that of assisting the regular classroom teacher with analyzing student's needs, modifying instruction and making recommendations (See Table 16).

6. Special education teachers as opposed to regular education teachers, show a higher percentage of agreement on the role of the special education teacher (See Table 17).

7. Teachers in Springfield and Ludlow need assistance in analyzing student's learning and behavioral needs (See Table 18).

8. The highest percent of training activities teachers in Springfield and Ludlow have received was through participation in seminars or workshops.

9. Ludlow teachers have received more inservice training focusing on Chapter 766 then teachers in Springfield (See Table 19).
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

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

Summary

The legal guidelines of the identification, evaluation and placement procedure of Public Law 94-142 and the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Special Education Law are intended to insure more fair and just identification and placement for children in need of educational intervention. One of the major differences between the two laws is the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process. The Pre-Referral Process (Regulation 314.0) is designed to provide teachers, parents and administrators with opportunities to eliminate unnecessary and inappropriate referral, evaluation and placement of students. During the Pre-Referral Period, the teacher attempts to devise and implement strategies to meet the student's needs by modifying instruction and/or utilizing regular school services before the student is referred for a special education evaluation.
The literature on the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process is limited. However, the literature presented on the studies of the past procedures for the identification, evaluation and placement of students in special classes, presented evidence that a disproportionate number of students, particularly minority students, are inappropriately referred or misplaced in special classes.

Parents as well as educators are attacking discriminatory testing practices, educational programming, stigmatizing labels and negative teacher attitudes.

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. Court decisions with federal mandates have reaffirmed children's rights in the face of discriminatory practices used to identify and place children in special education classes.

While the court decisions and research findings have been instrumental in changing the legal guidelines for the methods and procedures used to identify and place special needs children, they have not addressed the issue of the role of the special and regular education teacher during the Pre-Referral Process.

In order to insure more fair and just identification and placement procedures, all aspects of the identification
and placement process must be carefully examined and understood. Consequently, the regular classroom teacher's role before a student is referred, warrants more investigation since they are the key figures in the educational process of such children once they are enrolled in public schools.

One of the principal means to assure that teachers are familiar with the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process is the necessary training of special and regular education teachers, support staff and administrators.

The purpose of this study is to: (1) determine if teachers are familiar with the legal guidelines of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process, (2) to survey special and regular education teachers concerning their roles during the Pre-Referral Period, and (3) to determine from the study data the inservice training needs of special and regular education teachers related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process.

This information was ascertained via a questionnaire constructed by the investigator followed by statistical analysis of the data.
Conclusions

Every educator with the responsibility for providing education and related services will encounter children in need of alternative educational programs and services. Teachers and counselors alike have identified children in schools today as needing an alternative form of instruction.

Rubin and Balow (1971), found that 41 percent of 967 children in kindergarten through the third grade were identified as having school learning and behavioral problems.

Burrello and Peele (1975) surveyed a junior high school program when teachers and counselors indicated that a significant proportion of pupils were "only sitters," not participating fully as students. Among 404 students so identified out of 1200 in the seventh through ninth grades, the primary areas of concern were: self-concept, attitude toward school, low achievement, attendance and discipline.

Teachers should examine the learning style of the children in their classroom, especially those that are potential candidates for referral. The possibility that the mode of instruction is in conflict with the child's learning style, should be explored.

Approximately 90% of all instruction occurs through the lecture, question and answer methods. Yet only 2 to 4 students out of 10 learn best auditorily (Dunn and Dunn, 1978). A child may learn best through his auditory sense, visual sense, tactual sense, kinesthetic sense or a
combination of these. Each learner responds in a unique way to input, therefore, it is up to the teacher to recognize the differences among the students and help them learn through their strongest modality.

A child's learning style may also be culture-related (Barnes, 1969). Certain cultures, for example, value cooperativeness over competitiveness, performance over speed, and spiritual satisfaction over material gains. A culturally different child may perform poorly in a learning environment which will base its evaluations on a totally unfamiliar scale of values. A child may be penalized for working at a slow pace because this conflicts with the dominant culture's value for speed.

For the child experiencing learning problems a careful determination should be made of the child's strengths and weaknesses. What is the child's preferred learning modality? What is the child's linguistic competence? What is the level of the child's basic learning skills, i.e. reading, writing, arithmetic, and language arts? Information such as this will assist the teacher in capitalizing on the student's strengths by providing the child with opportunities for success and by helping him/her learn more effectively.

A teacher might find that a change in the method of presenting information and/or the options for completion of an assignment given to a child can improve academic performance. Teachers often place too great a burden on the student and don't examine their instructional strategies for modification. The student is usually considered the cause of the problem, not the teacher or the learning environment.
Based on the analysis of the data, the following conclusions were drawn concerning the major questions this survey sought to answer:

1. Teachers need more training to become familiar with all the legal mandates of the Pre-Referral Process.

2. The role of the regular education teacher during the Pre-Referral Period should include modifying instruction to meet student's needs, utilizing school services and analyzing student's learning and behavioral needs.

3. The role of the special education teacher during the Pre-Referral Period should be one of a consultant, to assist the regular education teacher with modifying instruction, utilizing school services and analyzing student's learning and behavioral needs.

4. Special and regular education teachers should be encouraged to work as a team in order to share experiences, expertise, and decision-making.

5. Special education teachers recognize the need for regular education teachers to analyze the student's learning and behavioral needs, modify instruction and utilize regular school services before a referral is made for a special education evaluation.
6. Many teachers have had no training activities focusing on Chapter 766.

7. Teachers need more training in analyzing the student's learning and behavioral needs.

8. The training of regular education teachers should include components on the techniques of using alternative strategies within the context of the regular education program before a student is referred for a special education evaluation.

9. Providing learning experiences through inservice training can be an effective method for increasing the teachers knowledge about Chapter 766, making it easier to identify children with special learning problems and stimulating teachers to learn more about special education in general.

10. Teachers in Ludlow, the smaller school system, modify instructions to meet student's needs more then teachers in Springfield, which is much larger.

11. Ludlow teachers have received more inservice training focusing on Chapter 766 than teachers in Springfield.

12. Teachers in both school systems feel that they have not had adequate inservice training activities related to the Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process.
Recommendations

An important step which must be documented before referring a child for a special education evaluation is a description of the modifications made within the regular program to assist a child experiencing learning problems. Often a slight change within the regular classroom may remedy a child's difficulty and eliminate the need for a special education evaluation and placement.

The following are some basic principles that should be applied in modifying instruction for the child experiencing learning difficulties:

1. Tasks should progress from the simple to the complex. For example, a child may have to practice making straight lines before forming a letter (Hammill and Bartell, 1975).

2. Children should receive immediate feedback on the correctness of their responses. Mistakes which are not corrected immediately may be retained and learned.

3. Divide work assignments into several small tasks.

4. Reinforce children's learning through praise or other rewards.

5. Provide continuous review and practice.

6. Provide many opportunities for positive transfer of skills. Subjects, methods and materials should be chosen based on whether a child can transfer what he/she has learned to other situations. Learning to tie a bow on a ribbon, for example, will be transferred to learning to tie shoe laces. Over-learning facilitates transfer of skills and is essential for children experiencing learning difficulties.
7. A child's self-concept in school is crucial to her/his successful learning. Research in this area suggests a strong correlation between self-concept and academic achievement. Children with learning problems are likely to have developed a history of failure. A main task in remedial work is the enhancement of self-concept by providing the child with: (a) successful experiences, (b) reassuring contacts between the teacher and the child, (c) tasks geared to the child's ability, (d) constant praise, and (e) examples of what the child has accomplished (Deutsch, 1963).

8. Provide child with opportunities to act upon their environment and effect changes (Taba and Elkins, 1966). A child's desire to explore and discover are essential factors in learning.

9. Capitalize childrens' strengths to facilitate learning. For example, a strong visual learner with auditory difficulties should be taught to read through the word-recognition approach instead of through a phonics approach.

10. Provide relevant material; provide continuity. Situations where the child is likely to fail should be avoided.

Much of the needed instructional service can and should be carried on within regular classrooms. Teachers however, need some assistance in the rapid assimilation and application of information as well as alternative means to managing the multiple diverse needs of children. No one teaching method, no one test, no one curriculum will be appropriate for all students.

The Quincy, Massachusetts school system, with a total school enrollment of 13,000 in 1979-80, developed a strategy which has proven quite successful in servicing the special needs of students through program modifications to regular
education. The Pupil Personnel Services Team Model, located in each school building, coordinates and integrates all services in that building in order to enhance each student's positive growth, prevent problems which may interfere with learning, prepare students to cope with existing difficulties, and intervene in crisis situations (Spagnoli, 1980).

Consistent with section 314.0 of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Special Education Law, the goal of every Pupil Personnel Service Team, is to provide services and/or modify programs within the context of regular education prior to initiating a Chapter 766 referral. During the school year 1979-80, Team meetings discussed approximately 2,000 children, and 450 or 22.5% were ultimately referred for a special education Team evaluation.

At the elementary level (grades kindergarten through six) in Quincy, problems brought to the Pupil Personnel Services Team are largely concerns about learning, ranging from behavior management issues to social/emotional problems, to possible learning problems. The purpose of the Team meeting is to discover what factors are blocking learning and to develop modifications to regular education which will enable learning to take place within the classroom setting.

Prior to the Team meeting the teacher is asked to complete a three page Classroom Teacher Assessment of student
performance. In this document the teacher indicates by means of a checklist the child's skills, abilities, and learning style. The instructional level and diagnostic testing are included with a statement of concerns.

At the Pupil Personnel Services Team Meeting, staff members share information, brainstorm, and most importantly, decide on specific strategies and the persons responsible for implementing these. Strategies might include consultation between the special needs and regular classroom teachers regarding learning materials, development of a behavior modification program with the help of the counselor or psychologist, or diagnostic testing.

The Pupil Personnel Services Team at the high school level discuss concerns which may center around academic issues, attendance issues, behavior, family life and/or evidence of drug or alcohol use interfering with school performance. Solutions may include program adjustments, group or career counseling, referral to workstudy or career internship, or to other school programs.

At the high school level the drop-out rate was reduced from 6.1% to 3.8% since the implementation of the Team Model. There is also a dramatic reduction in the number of Special Education Team evaluations conducted with findings of no special needs. The referral rate itself has been reduced. In 1979-80, only seventeen students at the
high school level were referred for Team evaluations, and only two of these referrals were from the Pupil Personnel Conference Team. In other words, the Conference Team was able to successfully recommend program modifications for all of the students it serviced except for two who were referred for special education Team evaluations.

At the elementary level 12% of the student population each year for the past four years has been discussed at Pupil Personnel Services Team meetings. Of the children discussed 35% have ultimately had special education Team evaluations, with 77% of these requiring Individualized Educational Plans and the remaining 23% being found not to need special education services. Thirty percent of the children discussed have Individualized Educational Plans. The remaining 70% were serviced through program modifications in regular education.

In addition to figures pointing to the effectiveness of the procedures, teachers agree that the conference team model has increased their awareness of available program modifications and alternatives. Communication among regular and special education teachers and staff have also improved.

This writer believes that inservice education is a technique that if used effectively can assist teachers in meeting the diverse needs of their students. The fundamental purpose of inservice education is the improvement of educational programs for students. Inservice programs for the
professional development of educational personnel should therefore be designed, in the final analysis, to have an impact on the quality of school programs for students (Edelfelt, 1977).

Teachers' views on inservice delivery reported in a recent National Education Association study (1978) emphasize experimental over theoretical training and use of support personnel as ongoing training to expand teachers' skills on materials and techniques. Onsite training personnel available for long periods were a major characteristic of inservice programs that effectively influence and stabilize attitudes and complex teaching skills (Lawrence, 1974; Mann, 1976; Norton and Jones, 1982).

Various training implementers and differential patterns of delivering training materials and resources can be used in traditional courses and workshops but also lend themselves to more innovative uses.

It must be emphasized that special education related inservice is an integral part of inservice education in general, and not a separate entity. Inservice education should be recognized as a viable method of maintaining and improving instructional services within a school system and a necessary component of an over-all instructional plan (Humes, 1978).
Perhaps the most critical element in a plan for providing inservice training to staff is the participatory planning process. This means that those persons—regular educators, special educators, administrators, school adjustment counselors, other support staff, and parents who will be affected by the training plan, must be involved in its design, implementation, and evaluation (Burrello and Sage, 1979). The planning of a program, its implementation, changes made in midstream, its evaluation, its application in a school—all are the common concern of the people directly involved. The process of conducting an inservice program is a component of the program itself. To participate in controlling one's own learning is to learn.

The best inservice education is aimed at providing experiences that directly improve the quality of learning and teaching in schools. The literature of teacher education is full of accounts of the inability of individual teachers to affect the climate of a school or even, by themselves, the climate of their own classrooms. The bright, well-trained, but isolated and eventually frustrated teacher is a stock figure. The best inservice programs should involve a critical mass of people within a school, a department, or a system who as a group have the ability to put into effect a new approach or program and who can give each other the support and assistance needed. Programs offered onsite are
more apt to attract the appropriate cross-section of participants.

An acceptable inservice training plan should also include an assessment of the inservice training needs of the various personnel directly involved in providing services to students.

A needs assessment is a method for gathering information. Its purpose ranges from evaluating present conditions to identifying future goals. The information can be gathered informally or formally, on paper or orally, individually or in groups.

Needs assessments are vital to staff development groups because they are the source of the content or structural information for any training. Good staff development is founded on teacher input. The process itself involves the staff in the decision making process, giving them a sense of ownership. It is also used for public relations. The data gathered can be used as a valuable reference tool. Needs assessment should be viewed as both a process and a product.

Another important part of a good inservice plan is to be able to locate and use resources appropriate to needs (Mass. Department of Education, 1980). Locating appropriate personnel or material resources is not easy. One aspect of this skill is the identifying of and negotiating with
resources outside the school system. Another part is recognizing and nurturing the resources which exist within the school or system. Since the quality of the resources used is a major component in the success of any inservice activity, the importance of a creative process for locating resources cannot be over-emphasized.

Finally, the plan must address program effectiveness. Evaluation is the key to determining the overall strength for inservice training as it applies to the school or system as a whole as well as to individual programs. Evaluation should be concerned with measuring the impact which the training program has had on trainees, the impact it has had on the school or system, and ultimately the impact it has had on the quality of education provided to students.

Implications For Further Research

Section 314.0 of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Special Education Law states that before a child is referred for a Chapter 766 Special Education evaluation, attempts must be made within the resources of the school system to remedy a child's learning difficulties in the regular classroom.

Too often children are placed in special education classes because they are rejected by regular teachers in regular classrooms and also because they are considered troublemakers. Too often we see a class of so called
"Educable Mentally Retarded" who are placed together because they are disruptive to the school system. Very often this defeats the purpose for which special education was designed.

The following types of questions should be asked before a student is referred for a special education evaluation.

1. What modifications took place prior to referral?
2. If behavior is an issue, what behavior management techniques has the regular education teacher tried?
3. What communication has taken place with the home prior to and at the point of referral?
4. Is there a lack of understanding of cultural differences between the referring teacher and the child?
5. Could irrelevant personal characteristics, for example, sex of the child, have influenced the decision to refer?
6. In assessing the student's academic performance, is equal weight given to the student's adaptive behavior? (Adaptive behavior means the effectiveness or degree with which the individual meets the standards or personal independence and social responsibility expected of her or his age and cultural group.)
The issue of inappropriate referrals warrants a thorough evaluation of the supportive services in regular education to determine the effectiveness of the Pre-Referral Modification. It is necessary to look at the availability and use of such services as remedial reading and math, Title I, work study, alternative schools within schools, guidance services, transitional bilingual education, and vocational education.

Special education can play a significant role in developing and implementing alternative strategies and tactics to maximize the learning of all children. The movement to special education as a support system suggests teaming with regular teachers. Four implications of this change have been identified by Reynolds (1975), they are:

1. Special education personnel will be less identified with categories of exceptionability.

2. Regular teachers will, both through formal training and work experience with special educators, become more knowledgeable and resourceful in dealing with exceptional pupils.

3. Special education personnel will be selected and prepared for more indirect influences in the schools, as in consultation and change agent roles.

4. Major restructuring will occur in the college training programs for special education personnel, becoming less categorized and more integral with general teacher preparation.
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APPENDIX

COVER LETTER

QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Teachers:

I am in the process of conducting a survey of inservice training needs for special and regular education teachers related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process. The Pre-Referral Process is the procedure used by the classroom teacher to modify instructions in the regular classroom setting and utilize regular school services in an effort to resolve a student's problems before a student is referred for a special evaluation.

The purpose of this project is to identify inservice training needs for special and regular education teachers related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process. The data resulting from this study will assist in providing more meaningful inservice training programs for special and regular education teachers.

All you need do to contribute to inservice teacher education training is complete the attached questionnaire.

A random sample of special and regular education teachers is being asked to participate in this survey.

Each participating school, upon request, will be provided with a copy of the results and recommendations forthcoming from this survey.

Thank you for your cooperation. You may be assured that after the data is tabulated, this questionnaire will be destroyed and that its contents will be used for no purposes than those stated.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY M. TAYLOR, Graduate Student
Learning Center Special Education Teacher
Classical High School

Approved by:
PART I: Information Related to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process

Regular education teachers please answer all questions. Special education teachers answer only questions 1, 2, 4, and 8.

1. The following are the legal mandates of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process. Check the procedure(s) you are familiar with.

   a.) Prior to referral of a child for an evaluation, all efforts will be made to meet such child's needs within the context of the services which are part of the regular education program.
   b.) In addition, all efforts shall be made to modify the regular education program to meet such needs.
   c.) Such efforts and their results shall be documented and placed in the child's record.

2. Please put a check beside the procedure(s) you feel should be part of the regular education teacher's role during the Pre-Referral Period.

   a.) modify instruction to meet student's needs
   b.) utilize regular school services
   c.) analyze student's learning and behavioral needs
   d.) other (please specify)

3. Please put a check beside any of the following procedures which you use before referring a student for a special education evaluation.

   a.) modify instruction to meet student's needs
   b.) utilize the regular school services
   c.) analyze the student's learning and behavioral needs
   d.) other (please specify)
For the following three questions, please put a check beside the statement(s) which best describe(s) your response(s).

4. I believe that the role of the special education teacher during the Pre-Referral Period should be

____ a.) to assist the regular education teacher in analyzing the student's needs.

____ b.) to make recommendations.

____ c.) to assist the regular education teacher in modifying instruction to meet the student's needs.

____ d.) other (please specify)

5. As a regular education teacher, I feel that during the Pre-Referral Period I need the most assistance in

____ a.) analyzing a student's learning and behavioral needs.

____ b.) modifying instruction to meet student's needs.

____ c.) utilizing regular school services.

____ d.) documenting effort to help the student.

____ e.) other (please specify)

6. In which of the following training activities focusing on Massachusetts Chapter 766 Special Education, have you participated in?

____ a.) Seminars/Workshops

____ b.) College course work

____ c.) Local/National Conferences

____ d.) other (please specify)

____ e.) none
Please put a check mark under the response which best describes your feeling.
Please use the following scale:

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

7. In general, I feel that my inservice training activities related to Massachusetts Chapter 766 Special Education have:

a.) stimulated my interest to learn more about special education
SA A A SD

b.) increased my knowledge of special education
SA A D SD

c.) made it easier for me to identify children with special needs within the regular classroom
SA A D SD

8. In general, how adequate do you think your inservice training has been in relation to the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Pre-Referral Process?

___ a.) Very Adequate
___ b.) Quite Adequate
___ c.) Adequate
___ d.) Not Adequate
PART II: Demographic Information

Directions: Please answer all of the following questions by checking the appropriate response or by providing the necessary information.

1. Sex (a)____ Male (b)____ Female

2. Age (a)____ below 25 (d)___ 46 - 55
(b)____ 25 - 35 (e)____ over 55
(c)____ 36 - 45

3. Which ethnic group do you belong to?
   (a)____ Afro-American
   (b)____ Caucasian
   (c)____ Hispanic
   (d)____ Asian
   (e)____ Other (please specify)___________________________

4. What is your educational background?
   (a)____ B.S./B.A.
   (b)____ Masters
   (c)____ C.A.G.S.
   (d)____ Other (please specify)___________________________

5. In what area(s) are you certified?
   (1)____ Elementary school teacher (K-6)
   (2)____ Secondary school teacher (7-12)
   (3)____ Special Education teacher in elementary grades
   (4)____ Special Education teacher in secondary grades
   (5)____ Other (please specify)___________________________
   (6)____ Not certified
6. What is your teaching status?
   (1)___ Permanent
   (2)___ Long-term substitute
   (3)___ Other (please specify)________________________

7. How many years have you been teaching?
   (a)___ less than 5 years  (d)___ 16 - 20 years
   (b)___ 5 - 10 years       (e)___ more than 20 years
   (c)___ 11 - 15 years

8. What grade level(s) are you presently teaching?
   (a)___ K
   (b)___ Elementary
   (c)___ Junior High
   (d)___ High School

9. What subject(s) are you presently teaching?
   (1)___ Reading  (6)___ Art
   (2)___ Math     (7)___ Physical Education
   (3)___ Science (8)___ Combination
   (4)___ Social Studies
   (5)___ Language Arts  (9)___ Other (please specify)

Question 10 is for Special Education Teachers Only

10. What is your present teaching position?
   (1)____ Special Education teacher/Learning Center
   (2)____ Resource room teacher
   (3)____ Reading specialist
   (4)____ Speech/language specialist
   (5)____ Combination (please specify)____________________
   (6)____ Other (please specify)__________________________

11. What type of grading system are you presently using?
   (1)____ Graded (A, B, C, D, F)
   (2)____ Non-graded (excellent, good, satisfactory, etc.)
   (3)____ Combination of graded and non-graded
   (4)____ Other (please specify)

12. Within the last two years, how many students have you referred for a special education evaluation?
   (a)____ one to five students
   (b)____ five to ten students
   (c)____ ten to fifteen students
   (d)____ more than fifteen
   (e)____ none
### APPENDIX B

**LUDLOW PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**REFERRAL FOR SPECIAL STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>D.O.B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent(s)</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone Number (Home)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal's Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved for Study</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CET#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Pre-Referral Activities**

I have attempted modifications within my classroom.

I have discussed this problem with the following people and sought their suggestions:

- ( ) Principal or Vice Principal
- ( ) Guidance Counselor
- ( ) Department Chairman
- ( ) Special or remedial educators

Since all attempts to resolve the problem within the regular education program have failed, I am referring the student.

I have used the attached checklist to identify problem areas and have completed an Educational Assessment.
REFERRAL PROBLEM CHECKLIST

Place a number opposite the statement which may indicate a problem area. Number problems by priority (according to what you consider most prevents successful performance in your classroom).

( ) Does not answer questions about content of material read, written at________grade level.
( ) Does not read at________grade level.
( ) Makes oral reading errors of________(omission, substitution, mispronunciations, pauses, etc.).
( ) Hand writing is illegible.
( ) Miscopies from________(chalkboard, books, etc.).
( ) Misspells words (write two or three example)_________.
( ) Uses incorrect verb forms in conversation.
( ) Misarticulates the________________sounds.
( ) Has unusual voice quality.
( ) Stutters.
( ) Attention span limited__________________________.
( ) Attendance (absent_______day(s) this year).
( ) Leaves room without permission.
( ) Disobeys authority.
( ) Physically violent toward peers by (kicking, hitting, etc.).
( ) Distracts classmates by__________________________.
( ) Cries.
( ) Curses.
( ) Makes derogatory remarks about_______(self, other).
( ) Remains alone, shy, withdrawn.
( ) Destroys property.
( ) Talks out inappropriately.
( ) Copies work of others.
( ) Never, or rarely, contributes to discussion.
( ) Clumsy (falls, runs into, drops)______________________.
( ) Asks for verbal directions to be repeated.
( ) Does not complete assignments.
( ) Seeks added closeness and attention from the teacher.
( ) Other:__________________________. 
EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT

Teacher preparing assessment

Teaching relationship to student

Length of time student has been a member of your classroom

Describe the evidence which supports each problem listed on the referral sheet.

Refer to each problem by the number assigned to it on the referral sheet or problem checklist.