

## Case Studies Focused on Building-Level Change

The only common element to define inclusion across these sites was the placement site (i.e. the general education classroom). Focus on this single dimension as a selection criteria fails to acknowledge the other values and practices that characterize inclusive models.

Author(s)	Scope of Intervention
Baker, 1995a	Inclusion of students with learning disabilities at the elementary level in Virginia.
Baker, 1995b	Inclusion of students with learning disabilities at the elementary and intermediate level in Minnesota.
Baker, 1995c	Inclusion of students with learning disabilities at the elementary level in Washington.
Fox & Ysseldyke, 1997	Inclusion of students with mild/moderate intellectual disabilities in a middle school.
Kozleski & Jackson, 1993	Inclusion of a student with severe disabilities in an elementary school (documented grades 3 through 5).
Salisbury et al, 1993	Inclusion of students with disabilities in an elementary school in Johnson City, New York.
Tralli, Colombo, Deshler & Schumaker, 1996	Inclusion of students with mild disabilities at the secondary level in Clayton, Missouri.
Zigmond, 1995a	Inclusion of students with learning disabilities at the elementary level in Pennsylvania.
Zigmond, 1995b	Inclusion of students with learning disabilities at the elementary level in Kansas.

## Observations as Compared to Inclusion “Best Practices”

Observations drawn from the case studies are presented alongside prevailing best practice recommendations drawn from the inclusive schooling practices literature.

Case Study Observations	Inclusion “Best Practices”
<b>1. Teacher Roles and Interaction</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Role changes predominantly focused on special educator; special educators identified as members of a grade level team in some coteaching situations (e.g., Baker, 1995b).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In inclusive schools, general and special educators share responsibility for meeting the needs of all students in a class (Thousand &amp; Villa, 1990).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coteaching took many different forms across sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There are many ways in which teachers can divide responsibilities in a co-teaching arrangement. “One teach/one support” does not maximize the talents of both participants (Friend &amp; Cooke, 1996).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In one example (Kozleski &amp; Jackson, 1993) active general education involvement in curricular accommodations is described, and is associated with high levels of classroom participation; in others, responsibility appears to fall entirely on the special educator.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teachers collaborate at the instructional planning phase, so that planning for diversity is “front loaded” (Heron &amp; Jorgenson, 1995; Jorgensen, 1996; Uvari-Solner, 1995).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Studies focused on students with learning disabilities utilized categorical models of delivering special education supports (e.g., Baker, 1995a, b; Zigmond, 1995a,b).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Non-categorical approaches to special education support maximize the time that a special educator can spend time in general education classroom (York-Barr, Kronberg, &amp; Doyle, 1996).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Availability of planning time varied across sites from planning “on the fly” (Baker, 1995b) to regularly scheduled time for the purpose (e.g. Baker, 1995a; Salisbury et al., 1993).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Time must be available to discuss ongoing instructional plans, providing an opportunity to adapt instruction/materials as needed (Thousand &amp; Villa, 1995).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Special education support within the classroom ranged from 30 min/day to 2 hours/day in the studies involving students with learning disabilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Special education support personnel must be in the classroom for a long enough period of time for them to be useful to the teacher. Regular education teachers can’t rely on them as teaching partners if their presence is sporadic or too brief (Friend &amp; Cooke, 1996).</li> </ul>

<b>2. Scope of Change</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ While moving toward inclusion, some schools maintained cluster programs to justify more special education staff positions (Baker, 1995a,c; Zigmond, 1995b)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The principle of natural proportions underlies the emphasis on home school placement for students with disabilities (Brown et al, 1989). If students with disabilities attend the school they naturally would attend if not identified as disabled, each school would have manageable numbers of students with disabilities to support.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Clusters of students were placed in general education classrooms to increase the time special educators could spend there and/or because these teachers “volunteered” to teach such a class (Baker, 1995a,b; Zigmond, 1995).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A school-wide philosophy that articulates the rights and ability of all children to learn (Schlechty, 1990) establishes a foundation in which all teachers work together to teach all students (Thousand &amp; Villa, 1990).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most studies focused on only certain “categories” of students (e.g. Tralli et al., 1996); several indicated building-wide changes (Salisbury et al, 1993; Zigmond, 1995a)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Belonging is the central tenet of inclusion (Kunc, 1992), contributing to the belief system that drives other decisions and actions of a school (Falvey, Givner &amp; Kimm, 1995). With such a foundation, an inclusive approach to education begins with general education placement as the first option for all students.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With one exception (Salisbury et al, 1993), the inclusion effort was not described as being linked with larger building or district-level reform initiatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The changes required of schools to meet the needs of students with disabilities are congruent with the changes necessary for classrooms to be responsive to the needs of all learners (Jorgensen &amp; Fried, 1994; Lipsky &amp; Gartner, 1997). The needs of students with disabilities should be considered within the context of general education reform rather than as a separate system (Consortium for Inclusive Schooling Practices, 1996).</li> </ul>
<b>3. Curriculum and Instructional Practices</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Basic skills approach to general education instruction characterized many of the sites (e.g. Baker, 1995a; Zigmond, 1995b); instructional practices known to accommodate diverse learners were a part of some models (e.g. Baker, 1995b, Salisbury et al, 1993b).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Best practice in general education involves active, meaningful, and integrated approaches to instruction (Zemelman, Daniels &amp; Hyde, 1993).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Whole group instruction predominated many of the site descriptions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All students learn differently, and classroom instruction should be planned and delivered in a way that actively</li> </ul>

McGregor, Gail, and R. Timm Vogelsberg. "Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations. A Synthesis of the Literature that Informs Best Practices about Inclusive Schooling." (1998).

	acknowledges this fact (Cohen, 1994; Jorgensen, 1996; Stainback & Stainback, Stefanich & Alper, 1996). Students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms are more engaged in 1:1, small group, and independent work arrangements than al during whole class instruction (Logan, Bakeman & Keefe, 1997).
<b>4. Preparation and Ongoing Support for Change</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site support ranged from training and fiscal support from a university/SEA (Zigmond, 1995a) to local model development without outside involvement (Baker, 1995a).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A school district can gain valuable human, political, and fiscal resources by developing partnerships with local universities, other school districts, and/or the state department of education to support the change effort (Thousand &amp; Villa, 1995).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Initial inservice training described in one study (Fox &amp; Ysseldyke, 1997); identified need for ongoing training and support.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ongoing training and to assistance is critical to support faculty in adopting new roles and utilizing new skills (Cheney &amp; Harvey, 1994; Schaffner &amp; Buswell, 1996).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Only one study (Salisbury et al, 1993) with a longitudinal focus describes ongoing dialogue and reflection about school practices, leading to fine tuning and changes. The approach is evolutionary and dynamic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Change is a dynamic process. Working to establish a “culture of inquiry” in a school is a valuable part of the change process (Brubacher, Case &amp; Reagan, 1994).</li> </ul>

## Case Studies Focused on District-Level Change

The following table identifies published descriptions exemplifying these larger-scale efforts, as well as strategies and outcomes that have been documented. A comparison of the processes and strategies used in these five examples yield common elements: (a) a strong values base that grounds the change effort; (b) a strong and ongoing commitment to support personnel to learn the necessary skills to work in new ways; (c) efforts to include previously segregated students occurred in an environment or general education reform; (d) role changes occurred for all teaching staff, not just special educators; and (e) change was purposeful, occurring across a number of years.

### District-Inclusion Implementation Studies/Descriptions

Focus	Process/Strategies	Lessons Learned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Restructuring of Winooski (VT) school district to accommodate diversity of all students (Cross &amp; Villa, 1992).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Instructional strategies are delivered to all students in general education settings through team teaching, consultation, and collaborative arrangements among teachers; use of classroom aides and peer tutors; accommodations for individual learners; and curricular modifications.</li> <li>▪ Adoption of mission statement was supported by comprehensive inservice training agenda designed to support teachers to realize vision of mission statement.</li> <li>▪ Students were returned from out of district placements over a four year period of time.</li> <li>▪ Staff roles changed; single teacher job description; integration and support facilitation role was established.</li> <li>▪ Administrative structure was redefined to better</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cooperation between teaching staff and district administration is essential.</li> <li>▪ Implementation process is evolutionary, grounded in a mission statement of inclusive schooling.</li> </ul>

McGregor, Gail, and R. Timm Vogelsberg. "Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations. A Synthesis of the Literature that Informs Best Practices about Inclusive Schooling." (1998).

	coordinate services.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand/describe movement of students with moderate/severe disabilities from self-contained classes to general education classes in their home in St. Cloud, Minnesota (York-Barr, Schultz, Doyle, Kronberg &amp; Crossett, 1996).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic planning for inclusion was a response to multiple, precipitation influences.</li> <li>Focus on people-aspect of change, supporting the definition of new roles and responsibilities, and leadership in the change process.</li> <li>Focus on sharing success, maintenance of change efforts, and ongoing administrative support.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Successful educational reform focuses on people not just structure.</li> <li>There is more to effective teaching than classroom management and instructional competence.</li> <li>Teachers can be agents of social change.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District-wide effort in Saline Area Schools (MI) to include students with severe disabilities in home schools (Kaskinen-Chapman, 1992).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>History of serving students with mild disabilities in home schools.</li> <li>Redefined job functions of special educators who had taught in segregated classrooms.</li> <li>Ongoing opportunities for staff to air their concerns.</li> <li>Based model on known "best practices", including collaborative support teams, student peer support networks, use of effective instructional practices in general education classes, and networks of supports for teachers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-examination of beliefs in the principles of equity, integrity, human dignity, service, excellence, and potential provided impetus and energy to undertake this level of change.</li> <li>Recognition that ongoing restructuring of schools is a necessity.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District-wide policy to include students with emotional/behavioral disorders was adopted in a Northern New England City; study documents outcomes of this policy over a five year period of time (Cheney &amp; Harvey,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District had previously been involved in effort to integrate students with severe disabilities in general education settings.</li> <li>Reallocation of funds to hire more support personnel as reliance on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Importance of long term staff development, with focus on dealing with complex student behavior.</li> <li>Efforts were complemented by other regular education reforms, including</li> </ul>

<p>1994).</p>	<p>out-of-district placement decreased.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ District-wide needs assessment informed staff development activities.</li> <li>▪ “Wraparound” meetings conducted to coordinate services across agencies.</li> </ul>	<p>heterogeneous grouping, literature based reading and outcome-based measurement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ongoing interagency collaboration to provide wraparound services.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ District-wide effort in Franklin Northwest Supervisory Union (VT) to return students with severe disabilities to their home schools (Schattman, 1992)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Shift toward inclusive practices stimulated by changes initiated by adoption of outcomes-based model of instruction, funding changes that supported inclusion, adoption of collaborative teaming practices and initial successes.</li> <li>▪ Established link with university technical assistance project.</li> <li>▪ Transition planning process to identify necessary supports to return students to their home districts/school.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Collaborative teams capitalize upon the best thinking of all of its members.</li> <li>▪ Teaming is enough of a priority that time is found to support this activity.</li> <li>▪ You’re never really there – there is need for constant growth and improvement.</li> <li>▪ System-wide inclusion is very different from student specific integration, suggesting systemic supports to facilitate transitions and an ongoing expectation for inclusion to occur.</li> </ul>

## Outcomes of Inclusive Schooling Practices

Skill Acquisition for Students with Disabilities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students with disabilities demonstrate high levels of social interaction in settings with their typical peers, but placement alone does not guarantee positive social outcomes.</li> <li>▪ The availability of students to serve as role models and initiators of communication and social interaction is an important reason to place students with disabilities in general education classrooms.</li> <li>▪ Students with disabilities do interact more frequently in integrated and inclusive settings than in self-contained environments (preschool, elementary, and secondary).</li> <li>▪ Without adult intervention, students with disabilities tend to interact more frequently with their typical peers in social situations.</li> <li>▪ Many strategies have been used successfully to encourage and maintain ongoing interaction between students with and without disabilities, including the use of communication aids and play organizers, teacher-mediated interaction, and peer-mediated assists.</li> <li>▪ The number of students with disabilities in the classroom has an impact on the level of social interaction that occurs between students with and without disabilities with emphasis of having adequate numbers of typical peers in play groups - "natural proportions."</li> <li>▪ Students place in their home school had significantly higher levels of interaction with typical peers than those enrolled in cluster programs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dunn, Lloyd (1968)</li> <li>▪ MacMillan, Semmel &amp; Gerber, 1995</li> <li>▪ Brinker, 1985</li> <li>▪ Brinker &amp; Thorpe, 1986</li> <li>▪ Fryxell &amp; Kennedy, 1995</li> <li>▪ Guralnick &amp; Groom, 1998</li> <li>▪ Hanline, 1993</li> <li>▪ Jenkins, Odom &amp; Speltz, 1989</li> <li>▪ Cole &amp; Meyers, 1991</li> <li>▪ Kenney, Shukla &amp; Fryxell, 1997</li> <li>▪ McDonnell, Hardman, Hightower, &amp; Kiefer-O'Donnell, 1991</li> <li>▪ Faught, Belleweg, Crow &amp; van den Pol, 1983</li> <li>▪ Odom &amp; Strain, 1986</li> <li>▪ Sale &amp; Carey, 1995</li> <li>▪ Jolly, Text &amp; Spooner, 1993</li> <li>▪ Strain &amp; Odom, 1986</li> <li>▪ Brady, Shores, Gunter, McEvoy, Fox &amp; White, 1984</li> <li>▪ Sasso &amp; Rude, 1987</li> <li>▪ Guralnick &amp; Groom, 1988</li> <li>▪ Brown et al, 1989</li> <li>▪ McDonnell et al 1991</li> </ul>
Social competence and communication skills improve when students with disabilities are educated in inclusive settings.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students who participate with typical peers in educational programs show</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bennett, DeLuca &amp; Bruns 1997</li> <li>▪ Guralnick, Connor &amp; Hammond, 1995</li> </ul>



<p>growth in social competence and communication skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students in integrated settings as opposed to segregated settings demonstrate substantial growth in communication skills and social skills such as initiation, self-regulation, choice, and terminating contact. Students in segregated settings showed regression.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Turnbull et al, 1982</li> <li>▪ Cole &amp; Meyer, 1991</li> <li>▪ Jenkins, Odom &amp; Spelz, 1989</li> <li>▪ Hunt, Alwell, Farron-Davis &amp; Goetz, 1996</li> <li>▪ Hunt, Staub, Alwell &amp; Goetz, 1994</li> <li>▪ Jolly, Test &amp; Spooner, 1993</li> <li>▪ Kozleski &amp; Jackson, 1993</li> </ul>
<p>Students with disabilities have demonstrated gains in other areas of development when they are educated in inclusive settings.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students with disabilities served in general education settings had higher quality IEPs than those who placed in self-contained classrooms.</li> <li>▪ More favorable outcomes in student performance in the areas of engagement, integrated activities, affective demeanor, variety of curricular areas and stimulating experiences, and social interaction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hunt &amp; Farron-Davis, 1992</li> <li>▪ Hunt, Goetz &amp; Anderson, 1986</li> <li>▪ Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis &amp; Goetz, 1994</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Parents report that their children learn more in an inclusive setting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ryndak et al, 1995</li> </ul>
<p>Interactive, small group contexts facilitate skill acquisition and social acceptance for students with disabilities in general education classrooms.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Whole group instruction is increasingly becoming a barrier to the learning of not only students with disabilities, but others in the general education classroom that have diverse learning styles.</li> <li>▪ Small group structuring associated with cooperative learning has been repeatedly demonstrated as academically and socially beneficial for heterogeneous groups of students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Wang &amp; Birch, 1984</li> <li>▪ Johnson, Johnson &amp; Anderson, 1983</li> </ul>

## Social Outcomes for Students with Disabilities

Students educated inclusively will have the opportunity to develop relationships with peers that evolve into true friendships, carrying over into after school hours.

Friendships do develop between students with disabilities and their typical peers in inclusive settings.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A positive relationship has been established between the proximity of a student's educational placement to his home and in-school and after school involvement with peers.</li> <li>▪ Severity of disability has not been found to preclude the formation of social relationships and interactions with typical peers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ McDonnell et al, 1991</li> <li>▪ Salisbury &amp; Palombaro, 1998</li> </ul>
Teachers play a critical role in facilitation friendships between students with disabilities and their typical peers.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opportunities for interaction and relationship-building can be enhanced by purposeful facilitation by teachers.</li> <li>▪ Instructional assistants maintaining ongoing physical proximity to students with severe disabilities that they support in the general education classroom has broad implications. The constant proximity of an adult inhibits interaction with peers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Kozleski &amp; Jackson, 1993</li> <li>▪ Forest &amp; Lusthaus, 1989</li> <li>▪ Giangreco, Edelman, Luiselli &amp; MacFarland, 1997</li> </ul>
Friendship and membership is facilitated by longitudinal involvement in the classroom and routine activities of the school.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Shared experiences created by full inclusion provide the foundation for more social integration.</li> <li>▪ General education students in elementary school viewed "mainstreamed" or "integrated" students as part time and they did not "belong" to the first grade.</li> <li>▪ In Middle School and High School classes, student membership and belonging depends upon developing an affiliation with a subgroup of peers within the class.</li> <li>▪ "Being there" full time is important to develop social connections.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Guralnick, 1981</li> <li>▪ Hanline, 1993</li> <li>▪ Schnorr, 1990</li> </ul>

## Impact on Students without Disabilities

A concern about the involvement of students with disabilities in general education classroom is that their presence will be detrimental to other students in the class. Three themes and benefits that address this issue follows:

The performance of typically-developing students is not compromised by the presence of students with disabilities in their classrooms.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Preschool and elementary studies demonstrate typically developing children did not decelerate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bricker et al, 1982</li> <li>▪ Sharpe, York &amp; Knight, 1994</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concerns about students with disabilities requiring a disproportionate amount of teacher attention – taking away from the educational opportunities for other students was negligible as results indicated no difference in engagement rates between classrooms, suggesting no negative impact on instructional opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hollowood, Salisbury, Rainforth &amp; Palombaro, 1994-95</li> <li>▪ McDonnell et al, 1997</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Skill acquisition for students in small instructional groups that are heterogeneous demonstrated academic gains.</li> <li>▪ Factors such as partner selection, teacher monitoring, and the establishment of a cooperative work ethic appeared to influence outcomes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dugan et al, 1995</li> <li>▪ O'Connor &amp; Jenkins, 1996</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was no evidence found to substantiate concerns that typical students will model inappropriate behavior</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Staub et al, 1994</li> </ul>
Typically developing students derive benefits from their involvement and relationships with students with disabilities.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students themselves typically responded to survey research documenting positive outcomes for typically developing students.</li> <li>▪ Benefits revolve around improvement in self-concept, growth in social cognition, and reduced fear of human differences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Helmstetter, Peck &amp; Giangreco, 1994</li> <li>▪ Kishi &amp; Meyer, 1994</li> <li>▪ Peck, Donaldson &amp; Pezzoli, 1990</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supports are necessary in order to maximize the potentially positive outcomes for all students.</li> <li>▪ Typical students reported they needed more information about students with disabilities in order to feel more comfortable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ York &amp; Tunidor, 1995</li> </ul>

McGregor, Gail, and R. Timm Vogelsberg. "Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations. A Synthesis of the Literature that Informs Best Practices about Inclusive Schooling." (1998).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Middle and High School students reported that they felt they needed to initiate relationships with students with disabilities but also reported they might not know what to do.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Henrickson, Shokoohi-Hekta, Hamre-Nietupski, &amp; Gable, 1996</li> </ul>
<p>The presence of students with disabilities in the general education classroom provides a catalyst for learning opportunities and experiences that might not otherwise be part of the curriculum.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms actually yielded positive results consistently for non-identified students.</li> <li>▪ This suggests instructional strategies and organization approaches yield academic benefits for a far wider range of students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Manset &amp; Semmel, 1997</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dialogue around providing ongoing accommodations and issues about fairness and equity have been associated with the acquisition of sophisticated social cognition skills by typical students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evans, Salisbury, Palombaro &amp; Goldberg, 1994</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teachers successfully taught elementary-aged students to use collaborative problem-solving process to eliminate barriers to various issues related to the inclusion of students with disabilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Salisbury, Evans &amp; Palombaro, 1997</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Skills and values were learned through naturally occurring situations that arose in the course of supporting students with a wide range of skills within the general education setting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Kozleski &amp; Jackson, 1993</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students reported a willingness to do far more than they were asked to do by adults in initial efforts to include students with disabilities in general education classes.</li> <li>▪ The presence of these students creates opportunities for others to serve in roles or assume responsibilities that were previously not available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ York &amp; Tunidor, 1995</li> </ul>

## Impact on Parents

Two themes prevail from the following literature:

<p>Parent support for inclusion is positively impacted by actual experience with this approach to education, although experience alone does not shape attitudes.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Studies show support for inclusion among parents of typical students.</li> <li>▪ Parents current or previous experiences in inclusive settings are positively associated with inclusion.</li> <li>▪ Parents of young children with disabilities hold more positive attitudes toward integration than those of older children.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bailey &amp; Winton, 1987</li> <li>▪ Diamond &amp; LeFurgy, 1994</li> <li>▪ Miller et al, 1992</li> <li>▪ Palmer et al, 1998</li> <li>▪ Green &amp; Stonemann, 1989</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Among parents of students receiving resource room services, there was positive responses to questions, but reluctance to willingly reintegrate their child.</li> <li>▪ Parents of students with experiences in both settings gave comparable ratings to resource room and regular class placements despite their lower ratings for academic progress and self-esteem in resource room programs.</li> <li>▪ Parental satisfaction was related to teacher attitudes and support rather than data about their child's academic progress, which enabled them to continue to strongly support pull out services despite an absence of academic gains.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Green &amp; Shinn, 1994</li> <li>▪ Lowenbraun et al, 1990</li> </ul>
<p>Parents of students with disabilities are looking for positive attitudes, good educational opportunities, and acceptance of their child among educators.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Parents clearly valued the relationship between the special educator and their child and the knowledge that their child is receiving individual attention.</li> <li>▪ Parent responses underscore the importance of relationship between the family and the teacher and programmatic changes for their child.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Green &amp; Shinn, 1994</li> <li>▪ Giangreco, Cloninger, Mueller, Yuan &amp; Ashworth, 1991</li> </ul>

## Impact on Teachers

<p>Although many teachers are initially reluctant about inclusion, they become confident in their abilities with support and experience.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reluctant teachers to include severe disabled students into their classrooms at first were able to overcome their feelings of uncertainty.</li> <li>▪ Through the cooperative teaching model, similar results were found with reluctant teachers and also an increase their confidence, sense of professional growth, and ability to accommodate a more diverse group of students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Giangreco et al, 1993b</li> <li>▪ Salend, Johansen, Mumper, Chase, Pike &amp; Dorney, 1997</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Resources, time and training emerge as the intervening variables in understanding the varying reactions and success of general educators with inclusion.</li> <li>▪ Teachers who feel adequately supported in their efforts to include students are more likely to report being successful in their efforts.</li> <li>▪ Specific training for teachers to broaden their instructional repertoire have documented positive results for both teachers and students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bennett et al, 1997</li> <li>▪ Gemmel-Crosby &amp; Hanzlik, 1994</li> <li>▪ Wolery, Werts, Caldwell, Snyder &amp; Liskowski, 1995</li> <li>▪ Brady, Swank, Taylor &amp; Freiberg, 1992</li> <li>▪ Wolery, Anthony, Snyder, Werts &amp; Katzenmeyer, 1997</li> </ul>
<p>Support from other teachers is a powerful and necessary resource to empower teachers to problem-solve new instructional challenges.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The most frequently recommended type of support for general educators who are including students with disabilities in their classroom is some form of collaboration or co-teaching arrangement with special educators.</li> <li>▪ Promoting peer support between general educators demonstrated that helping teachers to use reflective, structured dialogues to problem-solve and brainstorm challenges that arose in each others' classrooms enable them to successfully solve 88% of situations they encountered in class.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Friend &amp; Cooke, 1996</li> <li>▪ Salend et al, 1997</li> <li>▪ Wood, 1998</li> <li>▪ Pugach &amp; Johnson, 1995</li> <li>▪ Salisbury, Wilson, Swartz, Palombaro &amp; Wassel, 1997</li> </ul>
<p>Facilitating the inclusion of students with disabilities requires the sensitivity to make on-the-spot judgments about the type and amount of support to encourage participation while not interfering with student interactions.</p>	

McGregor, Gail, and R. Timm Vogelsberg. "Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations. A Synthesis of the Literature that Informs Best Practices about Inclusive Schooling." (1998).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Studies conducted in the general education setting identify 5 different approaches used by teachers to facilitate student involvement.</li> <li>▪ Backing off, vary types and levels of supports by instructional staff, encompassing teaching supports, prosthetic supports, and interventions that assist others in interpreting the actions or intent of a student.</li> <li>▪ Teachers nominated by peers as “effective inclusionists” were described as tolerant, reflective, flexible, and willing to accept responsibility for all students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Janney &amp; Snell, 1996</li> <li>▪ Ferguson et al, 1992</li> <li>▪ Olson, Chalmers &amp; Hoover, 1997</li> </ul>
---	--

## Program Related Outcomes

Issues of the cost-effectiveness of inclusive models have received some attention in literature.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Implementing an inclusive model is less costly compared to serving students with disabilities in out of district placements.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Salisbury &amp; Chambers, 1994</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Initial start up costs associated with inclusive models may appear to be higher at first, but over time, savings in transportation may actually reduce the costs of providing services in an inclusive manner.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Halvorsen, Neary, Hunt &amp; Piuma, 1996</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The most frequently cited barrier to inclusion, as reported by 14 states, was their existing state special education funding formula.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Katsiyannis, Conderman, &amp; Franks, 1995</li></ul>



## Documented Outcomes for Students with Disabilities in Inclusive Settings

Study	Findings
Affleck, Madge, Adams, & Lowen-braun, 1988	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No differences in performance of students with LD in resource or integrated classrooms</li> <li>▪ No differences in performance of typical children in integrated vs. non-integrated classrooms</li> <li>▪ Integrated model found to be more cost effective while achieving similar results</li> </ul>
Brady, Shores, McEvoy, Ellis & Fox, 1987	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Level of initiation and interaction increased with trained and untrained peers after two typical peers were involved</li> <li>▪ Result continued to improve as third student was involved in intervention</li> </ul>
Brinker, 1985	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Greater opportunities for social interaction in integrated groups</li> <li>▪ Typical students interacted with students with disabilities more frequently than peers</li> </ul>
Brinker & Thorpe, 1984	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Degree of integration was a significant predictor of educational progress as measured by proportion of IEP objectives met</li> </ul>
Brinker & Thorpe, 1986	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Variance in degree of integration associated with social behavior directed to student with disabilities by typical peers</li> <li>▪ Data suggests integration can be best fostered by teaching typical students strategies for maintaining interactive behavior with peers with disabilities</li> </ul>
Cole & Meyer, 1991	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Children in inclusive settings spent less time with therapists, equal time with special educators, more time with assistant, more time with peers, and less time alone than those in segregated settings</li> <li>▪ Children in inclusive settings demonstrated greater progress on measure of social competence</li> </ul>
Eichinger, 1990	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cooperatively structured activities were more effective than individually structured activities in promoting social interaction between mixed dyads of students</li> </ul>
English, Goldstein, Shafter & Kaczmarke, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant increase in interactions</li> </ul>

McGregor, Gail, and R. Timm Vogelsberg. "Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations. A Synthesis of the Literature that Informs Best Practices about Inclusive Schooling." (1998).

	<p>between children after training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students with disabilities received more social approaches than they made</li> <li>▪ Number of interaction declined over the year, but the patterns and types became more typical</li> <li>▪ Acceptance was unrelated to social competence</li> <li>▪ Social acceptance is not uniquely associated with disability status.</li> </ul>
Evans, Salisbury, Palombaro & Berryman, 1992	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interaction between students with and without disabilities occurred about half of the time</li> <li>▪ Typical children spent the largest proportion of their time with other typical children</li> </ul>
Faught, Balleweg, Crow & van den Pol, 1983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students in general education placements had higher levels of social contact with peers</li> <li>▪ Students in general education placements gave and received higher levels of social support</li> <li>▪ Students in general education placements had larger friendships networks</li> </ul>
Fryxell & Kennedy, 1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Higher levels of interaction and play associated with mainstreamed settings</li> <li>▪ Proportion of typical children and availability of chronological age-peers important programmatic factors</li> </ul>
Guralnick & Groom, 1988	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teachers felt friendships between diverse students possible</li> <li>▪ Friendships should be facilitated by adults</li> <li>▪ Friendships mutually beneficial to students</li> <li>▪ Expressed high degree of willingness to use strategies to promote friendships between students</li> </ul>
Hamre-Nietupski, Hendrick-son, Nietupski & Shokoohi-Hekta, 1994	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Children with disabilities had many opportunities to interact with peers</li> <li>▪ Children with disabilities engaged in interactions comparable in length to those of their typical peers</li> <li>▪ Typical children would benefit from help in understanding and responding to idiosyncratic behavior of peers with disabilities</li> </ul>
Hanline, 1993	

Hasazi, Gordon & Roe, 1985	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Over 50% of the same was employed</li> <li>▪ Most students found jobs in the self-family-friend network</li> <li>▪ Paid employment in high school was a predictor of employment/wages</li> <li>▪ Students in resource room programs had higher employment rates than those placed in a special class</li> </ul>
Hunt, Alwell, Farron-Davis & Goetz, 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increases were seen in reciprocal interactions and those initiated by the students with disabilities</li> <li>▪ Decreases in assisted interactions with paraprofessionals</li> </ul>
Hunt & Farron-Davis, 1992	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No differences found in curricular content before and after general class involvement</li> <li>▪ Community-based opportunities did not decrease</li> <li>▪ Quality of IEPs higher when students were members of general education class</li> </ul>
Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis & Goetz, 1994	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Important differences in the quality of written program plans for students with disabilities favoring those in inclusive settings</li> <li>▪ Students in inclusive settings had higher levels of engagement in school activities, engaging in different types of activities than peers in self-contained classes</li> <li>▪ Students with disabilities had higher levels of social interaction in inclusive programs</li> </ul>
Hunt, Goetz & Anderson, 1986	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quality of IEPs better for students placed in integrated school settings</li> <li>▪ More opportunities for students in integrated programs</li> </ul>
Hunt, Staub, Alwell & Goetz, 1994	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 3 students with disabilities learned and generalized targeted skills</li> <li>▪ Typical students in heterogeneous cooperative groups performed as well as students in groups without students with disabilities</li> </ul>
Janney & Snell, 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teachers used typical peers in various ways to assist and promote interaction</li> <li>▪ Classroom rules about helping changed</li> <li>▪ The message “just another student” conferred membership status to student with disability</li> </ul>

McGregor, Gail, and R. Timm Vogelsberg. "Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations. A Synthesis of the Literature that Informs Best Practices about Inclusive Schooling." (1998).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teachers encourage age appropriate interactions</li> <li>▪ Teachers “backed off” when necessary to allow children to interact naturally</li> </ul>
Jenkins, Odom & Speltz, 1989	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Higher levels of interactive play and language development in social integration conditions</li> <li>▪ Children in integrated settings received higher social competence ratings</li> </ul>
Johnson & Johnson, 1981a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cooperative learning experiences promoted more interaction with students with disabilities during both instructional and free time situations</li> <li>▪ Cooperative learning was associated with greater interpersonal attraction between students with and without disabilities</li> </ul>
Johnson & Johnson, 1981b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cooperative learning experiences promote more friendships and interaction between students with and without disabilities within and outside of instructional situations</li> </ul>
Johnson, Johnson & Anderson, 1983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Frequent participation in cooperative learning situations was positively related to perceptions of support, help, and friendship from teachers and peers</li> </ul>
Johnson, Johnson, Tiffany & Zaidman, 1983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cooperative learning experiences promoted higher achievement for minority students, more cross-ethnic interaction, and greater cross-ethnic interpersonal attraction</li> </ul>
Jolly, Test & Spooner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Use of badges resulted in greater frequency of positive play initiation and response behaviors</li> </ul>
Kennedy, Shukla & Fryxell, 1987	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Substantial social benefits found for students in inclusive programs</li> <li>▪ Students in general education settings interacted more frequently with peers</li> <li>▪ Students in general education settings had larger and more durable peer networks</li> </ul>
Kozleski & Jackson, 1993	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Classroom teacher played a critical role in orchestrating the level of inclusion during a given year</li> <li>▪ Over time, classmates initiated interaction outside of school</li> <li>▪ Specific purposes to support social relationships (e.g. Circle of Friends) were</li> </ul>

McGregor, Gail, and R. Timm Vogelsberg. "Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations. A Synthesis of the Literature that Informs Best Practices about Inclusive Schooling." (1998).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>valuable</li> <li>▪ Student experienced positive social relationships with her peers</li> <li>▪ Improvement in communication skills and in other skill areas</li> </ul>
Lew, Mesch, Johnson & Johnson, 1986	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Positive goal interdependence with both collaborative skills &amp; academic group contingencies promoted the most positive relationships with typical peer, most frequent engagement in cooperative skills, and the highest achievement</li> </ul>
Logan, Bakeman & Keefe, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Engaged behavior of students with disabilities in a general education class where one to one, small group, and interdependent work arrangements were associated with higher engaged behavior than whole group instruction</li> <li>▪ Students with disabilities were almost twice as engaged in these settings</li> </ul>
Maheady, Sacca & Harper, 1987	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Average scores on weekly tests increase by 20</li> <li>▪ Number of students earning A's rose by 40%</li> <li>▪ No students with disabilities failed</li> </ul>
McDonnell, Hardman, Hightower & Kiefer-O'Donnell, 1991	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proximity of the student's placement to their home was positively associated with in-school and after school integration</li> <li>▪ The number of students with severe disabilities at a school was negatively associated with in and after school integration</li> <li>▪ Presence of intense behavior problems was negatively associated with after school integration</li> <li>▪ Students placed in home school programs had significantly higher levels of integration than students enrolled in cluster programs</li> </ul>
McDonnell, Thorson, McQuivey & Kiefer-O'Donnell, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Academic engagement rates of students with disabilities were comparable to their typical peers in inclusive classrooms</li> <li>▪ Students with disabilities exhibited more competing behavior than their typical peers, but behaviors were not unlike those of their typical peers</li> <li>▪ No significant differences in engagement rates were evident among students with</li> </ul>

McGregor, Gail, and R. Timm Vogelsberg. "Inclusive Schooling Practices: Pedagogical and Research Foundations. A Synthesis of the Literature that Informs Best Practices about Inclusive Schooling." (1998).

	<p>disabilities that were supported by paraprofessionals, and those who received support from peers</p>
McDougall & Brady, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students increased math fluency &amp; engaged time after intervention faded</li> <li>▪ 4/5 students matched or exceeded typical level of math fluency</li> <li>▪ Students generalized improvements in math fluency</li> <li>▪ Self-monitored accurately and punctually</li> </ul>
Meyer, Minondo, Fisher, Larson, Dunmore, Black & D'Aquanni, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Six district frames were identified that characterize the social relationships of students with and without severe disabilities</li> <li>▪ Frames are: ghosts and guests, the inclusion kid, I'll help, just another kid, regular friends, and best friends</li> </ul>
Newton & Horner, 1983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in size of social networks</li> <li>▪ Increase in frequency of social interaction</li> <li>▪ Gains were generally maintained during a follow-up period</li> </ul>
O'Connor & Jenkins, 1986	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 40% of students with disabilities classified as successfully participating in cooperative groups</li> <li>▪ Differences among classroom practices were related to successful cooperative learning experiences for students with disabilities</li> </ul>
Odom & Stra6in, 198	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Both teacher and peer interventions were successful in increasing social responses of students with disabilities</li> <li>▪ Teacher condition also produced increased level of responding among children</li> </ul>
Putnam, Rynders, Johnson & Johnson, 1989	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students who received collaborative skill instruction interacted more positively than those who didn't</li> <li>▪ Instruction had greatest impact upon behaviors directed toward students with disabilities</li> </ul>
Sale & Carey, 1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Students with disabilities had lower peer preference scores than their general education peers</li> </ul>
Salisbury, Evans & Palombaro, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impact of collaborative problem solving process was successfully implemented as</li> </ul>

	<p>designed in 12 classrooms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teachers judged collaborative problem solving to be easily incorporated into existing practices</li> <li>▪ Collaborative problem solving promoted outcomes valued by administrators, teachers, &amp; parents</li> </ul>
Salisbury, Gallucci, Palombaro & Peck, 1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Five strategies used by classroom teachers were identified to promote positive relationships between students</li> <li>▪ Strategies were: active facilitation of interactions empowering children, building sense of community, modeling acceptance, and developing school organizational supports</li> </ul>
Salisbury & Palombaro, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Friendship patterns differed across three students studied, although all experienced physical, social &amp; instructional inclusion</li> <li>▪ Severity of disability did not preclude the formation of social relations and interactions with peers</li> <li>▪ Teachers employed proactive strategies to support interaction, but did not force friendships</li> </ul>
Sapon-Shevin, Dobbellaere, Corrigan, Goodman & Mastin, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Implemented rule “You can’t say you can’t play” in four classrooms. Rule was positive for organizing principle for classrooms</li> <li>▪ Rule was powerful in changing behavior in context in which teachers already took seriously their roles in structuring social interactions between students</li> <li>▪ Rule was not a cure-all</li> <li>▪ Rule provided basis for discussion and analysis of situations arising in the school &amp; classroom</li> </ul>
Sasso & Rude, 1987	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interaction of high-status peer resulted in higher levels of initiations by untrained peers</li> <li>▪ Social response levels differentially affected by status of the peer initiat97or</li> </ul>

Schnorr, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Examined meaning of “belonging” in four general education classrooms where student membership depends upon an affiliation with a subgroup of peers within the class</li> <li>▪ Only some of the students with disabilities connected with subgroups and were considered class members</li> </ul>
Schnorr, 1990	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Examined what typical students think about their school experience &amp; mainstreamed student</li> <li>▪ First graders have common framework for defining their school experience</li> <li>▪ Significant discrepancies between the students’ definitions of what it means to be a part of first grade and the student with disability’s involvement in the class</li> </ul>
Staub, Schwartz, Gallucci & Park, 1994	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Constructed “portraits” of the friendships between students</li> <li>▪ All four students had rich and varied relationships</li> <li>▪ All four friendships had roots in nontutorial contexts and activities</li> <li>▪ Classrooms teachers used strategies to actively promote interaction</li> </ul>
Strain & Odom, 1986	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Comparison of peer-initiation and teacher-antecedent interventions for promoting interaction in preschool</li> <li>▪ Both approaches increased initiation of social responses</li> <li>▪ Teacher-antecedent approach also produced increases in responses to social initiations</li> </ul>
Tralli, Colombo, Deshler & Schumaker, 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Implementation of Strategies Intervention Model</li> <li>▪ ALEM program model resulted in greater performance, attitudes, and participation and students with disabilities</li> <li>▪ Costs projections suggest program is less expensive than traditional special education model across time</li> </ul>



Wehman, Kregel & Seyfarth, 1985	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assess employment status of students with disabilities after leaving school</li> <li>▪ There was an 88% unemployment rate for this sample of former students</li> <li>▪ A number of respondents did not have many years of special education services</li> <li>▪ Poor employment and wage outcomes seen as outcomes of school programs that incorporated little functional community-based training</li> </ul>
Zigmond & Baker, 1990	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MELD model was not fully incorporated into mainstreamed classes</li> <li>▪ Students with disabilities adjusted well to general education classrooms</li> <li>▪ Students made no significant progress in reading or math, and earned lower grades in implementation year</li> </ul>