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Abstract

The purpose of this exploratory study was to look at the perceptions of Indiana’s special and general education administrators and teachers regarding service delivery and instructional models used with secondary students with emotional disabilities (ED) and the transitional outcomes for this population of students. Study participants were provided an electronic survey using Ball State’s inQsit software program. Demographic data (i.e. age, gender, and ethnicity) were collected along with school size and educational roundtable location. Study participants were asked to report which service delivery (placement) and instructional (personnel) models were currently being used with their students with ED and also what transitional outcome (i.e. graduating with a diploma) best summarized their students with emotional disabilities. Respondents rated the effectiveness of current placements and personnel used with their students using a Likert-type scale. The study found that administrators and teachers regardless of specialty area perceived their students with ED being educated in the regular classroom or resource room. They also indicated this service delivery model was effective. In regards to personnel, the teacher with paraprofessional support was still reported as the dominant choice for instructional model and was perceived as being effective. Respondents also reported that their students with ED were leaving school with a diploma or certificate of completion. However, over 15% of respondents indicated their students with ED were dropping out of school. The study recommended follow up research to investigate current curriculums used to provide instruction to students with emotional disabilities. Survey participant size (n=245) was considered too small to make generalizations, but the study provides useful insight into potential future research.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Brief History

The 1975 passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) mandated that all children be educated in public schools across the United States. Therefore, a new system of education, special education, was created within public schools with this monumental passage of legislation (Hitchcock, Meyer, Rose, & Jackson, 2002). This new set of students moving into schools, by law, was to be provided a free and appropriate education (FAPE). FAPE afforded any student the opportunity to a public education regardless of his disability in accordance with his Individualized Education Plan (Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities, 2006). The idea of having to provide services to all students within a school was a new concept and provided education professionals many new challenges. When EAHCA was revised and renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1990 (IDEA), inclusion truly became a focal point of special education. This new focus of including students with disabilities in classrooms provided schools a major obstacle: finding the appropriate placement or service delivery model that would be used with this student population. This had to be done to provide the free and appropriate public education that was now in place for schools.

Historically, students with special needs, especially those with emotional disabilities, had not been provided the opportunity to be educated in public schools (Bullock & Gable, 2006). The issue of placing these students in the appropriate setting was important and was addressed by aforementioned laws, as they designed and
implemented the principle of least restrictive environment (LRE). A least restrictive setting is federally mandated to provide students with disabilities, such as students with ED, education and related services in the least restrictive environment (LRE). This concept of LRE was based on schools using a continuum of placements to service students with disabilities (Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities, 2006). Yet, finding the appropriate LRE is often difficult and complex, even burdensome for educators (Smith & Coutinho, 1997). Educators need to be watchful when placing students and the continuum provides some alternatives (Braaten, Kauffman, Braaten, Polsgrove, & Nelson, 1988). Students with emotional disabilities are still educated outside of the classroom for longer periods of time when compared to other high incidence disabilities which questions true LRE (Handler, 2003).

Evidence-based planning and decision-making is imperative when deciding upon the appropriate placement of students. The planning process also needs to be careful and methodical in order to be student-centered and capture what is unique to each student (Flexer, Baer, Luft, & Simmons, 2008). Decisions derived from the planning sessions, case conference or IEP meetings, can have a major impact on the success of a student with emotional disabilities. A second component accompanying the placement of students would be the personnel working with these students.

The appropriate instructional model or personnel used to provide services to students are a critical component in the decision-making process for all students with disabilities, more specifically, students with emotional disabilities. The right personnel in the classroom can be the difference between success and failure for this student.
population. The instructional model used must be clearly defined with the roles and responsibilities of the personnel outlined (Wasburn-Moses, 2005). This may be done using a student-centered approach and working together collaboratively to place the needed personnel with these students. This ideology of student-driven decision making when deciding instructional models is only feasible if personal and professional attitudes are focused on the task at hand (Smith & Coutinho, 1997). Student-driven decision making should be a collaborative effort among professionals searching for the best possible learning environment, staffed with the best personnel for the student (Walther-Thomas & Bryant, 1996). The proper personnel providing instruction and support within classrooms need to be paired with the students being provided the proper curriculum.

The reauthorization of IDEA in 1997 created a focus to provide access to the general education curriculum for all students in public schools. (Yell & Shriner, 1997; Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and the Early Intervention Program for Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities; Final Regulations, 1999). Educational professionals were challenged to provide students with special needs an opportunity to be educated like their non-disabled peers; instruction using the general education curriculum was never required. This initiative provided the needed basis to align with the reform agenda that was about to be presented to America’s schools.

Reform Agenda

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) which implemented standards-based curriculum and annual yearly progress (AYP) placed many schools in a very difficult situation: educate all students to the highest standard possible. Accountability, sustainability and a strong academic driven educational system have raised the stakes on
how educational institutions will produce the desired results of NCLB. This new pressure produces a challenge that the system needs to adapt and prepare for in order to establish a productive environment (Wasburn-Moses, 2005). These new challenges are placed on educators to produce positive progress with some of the most difficult students to reach and educate in today’s classrooms (Smith & Coutinho, 1997). No Child Left Behind created the need for special education to revisit, revise and implement new policies and procedures for students with exceptional needs. This led to the development of the Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 worked to incorporate the initiatives of NCLB (i.e. accountability and progress) to better serve those students with special needs. The law implemented the use of highly qualified teachers, a higher standard of education and the need to better assess students and their learning, and the conceptual framework for the response to intervention model (RTI). These concepts of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA) have heightened the performance level to which students with disabilities are assessed. These new levels of academic awareness have forced schools to introspectively dissect their current system and make changes to meet the new ideology of public education.

The No Child left behind Act of 2001 and IDEA 2004 have developed an educational system with newly established expectations for students with disabilities. As increased expectations have been stated, so to has increased accountability for students, educators and administrators. These standards of excellence created by the new revision and language of the law have added pressure to students with disabilities, especially those with emotional disabilities, to successfully transition from secondary settings.
This specific student population, along with amplified accountability, and expectations produced by IDEA 2004 have created new challenges for administrators and educators to provide the best possible education within schools. An improved educational system can lead to more positive transitional outcomes for students with emotional disabilities. The goal of the laws and regulations designed, revised and reauthorized throughout the reform movement was to develop productive, responsible citizens.

**Today’s Issues**

The challenges of this particular population generate behaviors and emotions that need attentive and resourceful planning when deciding upon student placement and programs (Sutherland, Denny, & Gunter, 2005). Precise planning is needed to provide the best educational setting possible for all students. It is especially important for students with ED. These important decisions about appropriate service delivery and instructional models and their ability to transition students to today’s society have been even more emphasized by the passage of both the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) and Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA).

Service delivery and instructional models in today’s schools are developed, designed and implemented to produce positive, transitional outcomes for students with disabilities, including those with emotional disabilities. Unfortunately, the outcomes for many students with emotional disabilities are not productive or positive (Carter & Wehby, 2003). The United States Department of Education’s Twenty-Fifth and Twenty-Seventh Annual Reports to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act report in Indiana that over 1,100 students with emotional disabilities, nearly 44%, dropped out or moved without continuing and completing a secondary
education program during the 2000-2001 school year (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005). The percentage in Indiana is high as the same reports find the average to be a little over 35% in the United States for the same subgroup (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE] 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005). The Indiana Post School Follow-Up System found that 15.4% of students with ED dropped out of school during the 2006-07 school year (Harvey & Choi, 2008). That is twice the rate found for any other disability group (Harvey & Choi, 2008). Many secondary students with emotional disabilities in Indiana are not exiting secondary educational settings with a positive outcome (i.e. diploma, certificate of completion). They are leaving secondary schools without a diploma or the needed skills to be competitive in today’s global economy.

Educational systems have been working to find the needed models to support and enhance the success of students with emotional disabilities. One model that has been initiated in today’s schools is the Response to Intervention model (See Appendix C). This tiered model approach utilizes the knowledge and skills of all the educational professionals working with students. This tiered structure allows educators to work together, utilizing the student’s strengths, to design a placement and curriculum that allows a student to be successful using the correct personnel and curriculum within the needed placement. The design works to keep inclusive settings intact while providing the needed scaffolding and support students will need within the learning environment.

Response to Intervention works to support and provide students with the needed educational framework to give students a unique, individualized educational opportunity. The need to provide a setting that best fits a student’s need is imperative to efficiently and
effectively move a student through the educational system. As inclusion has been the most widely-used model, but has not always been the most appropriate choice, RTI has focused on providing appropriate and effective support. The old concept of universal placement is no longer effective, so the need to individualize the learning environment is a major aspect of educational planning (MacMillan, Semmel, & Gerber, 2005). The proper placement and personnel provide crucial interactions within the placement needed to offer the best learning environment possible (Bateman, 2005).

Placement, personnel, and outcomes are three major concerns for educators when working with students with ED. The necessity to provide educational settings that are advantageous to all students is imperative, but also extremely difficult. Providing the needed support and structure to meet the needs of students with exceptionalities is complex (Kaufmann & Hallahan, 2005). This difficulty is amplified when trying to provide educational environments for students with emotional disabilities. Federal reports show that students with emotional disabilities have one of the highest dropout rates in the nation (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005). The challenge of creating a successful learning atmosphere heightens as accountability, progress and standards have created a highly sensitive push toward academic success. It is imperative to provide the proper setting and personnel for students with disabilities, especially those with emotional disabilities, to provide the best opportunities possible.

Purpose of the Study

High stakes testing, standards, better access to the general education curriculum, and accountability have opened the eyes of many educators today to the changes in
education, especially special education. Students with special needs are being held more accountable for their academic progress which in turn has created a dilemma for schools as to what kinds of service delivery models (placement) and instructional models (personnel) should be used to produce positive transitional outcomes. This dilemma has become vital when working with students who have emotional disabilities (Reid, Gonzalez, Nordness, Trout, & Epstein, 2004).

Schools, administrators, and teachers are working to find the best possible service delivery and instructional models for students with disabilities to increase the positive transitions from secondary settings. Students with emotional disabilities are graduating at lower rates when they are compared to other disability categories (Kauffmann, 2001). This low graduation rate is producing a lifetime of problems for students with emotional disabilities such as incarceration and unemployment (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1999). Many school officials and employees are looking to find a solution to the negative transition of students with emotional disabilities.

The new reform in education, while necessary, is creating a burden on special education. The needed interventions to improve the educational setting and outcomes for students with emotional disabilities are unclear (Trout, Nordness, Pierce, & Epstein, 2003). Investigation and research will need to be completed to discover the effective and efficient service delivery and instructional models required to produce opportunities for secondary students with emotional disabilities that will allow them to be productive, contributing citizens to society. Improved education can lead to more positive transitional outcomes for students with emotional disabilities such as graduating from high school with a diploma.
The purpose of the study was to investigate the current service delivery and instructional models currently being used for secondary students with emotional disabilities throughout the state of Indiana. The investigated models would be the placement of students (service delivery) and the personnel (instructional) providing services to Indiana’s students with emotional disabilities. The study also examined the transitional and postsecondary outcomes for this population of students. Transitional outcomes were defined as how a secondary student with an emotional disability exited a secondary educational setting. The study was conducted to provide insight and information into educator and administrator, both general and special education, perceptions about these specific models and their impact on a student’s transition from school. Administrator and educator perceptions were studied to provide insight into Indiana’s current use of service delivery and instructional models.

A service delivery model is the placement used to educate a student along a continuum of services. Service delivery models are defined as: (1) regular class or inclusive setting (80% or more); (2) resource room (40-79%); (3) separate class (<40%); (4) separate day school facility; (5) residential facility; (6) correctional facility; (7) parentally placed in private schools; (8) homebound/hospital placement; and (9) not applicable (511 IAC 7-42-10 (b)(4)(A-F), 2008; CODA, 2005).

Instructional models are defined as: (1) teacher without or limited support services; (2) general education teacher with resource/pullout assistance; (3) general education classroom teacher with special education collaboration/consultation support; (4) team teaching; and (5) other (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2004; Friend & Cook, 2000; Salend 2005; Speece & Keogh, 1996).
Transitional outcomes are defined as: (1) graduated with diploma; (2) graduated with certificate of completion; (3) dropped out of school; (4) reached maximum age; and (5) incarcerated (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003).

This study also investigated predictor variables regarding the service delivery and instructional models used with secondary students with emotional disabilities in their educational settings in the state of Indiana (See Table 11).

Finally, the study explored participant groups’ perceptions of service delivery and instructional models and their potential differences. The possible relationship between the service delivery and instructional models used by students with ED and their transitional outcomes may provide assistance to administrators, educators, and Individual Education Program (IEP) teams. This assistance may aid in the planning and discussion of placement (service delivery model) and instructional models to be used for this student population.

Research Questions

1. What are the current service delivery models used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

2. How effective are the current service delivery models used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

3. What are the current instructional models being used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

4. How effective are the current instructional models used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?
5. Are there differences among participant group perceptions for the service delivery models currently being used in Indiana high schools?

6. Are there differences among participant group perceptions for the instructional models currently being used in Indiana high schools?

7. What are the current post-school/transitional outcomes for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

8. What are the controlled/predictor variables that impact administrator and educator perceptions of service delivery models?

9. What are the controlled/predictor variables that impact administrator and educator perceptions of instructional models?

10. What are the controlled/predictor variables that impact administrator and educator perceptions of transitional outcomes?

**Definition of Terms**

*Emotional Disability*

(A) IN GENERAL- The term 'child with a disability' means a child --

(i) with mental retardation, hearing impairments (including deafness), speech or language impairments, visual impairments (including blindness), serious emotional disturbance (hereinafter referred to as emotional disturbance'), orthopedic impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities; and (ii) who, by reason thereof, needs special education and related services (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. §1400 et seq.); a) a condition that, over a long period of time and to a marked degree, consistently interferes with a students learning process and adversely affects the student’s educational performance. An emotional
disability may include, but is not limited to, one or more of the following conditions: (1) a tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems; (2) a general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; (3) an inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors; (4) an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships; or (5) inappropriate behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances (511 IAC 7-26-6, 2002).

General Education Teacher with Resource/Pullout Assistance

A student receives instruction from both general educators and special educators. The student would leave the general education classroom and receive instruction from a special educator in an alternative setting. The general educator is still the primary instructor (Olson & Platt, 2004).

General Education Teacher with Special Education Collaboration/Consultation Support

The general educator and special educator meet to plan, discuss, and develop instruction for the student. The general educator is still the primary instructor (Olson & Platt, 2004; Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2004).

Homebound/Hospital Placement

Homebound or hospital setting with special education and related services provided at the student's home, a hospital, or other non-educational site selected by the public agency (511 IAC 7-42-10 (b)(4)(F), 2008; CODA, 2005).

Instructional Model

Instructional models are classified by the way personnel staff, the instructional setting and instruction is provided.
Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

(A) IN GENERAL- To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not disabled, and special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. §1400 et seq.); each public agency having in place written policies and procedures to ensure the following: (1) to the maximum extent appropriate, students with disabilities, including those students placed in public or private institutions by the public agency outside the public’s jurisdiction and those students placed in public or private institutions and other care facilities in the public agency’s jurisdiction, are educated with non-disabled students; (2) special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of students from the general education environment occurs only when it is documented that education in general education classes using supplementary aids and services cannot be satisfactorily achieved; (6) a continuum of services is available to meet the individual needs of students with disabilities, including, but not limited to: (A) instruction in general education classes; (B) special classes; (C) special schools; (D) home instruction; and (E) instruction in hospitals and institutions (511 IAC 7-27-9, 2002).

Negative Transitional Outcome

This refers to a student leaving the secondary school setting without completing the requirements set forth by the local educational agency.
Positive Transitional Outcome

This refers to a student leaving the secondary school setting after completing the requirements set forth by the local educational agency.

Regular Class

A student spends 80% or more of his instructional day in a general education setting (511 IAC 7-42-10 (b)(4)(A), 2008; CODA, 2005).

Residential Facility

Public or nonpublic residential school or facility with special education and related services provided to students living at the school or facility (511 IAC 7-42-10 (b)(4)(E), 2008; CODA, 2005).

Resource Room

A student spends between 40%-79% of his instructional day in the general education setting (511 IAC 7-42-10 (b)(4)(B), 2008; CODA, 2005).

Separate Class

A student spends less than 40% of his instructional day in the general education setting (511 IAC 7-42-10 (b)(4)(C), 2008; CODA, 2005).

Separate Day School

Separate public or nonpublic nonresidential school or facility with special education and related services provided (511 IAC 7-42-10 (b)(4)(D), 2008; CODA, 2005).

Service Delivery Model

Service delivery model refers to the percentage of time and the placement/setting a student receives instruction.
Teacher Without or Limited Support Services

This is an inclusive setting where the student would receive the majority of instruction from the general education teacher with limited or no support from special education. This support would come from paraprofessionals (Olson & Platt, 2004).

Team Teaching

General and special educators share teaching duties. They work together collaboratively to deliver instruction. There are multiple forms of team teaching: co-teaching, interactive teaching, station teaching, parallel teaching, and alternative teaching (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2004).

Transitional Outcome

A coordinated set of activities for a child with a disability that: (A) is designed to be within a results-oriented process, that is focused on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child with a disability to facilitate the child’s movement from school to post-school activities, including post-secondary education, vocational education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, or community participation; (B) is based on the individual child’s needs, taking into account the child’s strengths, references, and interests; and (C) includes instruction, related services, community experiences, the development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives, and, when appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills and functional vocational evaluation (Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities; Final Regulations, 34 C.F.R. § 300.43).
Significance of Study

The pattern in which students with emotional disabilities are placed is different from other students in special education (Stephens & Lakin, 1995). The Twenty-Fifth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2003) projects nearly 55% of students with emotional disabilities in Indiana will be educated in a learning environment outside an inclusive setting, which is over four times the number of students with a specific learning disability who will be educated in this type of educational setting. This vast difference in placement depicts the needed accuracy in the selection of appropriate service delivery models to produce positive transitional and post secondary school outcomes for students with ED.

Students with emotional disabilities also experience negative outcomes when leaving high school. According to the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 (2005) students with special needs dropping out of high school was projected at 29.7%. This compared to the 44.2% dropout rate for students with ED (National Longitudinal Transition Study 2, 2005) shows a discrepancy within the student population of those who have emotional difficulties. Accurate placement of students with emotional disabilities, which provides insight into the needed service delivery and instructional models, is critical to creating positive transitional outcomes.

Basic Assumptions

This study was conducted using electronic surveys, delivered via email, requiring administrators and teachers to provide demographic information. It was assumed that the information that was presented is an accurate depiction of the participant.
This study also assumed that the information provided by a perception rating scale would be unique to the individual participant and that the participant voluntarily provided the information.

A final assumption was that the information provided by each survey would be directly produced by the solicited participant.

Summary

The issue of varying service delivery and instructional models to produce positive transitional outcomes for students with emotional disabilities has been an ongoing debate (Denny, Gunter, Shores, & Campbell, 1995). Secondary students with special needs are being held to a higher standard; therefore, the models in which these students are serviced need to be appropriate. This study investigated current service delivery and instructional models being used in Indiana as perceived by general and special education administrators and teachers. The way students exit high school using the current models and professional perceptions of these models and outcomes were examined. Given the limited investigation into service delivery and instructional models being provided to students with emotional disabilities, this study strived to provide significant information to the field of emotional disabilities.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Literature Search

Studies and articles reviewed were selected from journals, databases, books, dissertations, websites and submitted papers up to the present time. A thorough search was conducted at Ball State University’s Bracken Library within the reference stacks, dissertation and thesis sections. A computer-assisted search was also conducted from the following databases using the Ball State University Bracken Library Website: Academic Search Premier, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Education Resources Information Center (CSA), and Education Resources Information Center (EBSCOhost). Searches were also conducted using the following websearch programs: Google, Alta Vista, Yahoo, WebCrawler, and Lycos. Several descriptors such as: “special education”; “emotional disabilities”; “emotionally handicapped”; “emotional disorders”; “secondary students”; “transitional outcomes”; “behavioral disabilities”; “behavioral disorders”; “transitional outcomes”; “service delivery models”; “instructional models”; and any combination of the terms were used to search for valid material. These searches produced hundreds of articles related to the topics and/or related combinations of terminology.

Various educational websites were also used throughout the literature search. The United State Department of Education (ed.gov) was a primary source of law and statistical information. These same documents focusing on state data were discovered using the Indiana Department of Education website (doe.state.us.in). Other useful websites included the Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education (icase.org) and the Indiana High School Athletic Association (ihsaa.org).
Department dissertations dealing with the subject area and other special education dissertations were analyzed and reviewed to yield insight into potentially useful articles. Reference pages were read to increase and expand the literature base.

Implication Articles

The research discussed is organized by the articles’ implications on the field of special education, more importantly students with emotional disabilities. The author reviewed the research and then decided on the correct category. Three major categories emphasized for this review are: 1) service delivery models; 2) instructional models; and 3) transitional outcomes.

Service Delivery Models

The service delivery model or placement of a student is vital to the success of the student. It provides the unique environment that allows a student to utilize his strengths while improving upon his weaknesses. It also provides a place where the student feels free to participate and challenge himself educationally. This placement is to fall within the parameters set forth by a free and appropriate education being provided in the least restrictive environment (Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities, 2006). It can be argued that many placements are designed with the intention of providing the most appropriate LRE, but it must also be argued that many placements need to be done to best service the individual student. The state of Indiana reports that over 70% of its students with disabilities are being educated in a general education setting more than forty percent of the educational day (Binder & Parker, 2008; Binder & Parker, 2006). This is over 125,000 students with disabilities spending a majority of their days with their non-disabled peers. Indiana data show the movement to “include” students with disabilities in regular education classrooms is occurring in today’s schools and classrooms.
The service delivery model or placement of a student with emotional disabilities is a critical element to a student’s academic success, yet little is known about its effectiveness (Trout, Nordness, Pierce & Epstein, 2003). The needed infrastructure and resources is vital to its success (Etscheidt, 2006). The correct placement of a student may be the difference between a student succeeding or failing. The difficulty of finding the most appropriate placement is challenging many school personnel throughout the country (Gable, Bullock & Evans, 2006). It is a decision based on collaborative planning and cooperative coordination (Eggers, Delp, Lazear, Wells & Alonso-Martinez, 1996). Wilhite, Braaten, Frey and Wilder (2007) found that in order to find this successful, appropriate placement; assessment of student need is vital. Professionals working together to find a placement that is conducive to a student’s learning and progress can be very complex. It is an issue that many schools are working hard to solve in order to provide more opportunities for students with emotional disabilities. A key element in a student’s educational performance is his placement.

Federal reports found that over two and one half million students will need to be educated using special education services; among those nearly 300,000 will have an emotional disability (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005). This population of students has caused concern for schools and has attracted the attention of many educators (Oswald & Coutinho, 1995). The attention ascertains a goal to offer the educational setting which provides the best possible assistance for students to be successful. However, even the best created plans have difficulties and many schools struggle with finding the appropriate placement (Jolivette, Stichter, Nelson, Scott, & Liaupsin, 2000). Finding the correct placement is important, but it is also imperative to remember that what happens inside the
placement is vital to the student’s success (Singer, 2005). The placement alone will not be the answer, but it will be a solid foundation on which to start building student success.

The educational process (i.e. instruction, modeling, and scaffolding) will be delivered through a variety of models and placements, each providing a unique learning experience for students. Given this problem of identifying and implementing the appropriate service delivery model, a review of the possible options is needed (Kauffmann & Smucker, 1995). The service delivery models included were defined as:

- (1) regular class (80% or more);
- (2) resource room (40-79%);
- (3) separate class (<40%);
- (4) separate day school facility;
- (5) residential facility;
- (6) correctional facility;
- (7) parentally placed in private schools;
- (8) homebound/hospital placement;
- and (9) not applicable (Binder & Parker, 2008; Binder & Parker, 2006; 511 IAC 7-42-10 (b)(4)(A-F), 2008; The CODA Project, 2005).

**Inclusive Settings**

An inclusive setting provides services to a student who spends 40% or more of his educational day in a general education classroom (Binder & Parker, 2008; Binder & Parker, 2006; The CODA Project, 2005). During the past 10-15 years, the trend has been to move students with disabilities into a regular classroom setting (Trout, Nordness, Pierce & Epstein, 2003). Indiana has followed the same trend and is moving students back into the regular classroom placements (Plucker, Toutkoushian, Hansen, Chien, Spradlin, Michael, Zapf, & Edmonds, 2007). Nearly 61% of all students with an emotional handicap in the state of Indiana were educated in what is defined as an inclusive setting (Binder & Parker, 2008; Binder & Parker, 2006). The Twenty-Fifth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act reports that over 73% of students in special education will be
educated in a regular class setting sixty percent of their educational day (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). This is slightly higher than the approximately 50% of students with emotional disabilities who will be educated in this same setting (U.S. Department of Education [USDE], 2003), showing that schools have started to participate in a movement towards inclusive settings for a student’s educational placement.

The inclusion movement has been one of the most significant movements in special education (Kirk, Gallagher, & Anastasiow, 2003). The belief that the regular classroom setting for students with special needs is a philosophy that teachers will have to embrace in order to fully establish an inclusive setting (Barry, 1995). Administrators and educators fully understand the commitment it takes to establish an inclusive setting for students, especially students with emotional disabilities. However, students with emotional difficulties do not always embrace and thrive in the inclusive setting (Jolivette, Stichter, Nelson, Scott, & Liaupsin, 2000).

Schools are going to be asked to demonstrate that they are providing the needed opportunities for special education students to be successful in inclusive settings. These opportunities afford students the right to access the curriculum and receive a quality education. The inclusive model provides the same access to education for students with disabilities as it does for their non-disabled peers (Jensen, 2005). The key is to provide the placement that affords them this access to the regular education curriculum (Plucker, Toutkoushian, Hansen, Chien, Spradlin, Michael, Zapf, & Edmonds, 2007). This movement has been marked by the current Response to Intervention model presented to schools.

Response to Intervention has created a “…framework for prevention, advancement and early intervention which involves determining whether all students are learning and progressing optimally academically and behaviorally when provided with high quality instruction” (Indiana’s
Vision of Response to Intervention, 2008, ¶1. IDEA (2004) allowed interventions and Response to Intervention to become a part of the identification process and became a support structure within learning environments. The intent of RTI’s framework is to more appropriately assess and determine eligibility for students possibly needing special education services, more specifically those students possibly qualifying with a specific learning disability (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). Response to Intervention works to alleviate unnecessary placement of students into special education while providing support to keep students moving towards successful school outcomes.

This framework has set forth guidelines to create learning environments that provide access through inclusionary settings. The intervention works to keep students within the general education classroom walls to increase effectiveness with instruction (Chambers, Posny, & Shinn, 2009). This process will be difficult given the ever-changing educational demands by students in the current educational system (McDougall, Hawkins, Brady, & Jenkins, 2006).

Response to Intervention (RTI) has created the push to provide optimal learning opportunities facilitated through a more included, general education setting. The push has developed a tiered approach, allowing professionals to monitor progress and make educational decisions more effectively (Stecker, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2008). The number of tiers has been debated, but many sites have developed and worked under the three-tier approach (Stecker, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2008). The approach allows for progress monitoring and valuable curriculum evaluation (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2007).

This tiered approach has forced schools to work tirelessly to provide learning opportunities within the legal framework of educational settings (Barnett, Daly, Jones, & Lentz, 2004). The capability of these placements/classrooms and opportunities will need to be evaluated and demonstrated (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1998). The classic version of the classroom will be
reconstructed and designed to encompass all facets of education (McDougall, Hawkins, Brady, & Jenkins, 2006; Reutebuch, 2008). An essential component of the RTI movement will be to find the appropriate educational placement or setting to flourish within the current system (VanDerHeyden, Witt, & Barnett, 2005; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). The need to make adjustments to the placement and services will be imperative to consistently provide the most favorable opportunities to the students (Barnett, Daly, Jones, & Lentz, 2004). This adjustment and revision is linked to the typical education setting offered to all students (VanDerHeyden, Witt, & Barnett, 2005). The focus is to provide a quality, student driven setting (Ardoin, Witt, Connell, & Koeing, 2005).

Response to Intervention provides education a chance to re-evaluate the current system and look for the needed environmental changes (Gresham, Watson, & Skinner, 2001; McComas & Mace, 2000). The evaluation of the service delivery models currently being used, more specifically inclusive settings, allows for better planning for students with disabilities. This needed planning provides the supportive placement and services for students (Hardman, McDonnell, & Welch, 1997). Through this evaluation, education works to provide a meaningful, supportive environment to students within the least restrictive environment (Drasgow & Yell, 2001).

Separate Class

A separate class is defined as a setting in which a student will receive services with their non-disabled peers for less than 40% of his educational day (Binder & Parker, 2008; Binder & Parker, 2006; Indiana Administrative Code, 2008; The CODA Project, 2005). It is reported that approximately twenty-two percent of students with disabilities are being educated in a separate classroom during their educational day (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S.
Department of Education [USDOE], 2005). Students with emotional handicaps, disturbances or disabilities are also placed in these same settings; however, they are placed there at a noticeably higher rate (29%) (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005). The report confirms that students with emotional disabilities tend to be removed from the general education classroom more frequently than students with other disabilities. More segregated classrooms are more frequently used when working with students with emotional disabilities (Stephens & Lakin, 1995). Providing a more restrictive environment does not always solve the issues (i.e. disruptive behavior) occurring in the more inclusive settings. The demands can be very stringent within these separate classes (Bullis, Walker, & Sprague, 1991).

A separate class placement can evoke controversy and debate as to its restrictiveness to students who may possibly be educated in a regular education classroom with the appropriate support (Hallenbeck, Kauffmann, & Lloyd, 1993; Algozzine, Morsink, & Algozzine, 1986). This debate presents challenges to provide a quality education outside the regular classroom setting. This placement explores the possibility of providing an education equivalent to non-disabled peers, but within a different learning environment (Van Acker, 2007; Farmer, Leung, Pearl, Rodkin, Cadwallader, & Van Acker 2002). Even the best planned learning environments have difficulties.

Students who move to this more restricted environment tend to have more disruptive behaviors (Jensen, 2005). These behaviors can lead to an unsuccessful educational environment (Quinn, Poirier, Faller, Gable, & Tonlenson, 2006). These results create an environment often viewed as a form of punishment and not the needed safe harbor for students with exceptional needs. These separate placements are a different way to view education and its possibilities
outside the traditional style of education (Fizzell & Raywid, 1997). These settings have a unique design to meet the many needs of today’s student population (Reindal, 2008).

In actuality, a separate class is a setting designed for students to go to get the services needed to provide them a quality education, an education that mirrors that of their non-disabled peers (McLaughlin & Owings, 1992). A separate class is an environment that provides both academic and nonacademic opportunities and development (Tyler-Wood, Cereijo, & Pemberton, 2004). Separate class placements are concerned with meeting a student’s needs and goals (Kavale & Forness, 2000).

A placement other than the regular education classroom is a viable option for students with exceptional needs (Epstein, 1999). Steinberg and Knitzer (1992) found that there is a call for a placement where students with disabilities can flourish and excel, possibly a separate classroom. The separate classroom can provide a placement option that encompasses the needs of its students. It can be a service delivery model that increases the successful participation of its students (Gable, 2004; Zigmond, 2000). A separate class is a placement that strives not to change the student to fit the program, but to change the program to motivate the student (Tobin & Sprague, 1999).

Setting Outside School Buildings

A student receiving educational services outside of the regular school setting has decreased over the past decade, showing that public schools have continued to be the main educational placement (Skiba, Poloni-Staudinger, Gallini, Simmons, Feggins-Azziz, 2006; McLeskey, Henry, & Axelrod, 1999). A focus has been to “push” students back into public settings and not to “pull” them out of these environments. There has been a concentrated effort to keep students in public schools and not move them to alternative settings/placements (Lehr &
Lange, 2003). This push does not always mean that schools are completely staying away from these placements. The question is which placement is appropriate for the specific student, if it is not in the public setting (Gartner & Lipsky, 1989).

Projections show that over 4.5% of students with disabilities will still be educated somewhere other than a public school setting (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005). It is also projected that over 20% of students with emotional disabilities will receive educational services somewhere other than a public school placement (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005). The difference in students with emotional disabilities compared to all other disabilities categories is glaring. This trend shows that the inclusion movement is still fragile and not for all students (Runswick-Cole, 2008).

The difference among disabilities confronts the 1990 IDEA policy that looked to secure the inclusion of students with exceptional needs in American classrooms. The one out of five students with ED still being educated outside public educational settings is astonishing. This statistic shows that there is a need for various educational settings away from the public school setting (Kleiner, Porch, & Farris, 2002). These settings provide services that cannot be met in regular public school settings (Buchweitz, 1993).

The different educational settings can range from separate public facilities, private facilities, public residential facilities, private residential facilities, or homebound/hospital services (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). These service delivery models are necessary as some schools are struggling to provide appropriate services to students with emotional difficulties (Farrell & Polat, 2003). A continuum of placements is to be utilized to provide multiple varieties for students (Singer, 2005) The different placements are able to
provide the needed services to meet the unique needs of emotionally disabled students (Buchweitz, 1993). These students have a wide range of needs in which they will require specific services that some public institutions cannot provide. A comprehensive set of available placements from which to choose is necessary (Gallagher, 2005). Students are referred to a separate setting for many reasons and these placements work to be accommodating for specific student need (Pijl & Pijl, 1998).

The needed services may be provided by one or a combination of the five settings, so that the most appropriate program and delivery of services can be established. The common thread is that the setting(s) encourage(s) significant educational gains (Vostal, Hughes, Ruhl, Benedek-Wood, & Dexter, 2008; Pijl & Pijl, 1998). With the many differences students bring to the educational setting, especially those with disabilities, it is necessary that the placement is suited to accommodate these differences (Meece & Kurtz-Costes, 2001). It is good to note that these types of placements have become more acceptable and valid with the ever-growing need for their existence (Fitzsimmons-Hughes, Baker, Criste, Hufity, Link, & Roberts, 2006). There are also many alternative programs available to students when a current placement does not provide the appropriate services. Barr and Parrett (2001) report an estimated 20,000 alternative programs are now available to students looking for a different path for their education. This number reflects the enormous availability of alternative placements that can be made use of to help fulfill an important need of students that are struggling in their current educational placement.

The key to selecting the service delivery model is finding the one that provides the educational learning environment that envelops the student’s needs as well as providing him with the best option for success; the current trend shows movement back to the regular education classroom is offering the best option for success (Skiba, Poloni-Staudinger, Gallini, Simmons, &
This process is one that is done through a collaborative approach from those individuals providing services. The design of the Individualized Educational Program/Plan (IEP) develops a least restrictive environment (LRE) that best suits the student and his strengths and needs (Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities, 2006). The attempt to provide the appropriate setting, even if it is away from a public education environment, is an important step in providing a successful learning environment (Etscheidt, 2006). With this “safeguard” in place, the placement created for the student targets success and outcomes and not just somewhere to “put” them. This placement can be the cornerstone of a student’s road to success (Huefner, 2002; Casey & Hagaman, 2008).

**Instructional Models**

The selection of the appropriate instructional model can be very complex and comprehensive (Frew & Klein, 2001). Selecting the specific personnel who will work with students who have special needs can be taxing and finding professionals who are qualified to work with the special needs population can be difficult (Lu & Shen, 2007; Algozzine, Morsink, & Algozzine, 1986). This selection searches for personnel who will be held accountable for providing opportunities for students to be successful (Frew & Klein, 2001). Several different approaches have been utilized throughout secondary schools to find the needed personnel to promote success and stability within the school and social settings.

The impact of the No Child Left Behind Act (2001) and the reauthorization of IDEA (2004) has reverberated throughout the educational system. States such as Indiana have established procedures to use documents, such as the High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) guidelines (see Appendix C), to direct schools in their staff evaluation and hiring processes. Indiana’s HOUSSE and other states’ documents provided a rubric to
Highly qualified and its intent attempted to provide quality, certified educators and paraprofessionals to the field of special education who were truly needed (Stempien & Loeb, 2002). The No Child Left Behind Act (2001) stated elementary teachers must have degrees, state licenses and demonstrate knowledge of teaching math and reading (20 U.S.C. § 6319). Middle and high school teachers must have majored in their subject area (20 U.S.C. § 6319). Paraprofessionals would have to meet standards as well to be considered highly qualified. These were: 1) taken higher courses; 2) obtained associate’s degree or higher; and/or 3) passed a local or state assessment (20 U.S.C. 6319 § 1119 (c)(1)(A-C)). These new requirements have placed a new pressure on schools to provide “qualified”, quality professionals/personnel. This spotlight on quality educators has made schools look for more appropriate, accommodating personnel to provide services to students, especially those with special needs (Boe, Shin, & Cook, 2007).

Having highly qualified pre-service professionals developing at the post-secondary level develops a more complex, wide-ranging pool of candidates. Schools will then be provided the opportunity to select from this newly established pool in hopes of supplying a well-prepared staff/faculty to students in schools today. The choice lies within the selection process of the appropriate personnel and also keeping those professional staff in the field (Mooney, Denny, & Gunter, 2004). Again, the practice of finding the right staff to properly meet the evolving needs of students with emotional needs is extremely difficult. This element of education is one that needs to be viewed with critical thought and the utmost importance.
Teachers Without Paraprofessional Support

It has been reported that over 44,000 non-certified teachers will be employed in schools in placements that directly work with special education students (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). Couple this with the over 22,000 non-certified paraprofessionals, and the country is looking at over 66,000 individuals in schools who are not fully certified to work with students who have special needs (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). In 2006-07, Indiana had nearly 1,000 non-certified employees working with students with disabilities. This number dropped to over 750 in 2007-08, but this still shows that approximately 45% of all teachers working on a limited or emergency permit will be in classrooms educating students with disabilities. This staggering statistic shows that students across the country will be in classrooms with educators who are not fully trained to be working with them. Classrooms throughout the country have service providers who are not prepared to work with students with disabilities, especially those with emotional disabilities. This creates a crucial discussion for the educational system. How do we compensate for those non-certified teachers? Response to Intervention can be one solution that provides an opportunity for the many talented professionals working in a school system to come together to provide a unique, student-based learning opportunity.

Students moving back into the general education classroom and teachers being asked to use their entire complement of skills to work with students in their classrooms have caused some concern with all parties working with today’s student population (Posny & Hackett, 2008). The movement (RTI) asks teachers to work with students and their needs to provide the best instruction and support possible. This tiered-approach works to use the strengths of all individuals associated with a student (Kavale & Spaulding, 2008). It allows students to stay in
their general classroom setting, working with professionals that collaborate and communicate about their educational future (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2008).

The RTI interventions are designed to align instruction to unique and specific student need (Duhon, Mesmer, Gregerson, & Witt, 2009). Response to Intervention asks the professionals in the student’s LRE to work hard to provide these needed resources and interventions (Chambers, 2008). Working with students to provide them services through general education settings has been an enormous task for educational professionals and will continue to be one without the proper training and professional development needed by faculty and staff (Berkley, Bender, Peaster, & Saunders, 2009).

Many have questioned whether general education teachers are properly trained to work with special education populations (Skiba, Poloni-Staudinger, Gallini, Simmons, & Feggins-Azziz, 2006; Evans, Townsend, Duchnowski, & Hocutt, 1996; Smetler & Rasch, 1994). Lu and Shen (2007) found that there is a deficit of highly qualified teachers to supplement the current need. This concern has filtered in to the institutions of higher education to properly train pre-service teachers.

Many pre-service institutions do not even require a course in exceptional needs at the secondary level, let alone, fieldwork. Harvey, Yssel, Bauserman, and Merbler (in press) found that higher education secondary/elementary departments reported they did not agree they had a course emphasizing collaboration, a key component of education. The same study found that 39% of respondents indicated they needed more faculty awareness of special education, collaboration, and more experiences provided with special education (Harvey, Yssel, Bauserman, and Merbler, [in press]). It is detrimental for pre-service teachers when they are not given opportunities to work with students with disabilities or in a collaborative/consultative
environment while they are pre-service teachers. Sindelar, Daunic and Rennells (2004) state that several experiences, such as fieldwork and mentorship, need to be infused into teacher preparation programs in order to better prepare them for the classroom. Unfortunately, many educators have to resort to on-the-job training as they are asked to provide services to students without any additional support. A realistic view of teacher preparation is needed to develop and employ the necessary teachers for today’s schools (Brownell, 1997). This view comes as a shift in perceptual thinking from the mentality of working with my students to working with all students.

This model has created an environment where teachers will have to rely on colleagues for support (Chalfant & Pysh, 1989). This lends to the questioning of the educational system being able to properly support specific populations of students, more specifically those with emotional disabilities (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). Demanding, both general and special education, teachers to provide the most efficient and effective education without the support of a licensed paraprofessional or teacher’s aide is asking a lot; especially from those 66,000 deliverers of services who are not certified and are not provided with the needed support (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). A support system with highly qualified individuals is often sought, but sometimes met with limited possibilities.

*Teachers with Paraprofessional Support*

School districts are often faced with small numbers in their applicant pools of teachers and paraprofessionals who are qualified to work with students with special needs (Cates & Yell, 1994). With such a depleted pool of available applicants, schools have worked diligently to try and find applicants and in turn secure their employment. Securing quality employees has been a daunting task for many districts and schools as a serious shortage of personnel has been
identified (Bullock & Gable, 2006). Teacher aides in Indiana dropped nearly 10% from the 2004-05 fiscal year to the following year (Binder & Parker, 2006). A drop equivalent to the overall percentage (10%) was also shown for Indiana regarding those aides who were specific to the area of emotional disturbance. However, this same personnel group increased nearly 15% overall and in the area of ED for the fiscal year of 2007-08. The increased hiring and use of paraprofessionals will be imperative to continue the effective use of the model. The use of the paraprofessional support model will provide an effective pairing of professionals in the room (Wright, Russell, Anderson, Kooreman, & Wright, 2006).

This instructional model of using paraprofessional support has increased over the past twenty years and so has the involvement of paraprofessionals within the classroom (Giangreco & Doyle, 2005). Using the needed support structure within the environment helps to alleviate some of the critical issues teachers face when working alone in a classroom with students from various learning and developmental stages. The development of integrated systems, such as paraprofessionals in the classrooms, has aided in the process of providing the needed assistance for students with special needs (Stroul, Piers, Armstrong, & Zaro, 2002; Lyons, 2004). These areas of support can be provided through the use of time management skills and one to one assistance that certain students will need throughout the day. The ability to work with students and provide them the needed support from having the paraprofessional in the room allows teachers to be more engaged in class activities, which leads to more positive classroom outcomes (High School Survey of Student Engagement, 2005). An issue with paraprofessional support has been the federal mandate implemented requiring paraprofessionals to be highly qualified. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines highly qualified for paraprofessionals as:
new paraprofessionals who work in Title I programs must complete two years of college or pass a rigorous skills test. Currently employed paraprofessionals must meet the requirements by 2006. Paraprofessionals may not provide instruction, except under the direct supervision of a teacher (20 U.S.C. § 6319).

Through this definition it is essential that paraprofessionals become highly qualified so the students who are placed in these types of instructional models are serviced appropriately.

This mandate has required current and future paraprofessionals to further their education and experience to become more qualified to work with today’s young people. The more experiences and knowledge professionals bring to the classroom should equate to better instruction and services (Gunter & Denny, 1998). The intent of the policy is genuine; however, it poses a dangerous threat to schools and securing paraprofessional support. More education and training equates to more money and resources, two things which schools are struggling to find. The new pressures of finding, hiring and maintaining paraprofessionals will certainly increase with the continued movement to move special needs students back into the classrooms. Sutherland and Morgan (2003) found that the deficits in high quality teachers and paraprofessionals will have a profound impact on today’s educational system.

**General Education Teacher with Resource Pullout Program**

The personnel required to address needed variables in a secondary setting is imperative (Nelson, Stage, Duppong-Hurley, Synhorst, & Epstein, 2007). General education teachers throughout the country work in schools that provide resource or “pullout” programs. This program is designed to accommodate students who need extra support or guidance working through their educational programs provided in general education settings (Jensen, 2005). As early as the 1970s this type of instructional model has been incorporated in school settings
(Kauffmann & Lloyd, 1995). It is a widely-used model that provides students with disabilities opportunities to access the general education curriculum through a less restrictive setting while still benefiting from special education services (O’Neal, 1997). This may be a critical model of instruction as there are over 140,000 students with emotional disabilities projected to be in regular education classrooms for 60% or more of their educational day (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE] 2005). Resource room support is a viable model for instruction, but can be detrimental to students with disabilities if it is not properly implemented. This implementation is designed to build on a student’s strengths and improve his weaknesses (Kauffmann & Hallahan, 2005).

An analysis of sequential placements done by Denny, Gunter, Shores, and Campbell (1995) found that students were more frequently moved from a resource style model to a more stringent instructional model. This is supported by Wagner and Shaver (as cited in Denny, Gunter, Shores, & Campbell, 1995) as they report that attrition can also affect students with disabilities at the secondary level, especially those with emotional difficulties, as this instructional model can engulf them and their academic progress. Although this model can be effective, it can also lead to more intense instruction or worse if not implemented properly. This can result from a shortcoming in the pullout system (Visser & Cole, 1996). Therefore, a well-structured educational learning environment that encompasses the true value of the resource program is a necessity to the success of the model (MacLeod, 2001).

Classroom Teacher with Special Education Collaboration/Consultation Support

Friend and Cook (2000) state, “This structure of physical isolation is contrary to the concept of collaboration, and its drawbacks are becoming clearer even as the pressure to create schools with collaborative culture mounts” (p.20). General education teachers working with
special education teachers in a collaborative, consultative instructional setting provides students with expertise from multiple arenas (Mooney, Epstein, Reid, & Nelson; 2003; Logan & Stein, 2001). This can be a difficult model as teachers, both experienced and beginning, have been prepared to work independently (Friend & Cook, 1990; Salend, 2005). Merging the fields of general and special education can be difficult, especially when teachers are already used to working individually. Collaborative dialogue amongst educators and other service providers is critical during the development of the appropriate instructional model (Walther-Thomas & Bryant, 1996; Laycock, Korinek, & Gable, 1991; Idol & West, 1991). The needed dialogue and collaboration can be difficult with so many different personalities and opinions working with one another during the development process (Flexer, Baer, Luft, & Simmons, 2008). Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) found that comprehensive planning will be needed to compliment the dialogue between professionals (as cited in Walther-Thomas & Bryant, 1996).

Skrtic, Harris, and Shriner (2005) found that if school stakeholders work together to promote quality educational conditions, students are better prepared to be contributors in today’s society. Wright, Russell, Anderson, Kooreman and Wright (2006) agree and state that increased collaboration promotes better societal outcomes. This successful collaboration works when professionals support one another and create a positive learning environment for both the student and the staff (Kerr & Nelson, 2006; Langerock, 2000).

Teachers working together through a collaborative, cooperative effort, allow students to receive a quality education, but also important social modeling of how individuals in the real world need to operate. It provides highly talented professionals the opportunity to display their talents, thoughts and insight into the instructional environment (Speece & Keogh, 1996; Lewis & Doorlag, 2006). These interactions allow the model to facilitate ongoing interaction between
professionals working with students with exceptional needs (Laycock, Korinek, & Gable, 1991; Kauffmann, 2001). This model is critical to both academic and social growth and allows services to be adjusted as new issues arise (Walker, Koroloff, & Schutte, 2003).

**Team Teaching**

Lane, Wehby, and Barton-Arwood (2005) state, “…educating and managing students with emotional and behavioral problems (EBD) is not just the responsibility of special education teachers” (p. 6). Providing an educational atmosphere that enables special education teachers and general education teachers to work on a level playing field can be very difficult. The two divergent approaches may encounter problems that limit their effectiveness when working together (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002; Rice & Zigmond, 2000). These two educational entities have been working independently for so long; it may be difficult to bring them together (Friend & Cook, 2000; Weiss & Lloyd, 2003). It is imperative to bring the “sides” together to work as a united front to provide collaborative services (Anderson & Wright, 2004).

If educators are able to work together to educate *all* children, the experience for the students has been more beneficial (Barry, 1995). In order for team teaching to excel, teachers have to have an ongoing, active role for all students within the educational setting (Walther-Thomas, 1997; Salend, 2005; Lewis & Doorlag, 2006). This active role provides the needed structure for team teaching to be successful. Educators will also need to make the necessary adjustments in order to model success for their students (Walker, Koroloff, & Schutte, 2003; Dunst & Bruder, 2001).

In a study conducted in Virginia using a team-teaching model, Walther-Thomas (1997) reported that students working in this type of instructional model increased their academic performance and teachers increased their collaboration amongst colleagues. A team teaching
model not only promotes homogeneity among students, it also has an influence on how teachers work together. The model provides a network utilizing the strengths of all professionals involved in instruction (Pescosolido, Wright, & Sullivan, 1995) All parties involved benefit from the coordinated services being provided (Wright, Russell, Anderson, Kooreman, & Wright, 2006; Jordan, 1985). This model cannot come at a better time as the reform movement has education working to create a placement that can provide access to general education for all children in general education classrooms with the appropriate personnel (Walsh & Jones, 2004). As student needs change, the instructional models used to educate them must also change. Careful consideration is needed when designing programs that meet the needs of students with disabilities (Hallenbeck, Kaufman, & Lloyd, 1993). The approach to seek out the best support systems and personnel will truly benefit and enhance the learning process (O’Neal, 1997; Vaughn, Bos, & Schumm, 2000).

**Transitional Outcomes**

Transitioning into adult life can be very difficult; if someone is ill-prepared it can be even worse. Creating environments that produce positive outcomes for students is imperative (Bullock & Gable, 2006). It seems even more difficult when as many as 7,000 students drop out of school each day (Alliance for Excellence Education, 2006). With a statistic as glaring as this, IDEA 1990, 1997 and 2004 along with NCLB set out to improve not only the dropout rate, but also the graduation rate for all students (National High School Center, 2007; Flexer, Baer, Luft, & Simmons, 2008). Nearly the last two decades have been dedicated to improving the outcomes of all students, in particular, students with disabilities (Kohler & Field, 2003). The dynamics of today’s working world are shifting and today’s student needs to find a way to transition into that new environment (Associated Press, 2008).
Mish (1983) defines an outcome as, “something that follows as a result or consequence” (p. 837). Transitional outcomes, whether positive or negative, are not always a direct reflection of the planning process. The transitional services designed by special education policy makers, administrators and educators look to create a positive transition from public education environments to society. Etscheidt (2006) states, “the successful transition of students with disabilities from school to post-school environments is a priority…” (p.28). Moving students into positive, productive environments such as employment, post secondary education and independent living is imperative to society.

Transition involves activities designed for a child to help him move through school and on to a post-school setting (Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities; Final Regulations, 2006 § 300.43). It also takes into consideration the strengths and weaknesses of a child to better design instruction and services to successfully move the child into post-secondary life (Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities; Final Regulations, 2006 § 300.43). These services are now required to be established by age 16, or younger if the local education agency determines (Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities; Final Regulations, 34 C.F.R. § 300.320(b)). Indiana is an example of this, as it has designed the transition IEP to be implemented by age 14 (IAC 7-32- 48 (b)(2)(A-B), 2008). Having these services provides more opportunities for students with disabilities to encounter a more successful transition from secondary education into adult life. This transition and the needed services will be predicated on the efficacy of the provider and its service components (Cobb, Sample, Alwell, & Johns, 2006).
Even with these opportunities in place, both the Twenty-Fifth and Twenty-Seventh Annual Reports to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act project that over 80,000 students with disabilities will drop out of school (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). From these approximately 80,000 students, over 20,000 of them will be students with emotional disabilities (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). This striking statistic shows that even though schools have become better at transitioning students with emotional difficulties, there is still room for improvement. Special education remains focused on improving the outcome based performances by students with special needs (Bateman, 2005). However, transition from high school for students with ED remains difficult and has been marked by failure and disappointment (Sample, 1998; Wood & Cronin, 1999).

Saborine, Evans and Cullinan (2006) agree and found that students with emotional disabilities have a significantly harder time transitioning from school. It is an area that needs attention and focus to appropriately move students, especially those with exceptional needs, into positive, productive roles in society.

*Positive Transitional Outcomes for Students with Emotional Disabilities*

The two most common transitions from secondary school for students with disabilities are: 1) graduating with a diploma; and 2) certificate of completion (Rusch, 2008). It is reported that over 200,000 students with disabilities in the United States will exit from high school with either a diploma or a certificate of completion (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE] 2005). Of these transitioning students, approximately 17,000, or 8%, will be students with emotional disabilities (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE] 2005). Reid, Gonzalez, Nordness, Trout, and Epstein (2004) found that students with emotional disabilities had significantly lower
academic progress than their non-disabled peers which confirms the low graduation rate for students with ED. Transitional outcomes for students with disabilities, especially those with emotional difficulties, are often not positive. The number of students not properly being served and sent out into society is alarming (Cullinan, 2007). Low transitional outcomes for students have become a national issue and interventions and preventions are currently being developed (National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities, 2005). The research in looking to find predictors for positive transitions for students with ED is sparse.

Negative Transitional Outcomes for Students with Emotional Disabilities

Wagner, Kutash, Duchnowski, and Epstein (2005) found in an analysis of the National Longitudinal Transition Study that started in 1985 that students with emotional difficulties had higher negative outcomes from school than any other group both in school and in the general population. These poor outcomes for students are: a) dropped out of school; b) reached maximum age; c) incarcerated; d) long-term suspension (10 days or longer); or e) expulsion or removal by school personnel (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). Students with emotional disabilities have the highest numbers in these identified outcome groupings when compared to all other disability categories (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003). There is a transition gap that is apparent when analyzing data for students with ED (Test, Aspel, & Everson, 2006). It is a gap that needs to be lessened to provide more positive outcomes for students with emotional disabilities.

Greenbaum (1996) reports in The National Adolescent and Child Treatment Study (NACTS) that 75,000 students with emotional disabilities were dropping out of school; two thirds of them had been in contact with law enforcement, and over 40% had been incarcerated within any given year. Students with emotional disabilities also failed more courses, had lower
graduation rates, and were less likely to go on to college (Kauffmann 2001; Wagner 2005). These statistics coupled with 579 students who reached maximum age, over 5,000 who had long-term suspensions, and over 4,000 who were removed from school, demonstrate that it is easy to identify a need to prevent so many negative outcomes for students with emotional disabilities in secondary school today.

Students with disabilities, especially those with emotional difficulties, continue to be the front-runner when it comes to dropping out of school. It is reported that approximately 56% of students with emotional disabilities in the United States dropped out of school or left school before graduation (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005; Wagner, 1993). This is nearly 25% more than any other disability category (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005). Staying in school and completing the needed requirements has become a major concern for educational systems regarding those students that fall into this student population.

Locke and Fuchs (1995) reported that students with emotional disabilities tend to have more academic difficulties in school thus leading them down the path of dropping out of school. Mooney, Epstein Reid, and Nelson (2003) concur stating that academic underachievement leads to negative results within the educational environment. The environments which are created for students with exceptional needs and their current outcomes are not producing the results needed for this specific population of students. Students with ED are experiencing far less positive transitions and upward movement in society than many other categories of students (Jolivette, Stichter, Nelson, Scott, & Liaupsin, 2000; Van Acker, 2004).

Another outcome for students with disabilities, often viewed negatively, is reaching the maximum age limit or those students who remain in school up until the final day of their twenty-first year of life. The irony of this category is that many students with emotional difficulties do
not stay in school long enough to meet this requirement. It is reported that less than 4% of students with emotional disabilities would leave school after reaching maximum age (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2003; U.S. Department of Education [USDOE] 2005). Emotional handicapped students will leave through a variety of ways school long before meeting maximum age limits.

One of those various ways to exit school is to be adjudicated or become involved in the legal system. Students being incarcerated and removed from the public education system is becoming a national concern (Burrell & Warboys, 2000). It is reported that 66% of the adult prison population did not finish high school (NLTS, 2005). Quinn, Rutherford, and Leone (2001) also found in a preliminary study that approximately 32% of youth in detention centers are suffering from a disabling condition. This abundance of students working their way into the legal system is alarming to educators and society. Once they are in the system are they receiving services? Quinn et. al (2001) also found that of those individuals incarcerated less than 30% were receiving some type of instructional services. This shows that once students are in the “system” they are lacking in ways to improve their skill sets to get back on track in society once released.

A final negative transition for school outcomes for students is long term suspension or expulsion from school. Fiore and Reynolds (1996) found that a suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities was around 20%; this is twice that of students in the general population. Achilles, McLaughlin and Croninger (2007) reported that students with ED are more likely to receive long term suspension or expulsion rulings when compared to any other group of students. Achilles et. al (2007) go on to report that this same faction of students, those with emotional difficulties, are becoming a concern for educational systems as they continually rank as the highest disability category receiving these types of disciplinary actions. The alarming statistics
provide useful data points needing assistance to alleviate the high rate of extreme disciplinary procedures.

Negative outcomes and activities have infiltrated our school systems for exceptional needs students, in particular those students with emotional difficulties. Many students are dropping out of school and not able to be productive citizens without the needed support systems in place (Conroy, Dunlap, Clarke, & Alter, 2005). Students are having a hard time finding a place in the workforce (Bullis, Moran, Benz, Todis, & Johnson, 2002). Others are making their way into the penal system and struggling to get out of that particular way of life, while many other students are receiving major disciplinary action from the educational system and struggling to find success. Carter and Wehby (2003) stated that transitions from school to external environments are often littered with disappointing outcomes. Whatever the case may be, students with emotional disabilities are finding ways to leave educational systems in a non-productive manner, resulting in major life struggles. A focus on achievement and success is issued to counter-balance these poor transitional outcomes (President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002).

Summary

Laws, mandates, and reform have truly shaped the direction that education, and more importantly special education, decided to embark on in regards to students with disabilities. The literature shows that there are numerous service delivery models being used in schools today. Also, within these placements, there are multiple instructional models being implemented to improve the quality and effectiveness of education being provided to students with disabilities. It was also found that students with emotional disabilities are continuing to struggle and fail in today’s schools. The emphasis continues to be to find the appropriate settings and personnel that
meet student’s needs and promote students’ successes. Educational professionals will have to be very careful and deliberate with the development and enhancement of service delivery and instructional models to substantially improve the transitional outcomes for students with disabilities, especially those with emotional disabilities. Education, schools, administrators, and teachers need to find ways to facilitate students with emotional disabilities so they become compassionate, responsible, and productive citizens.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the current service delivery models, instructional models, and transitional outcomes for students with emotional disabilities in the state of Indiana. It also examined the differences in perceptions of general and special education administrators and teachers about best practice service and instructional models used in Indiana secondary schools for students with emotional disabilities. The study explored to find the appropriate service delivery and instructional models needed to promote positive transitions (i.e. competitive workforce) from high school for students with emotional disabilities. The need to improve transitional outcomes for secondary students with emotional disabilities is imperative. The intent of the study was to provide insight into the service delivery and instructional models currently used in Indiana and their impact on the transitional outcomes for Indiana secondary education students with emotional disabilities.

Sample

The population for this study was drawn from all 92 counties identified in Indiana. All 296 school corporations and 67 special education cooperatives servicing students with emotional disabilities within the counties of Indiana were identified as potential participants. Potential participants for this study were high school level (grades 9-12) special education teachers, high school level (grades 9-12) general education teachers, high school level (grades 9-12) general education administrators, and special education administrators/directors (K-12), working in Indiana public school settings throughout the state. Selected professionals work with students
with disabilities, including those with emotional disabilities. Each of the participants works with a public high school in the state of Indiana.

Table 1 shows the breakdown of the defined population and sample within the study by the current position. The table shows that general education teachers make up the largest group of sampled participants by position. This is due to the fact that there are many more general education teachers compared to the other sampled positions within any educational environment.

### Table 1

**Population and Sample Participants by Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>General Education Administrators</th>
<th>Special Education Administrators</th>
<th>General Education Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Participants</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sampling Method**

Participants were selected using a multi-stage sampling design, which encompassed a multiple-phase approach. Multi-stage sampling designs can involve simple, stratified, systematic and clustered sampling (Trochim, 2006). This study used all four sections in the multi-stage sampling design: simple, stratified, systematic and clustering. A two-stage clustering sample design was used during the sampling process (Ross, 2005). The multiple-phased sampling method produced a total of 1598 sample subjects from the state of Indiana. The following tables describe the different phases of the sampling techniques used to produce the study’s participant pool.

The first phase utilized a two-stage clustering design. A clustering design can be viewed as a hierarchical system (Ross, 2005). The first part of the hierarchical schema was already in place for this study, the Educational Roundtable system used by the state of Indiana. The 2006-07
Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) Educational Roundtable directory was used to identify the seven roundtable regions in the state (See map in Appendix A). Table 2 displays the total number and percentage of sampled participants from each roundtable.

Table 2

**Sampled Participants by Roundtable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roundtable</th>
<th>1 Northwest</th>
<th>2 Northeast</th>
<th>3 North Central</th>
<th>4 East</th>
<th>5 Central</th>
<th>6 Southwest</th>
<th>7 Southeast</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Participants</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second part of phase 1 was identifying Indiana counties. Table 3 shows the breakdown of each county within the established educational roundtables. The 2006-07 Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) Educational Roundtable directory was again used to create this breakdown. It should be noted that 8 of the possible 92 counties were removed from the sample and not considered because they fell within the boundaries of two roundtables. Roundtable 3 was impacted the most, having 5 shared counties removed. This creates a limitation regarding the amount of counties that could be used for the study.
Table 3

**Roundtables and Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roundtable #</th>
<th>Roundtable Name</th>
<th>Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Lake, LaPorte, Porter, St. Joseph, Starke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Adams, Allen, DeKalb, Elkhart, Huntington, LaGrange, Noble, Steuben, Wabash, Wells, Whitley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Benton, Carroll, Cass, Clinton, Fountain, Howard, Jasper, Montgomery, Newton, Tippecanoe, Tipton, Vermillion, Warren, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Blackford, Delaware, Fayette, Grant, Henry, Jay, Randolph, Rush, Union, Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Hamilton, Hancock, Johnson, Marion, Morgan, Putnam, Shelby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Clay, Daviess, Dubois, Gibson, Greene, Jackson, Knox, Lawrence, MartinMonroe, Perry, Pike, Posey, Spencer, Sullivan, Vanderburgh, Vigo, Warrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Brown, Clark, Crawford, Dearborn, Decatur, Floyd, HarrisonJennings, Ohio, Orange, Ripley, Scott, Switzerland, Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second phase of the sampling design, also a cluster design, was to identify the current basketball classification for all schools in Indiana. This was done to determine school size. The *Indiana High School Athletic Association School Directory (IHSAA)* (Indiana High School Athletic Association, 2007) was used to obtain the needed classifications and breakdowns of the schools by school size. The directory also provided the total number of schools represented within each classification for the state of Indiana. This classification system was used to create the tier system used for the study. Table 4 displays the findings from the directory and the breakdown of the researcher-designed tier system based on IHSAA school size.
Using both Tables 3 and 4, along with *Indiana School Directory, Section IV* (Indiana Department of Education, 2006) schools were identified by their county, roundtable and tier level. Table 5 provides an example of the sampling design and how each school in the state was clustered using its county, roundtable and tier as identifiers. It should be noted that none of the schools identified in Table 5 were used within the study.

### Table 5

**Schools by County, Roundtable and Tier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>County (County #)</th>
<th>Roundtable</th>
<th>Tier (IHSAA Classification)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owen Valley HS</td>
<td>Owen (60)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (AAAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmhurst HS</td>
<td>Allen (02)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (AAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Creek HS</td>
<td>Johnson (41)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (AA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Forest HS</td>
<td>Lake (45)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Example for sample cluster classification purposes only – schools identified were not in study

Phase three used a stratified design to further define the sampling process. A stratified design, particularly in education, can be used to describe and control for demographic aspects such as size and locale (Ross, 2005). Table 6 provides an example of how schools were organized by tier within the roundtables, and how the design produced 12 schools per roundtable for each of the 7 roundtables. Using this framework, a total of 84 schools were selected as potential sites for the sample. The intent of the researcher was to select one school per county,

### Table 4

**School Tier Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IHSSA Classification</th>
<th>Researcher Tier Design</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Student Enrollment Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAAA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3600 - 1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1073 - 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>579 - 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>338 - 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using both Tables 3 and 4, along with *Indiana School Directory, Section IV* (Indiana Department of Education, 2006) schools were identified by their county, roundtable and tier level. Table 5 provides an example of the sampling design and how each school in the state was clustered using its county, roundtable and tier as identifiers. It should be noted that none of the schools identified in Table 5 were used within the study.

### Table 5

**Schools by County, Roundtable and Tier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>County (County #)</th>
<th>Roundtable</th>
<th>Tier (IHSAA Classification)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owen Valley HS</td>
<td>Owen (60)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (AAAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmhurst HS</td>
<td>Allen (02)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (AAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Creek HS</td>
<td>Johnson (41)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (AA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Forest HS</td>
<td>Lake (45)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Example for sample cluster classification purposes only – schools identified were not in study

Phase three used a stratified design to further define the sampling process. A stratified design, particularly in education, can be used to describe and control for demographic aspects such as size and locale (Ross, 2005). Table 6 provides an example of how schools were organized by tier within the roundtables, and how the design produced 12 schools per roundtable for each of the 7 roundtables. Using this framework, a total of 84 schools were selected as potential sites for the sample. The intent of the researcher was to select one school per county,
however, due to a limited amount of counties and schools within a roundtable, a minimal number of counties were duplicated throughout the selection process.

Table 6

*Number of Schools Selected Per Roundtable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roundtable #</th>
<th>Roundtable Name</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
<th>Total # of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 expands Table 5 by displaying the Special Education Planning Districts that are associated with the selected school. Each high school in Indiana was paired with its aligned Special Education Planning District for sampling purposes to link special education administrators with appropriate LEA sites and their personnel. Again, it must be noted that none of the schools or planning districts depicted in Table 7 were used in the study.

Table 7

*Schools and Special Education Planning Districts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>County (County #)</th>
<th>Roundtable</th>
<th>Tier (IHSAA Classification)</th>
<th>Special Education Planning Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owen Valley HS</td>
<td>Owen (60)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (AAAA)</td>
<td>Forest Hills SPCED Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmhurst HS</td>
<td>Allen (02)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (AAA)</td>
<td>Fort Wayne Community Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Creek HS</td>
<td>Johnson (41)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (AA)</td>
<td>Johnson County Special Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Forest HS</td>
<td>Lake (45)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (A)</td>
<td>Northwest Indiana SPCED Cooperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Example for pairing purposes only - schools identified were not in study

The fourth and final phase used a systematic design to select the schools. Trochim (2007) describes a systematic approach as a way to find a needed sample by knowing how many units are in the population and knowing how many units are needed for the sample. Taking this into consideration, the researcher systematically selected three schools from Tiers 1-4 for every
roundtable. This provided 84 needed schools previously mentioned. Using the selected schools and the design shown in Table 7, each school was paired with its special education planning district.

The selected schools were then prioritized. Each school was listed as a first, second or third choice within each tier (1-4) for each roundtable (1-7). Again, careful consideration was given to choose schools from different planning districts to acquire better representation from throughout the state. The multi-phase approach provided a precise method for sample design. The intent was to represent one county per roundtable and school tier. The researcher used caution during the school selection process to create a representative sample of Indiana within the sampling design. The final sample based on position classification was guided by Krejcie & Morgan’s (1970) Table 1 – Determining a Sample Size from a Given Population. The results of final sampling efforts for this study are reported in Table 1.

Instrumentation

A survey research design was selected as the best model to conduct this study. In accordance with this decision a survey instrument was designed by the researcher. The instrument designed used the framework and characteristics of the Indiana State Improvement Grant survey (Harvey, 2005, http://www.in-sig.org/). It was designed to be disseminated electronically via website eliciting demographic information and several styles of questions: forced answer, Likert-type scale designed, and open ended (see Appendix B). Each survey was coded to ensure confidentiality. Only the researcher and faculty advisor had access to the coding sequence design.
Survey Instrument

Section I

The first section of the survey collected participant demographic data, such as gender and age, to identify the characteristics of study participants. It also provided a table with terms and their definitions since special education jargon can be often misinterpreted. This information was collected to be used when looking for predictor variables and their significance (research questions 8, 9, & 10). These questions analyze the impact these predictor variables (i.e. gender) have on a participant’s perception of the current service delivery models, instructional models and transitional outcomes associated with students with emotional disabilities in their school setting.

Section II

The second section collected data regarding the special education and related services being provided to students with emotional disabilities on the continuum of placement options used in educational settings. This was defined as the service delivery model (SDM). The intent of this section was to investigate where students with emotional disabilities are placed and how participants perceived the usefulness of these placements. The participants were asked to first select the SDM that best described their students’ current situation. Choices ranged from a regular classroom setting to homebound setting and were presented using CODA definitions (“Computerized Data Project”, 2008) (See Appendix B). The participants were then asked to rate their service delivery model using a 5 point Likert-type scale. The scale design included the following: 1= Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Agree; 4= Strongly Agree; and 5= Do Not Know. “Do not know” data was initially collected to provide an overall perspective of the current
models. These responses were then removed to provide a more detailed analysis of those participants that did know the models currently being used.

The participants used the rating scale to answer questions relating to adequate resources and materials, being an adequate placement, and if placement is a major factor in the success of a student. They were also asked to provide primary and secondary reasons as to why it is difficult to work with students with emotional disabilities and to list two ways to improve their current service delivery models. Section II provided the data to be used in frequency and percentage tables, crosstab data along with means and standard deviations (research questions 1, 2 and 5). These questions look at the overall use of service delivery models, how effective they are perceived to be, and if there were any differences among participant groups regarding the model.

Section III

Section three collected information regarding the current instructional model such as teachers with or without paraprofessional support, resource/pullout and programs, among others used by schools. Choices were again presented using CODA definitions (“Computerized Data Project”, 2008) (See Appendix B). This question provided the data for research questions three, four and six. These questions look at the overall use of instructional delivery models, how effective they are perceived to be and if there were any differences among participant groups regarding the model.

This section looked at the personnel (instructional model) used to provide services to students with ED. This section, like Section II, asked the participants to select the current personnel used to provide services. The participants were again asked to rate these models using the Likert-type scale. The questions looked at highly qualified teachers, evidence-based instruction and overall success of the model. As before, participants were asked to provide
primary and secondary reasons as to why it is difficult to work with students using their current model and two reasons on how to improve the model. As in Section II, frequency and percentage tables, crosstab data along with means and standard deviations were used to analyze and report this data.

*Sections IV and V*

Sections four and five were designed to provide supplemental data. Section four looked to explore the general education curriculum access by those students with emotional difficulties in the core subjects using grade levels and standards. Section five searched to find data regarding the social skills and life skills being taught within the school environment. These skills ranged from communication skills to daily living skills. The intent of these sections was to provide data that could enrich the findings from the previous sections.

*Section VI*

The final section, section six, was in search of the outcomes of this student population. The outcomes were both positive and negative ranging from graduating with a diploma to dropping out of school (See Appendix B). The participants were asked to select what they felt was the most frequent outcome for their student population from the provided options. Participant input on whether their students were transitioning to college, the military or the competitive workforce was also solicited. This was done using the same 5-point Likert-type rating scale discussed previously.

The final part of this section was a narrative question regarding the improvements needed to move students into productive post-secondary life. This section was designed to answer research question seven. These questions centered on the transitional outcomes for students with ED that were leaving their educational settings.
**Jury Panel**

The survey instrument was disseminated to a jury panel of seven educational professionals to acquire feedback on its face, content, and construct validity. Feedback was also given regarding consistency and alignment with subject area needs. This jury panel consisted of subject matter experts. These professionals were selected from the Indiana Department of Education (n=2) along with noted professionals in the field of emotional and behavioral disorders from universities throughout the country (n=5). Each panel member provided feedback on formatting, question design and overall usefulness of the instrument. Their feedback, suggestions and input were collected and used as a guide for the redesign and revision of the instrument.

**Pilot Testing**

The survey instrument was also piloted to again test content and consistency, but also for readability, user-friendliness and to establish an average completion time. The survey pilot group was made up of 68 administrators and teachers from both special and general education from one high school and one special education cooperative in the central region of Indiana. The pilot test used a sample of convenience. The testing provided data and insight regarding the use of the electronic system, possible technological barriers and the time commitment needed to complete the survey. Participants were also allowed to provide comments as to the ease of the survey and possible improvements. It should be noted that the pilot site and the pilot test data were not used in the dissertation research study.

The data from the pilot was collected, culled and analyzed. The analysis that was done tested the assumed methods outlined in the research plan. Using the proposed research plan and
proposed statistical applications for data analysis, the pilot study verified that the instrument would provide the needed data to answer the proposed research questions. No modifications were made to the survey instrument following the pilot testing process.

Survey Procedures

The researcher made initial contact by calling principals and special education directors from the list of prioritized schools and their corresponding special education planning district/entity to ask for permission to use their site and staff in the study. The calling process began by using the special education cooperative that had been assigned as the primary selection from each tier within each roundtable. Contacted administrators were given a description of the study and their time commitment regarding study participation (See Appendix A). If contact was not made, the researcher would follow-up at a later date with a second or third phone call. This process was repeated using secondary and tertiary schools and cooperatives within each roundtable. The study was designed to use a school from each of the seven roundtables and four tiers for the study.

Once a school agreed to participate, it was given two options regarding its staff listing. The school could: 1) Send a faculty/staff directory which contained the staff’s first and last names, their departmental positions, and their email addresses; or 2) The researcher would ask for a web address for their site and create the list utilizing the staff directory and contact information provided by the site. From these two options, the researcher was able to obtain the number of total potential participants. Each set of potential participants from a site was broken down into the four categories according to position: 1) general education administrators; 2) special education administrators; 3) general education teachers; and 4) special education teachers.
The sample was then selected from the pool of potential participants. This study recognized that the sample would be small; therefore, the selection was guided by Krejcie & Morgan’s (1970). Table 1 Determining a Sample Size from a Given Population, was used to find the number of participants needed for each site. Using the table and determining the needed sample size for each site, the next step was to randomly select participants.

The participants were numbered sequentially within their current position. Each subgroup’s (i.e. special education teachers) possible participants were numbered chronologically. It should be noted that school nurses, librarians/media specialists, custodians and other classified/non-teaching staff were removed from the total potential participant pool. Using a web-based, randomizing number selection tool (Urbaniak & Plous, 2008), the participants were selected. This process was done for every participating site that provided the study with the sample of participants who would be contacted. Sample selection generated 1598 sampled participants (See Table 1).

All participants were assigned an 8-digit code. The code utilized roundtable number (1st digit), site number (researcher designed & assigned) (2nd & 3rd digit), tier level (4th digit), employment position (5th digit) and how many individuals there were in each position (6th-8th digit). For example: 71134005 would equate to: roundtable 7 (Southeast), site number 11, tier 3, special education teacher who was 5th out of the total number of possible special education teachers selected from the site.

The code was designed to protect the identity and ensure the confidentiality of the participants. It also aided in the email follow-up process, establishing participant response rates and easier, more efficient analysis. All 1598 sampled participants were assigned this unique participant identifier.
Participants were contacted via email using a mass email system. This system was selected because it provided a dual function: 1) it uses the blind carbon copy (Bcc:) feature of email; this ensures the confidentiality of the participants; and 2) it provided an efficient way to deliver nearly 1600 emails quickly and effectively. The mass delivery system was first designed to be disseminated three times using two-week intervals for a six week data collection cycle. However, due to limited responses, an additional two-week cycle was employed at the end of the six week period to garner more participants. Each time the mailer was launched, it would be updated removing those individuals who had participated or opted to decline. This would alleviate redundancy and confusion for those who had completed the process. Those remaining on the list each cycle would be contacted.

**Participation Rates**

Table 8 displays the overall response rates by position including those sampled individuals who did not participate. Participants in the study were placed into 5 different categories. One category was designed for those who participated and were used for analysis. The other four categories were created and presented as those individuals who did not participate in the study.

The first category identified those participants with valid responses. A person’s response was considered a valid response if the participant agreed to participate and completed the survey. The survey produced 245 valid responses and usable data for analyses. These 245 respondents were drawn from 31 high schools and 28 special education cooperatives located throughout Indiana. It should be noted that two of the designed roundtable-tier (See Tables 5, 6, & 7) areas did not have a representative school and three roundtable-tier areas had more than one school represented.
The four categories used for those individuals who did not participate in the study were: 1) Declined; 2) No Response; 3) Technical Problems; and 4) No Attempt/Non-Respondents. The declined category was defined as someone who navigated to the consent section of the provided survey link and chose the declined option. The Ball State University inQsit database kept a running total of this by participant code. No Response was classified as an individual who clicked on the provided link, chose to accept and entered the survey. However, the individual did not select any of the provided responses. This was also recorded by the inQsit database using the participant’s code. A survey response was recorded as a tech problem if the email sent to the sampled participant was returned to the researcher. These emails were saved and recorded by the researcher. The Ball State University inQsit system is unable to collect this data. The final category is no attempt/non-respondents. This category would be non-responding sampled participants. If a sampled surveyor did not fall into or display characteristics of one of the three mentioned categories, he was placed in the no attempt/non-respondents category.

Table 8 displays response rates by how the four sub-categorical positions compared to one another. General education teachers had the highest valid overall response rate (6.1%), but this could be due to the sheer number of participants in this category. Special education administrators were well represented comparatively at 4.4%. The group with the lowest response rate was the special education teachers (2.1%). This group also had 4.3% of its chosen surveyors not attempt to participate in the study. It can be noted that only 4.4% of all participants declined to participate and there were only 88 overall technical issues reported. These response rates are indicative of the decreasing numbers in survey research (Porter & Whitcomb, 2003). It is not uncommon to garner response rates lower than 20% when using electronic survey mechanisms.
Non-response issues and problems continue to be encountered and pose barriers to researchers (Smith, 1997).

Table 8

**Overall Response Rates Between Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>General Education Administrators</th>
<th>Special Education Administrators</th>
<th>General Education Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Responses</td>
<td>43 2.7</td>
<td>70 4.4</td>
<td>98 6.1</td>
<td>34 2.1</td>
<td>245 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>14 0.9</td>
<td>5 0.3</td>
<td>43 2.7</td>
<td>9 0.6</td>
<td>71 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>14 0.9</td>
<td>33 2.1</td>
<td>55 3.4</td>
<td>13 0.8</td>
<td>115 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Problems</td>
<td>12 0.8</td>
<td>6 0.4</td>
<td>41 2.6</td>
<td>29 1.8</td>
<td>88 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Attempt/Non-Respondents</td>
<td>20 1.3</td>
<td>17 1.1</td>
<td>974 61.0</td>
<td>68 4.3</td>
<td>1079 67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Total</td>
<td>103 6.4</td>
<td>131 8.2</td>
<td>1211 75.8</td>
<td>153 9.6</td>
<td>1598 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 displays how participants responded within their position. The table shows that special education administrators had the highest return rate of 53.4% and general education teachers had the lowest rate at 8.1% within their position. This is indicative of the study in the fact that it was focused on students with special needs. It is important to note that special education teachers had a no attempt rate that was twice that of their response rate, 44.4% and 22.2% respectively. Also, the overall no attempt/non-respondents category represented over two-thirds of the return rate (67.5%). This category was represented heavily by the general education teacher population (n=974, 90.3%). As high as 70% of sampled populations may not respond to electronic surveys per several reasons (i.e. technical problems, user difficulties) (Andrews, Nonnecke, & Preece, 2003). This indicates that response rates can be low and is comparable to the current study.

Manfreda, Bosnjak, Berzelak, Haas & Vehovar (2008) report on the “increased burden” of electronic surveys such as slow loading times and incompatible software. This burden could be a component as to why so many individuals did not attempt the survey. Technical problems using the inQsit system represented 5.5% of the overall response rate. Technical problems were
recorded as returned emails to the researcher regarding various issues (i.e. mailbox full, email longer exists). These issues stemmed from the receiving site’s technical services. Technical problems develop from all areas when using web-based programs and can be higher than many individuals would anticipate (Daley, McDermott, Brown, & Kittleson, 2003). A critical technical issue is the stringent filter system developed by schools that use @k12.in.us email addresses. These filter systems have created large barriers for Ball State inQsit designed systems to access. This issue and the others mentioned have created some difficulties for research to be done with school settings utilizing a web-based, electronic survey approach.

Table 9

*Overall Response Rates Within Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Education Administrators</th>
<th>Special Education Administrators</th>
<th>General Education Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Responses</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Problems</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Attempt</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis*

Responses to current service models, instructional models, and outcomes were analyzed as well as the perceptions of best practice models for both service delivery and instruction. The independent, dependent and predictor variables are presented and outlined to provide insight into the analysis process.

*Independent Variables*

An independent variable is an antecedent that can be manipulated, controlled or has some logical impact on the dependent variable (Jaeger, 1993; “Independent and Dependent Variables”,
The participant or independent variable should be allowed to respond freely and not be compelled to answer according to “guidelines” (Mansfield, 1986; Fassett, 2006). The independent variables within the study were the employed positions held by the participants. The four positions surveyed were: 1) high school level (grades 9-12) general education teachers; 2) high school level (grades 9-12) special education teachers; 3) high school level (grades 9-12) general education administrators; and 4) All level (grades K-12) special education administrators.

Table 10 displays the demographics of the study participants who completed the survey and had usable data. Nearly 67% of participants in the study were female, but that was not representative of the general education administrator category (39.5%). All other areas exceeded 67% female participants. Overall age among participants was more evenly distributed with the largest participation group being in the 51+ years category (33.1%). Teachers, both special education and general education, were evenly distributed when looking at age, but administrators had more participation from those ranging in age from 40-51+. Caucasian was the most dominant group when looking at ethnicity having 98.8% of the participants. African-American and Hispanic were the only other ethnic categories represented, both having very low participation levels. The overall representation of years in current position also showed an evenly distributed participation rate. The low in the range was 5.7% in the 16-20 years to a high of 22.9% in the 3-5 years range.
### Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Education Administrators</th>
<th>Special Education Administrators</th>
<th>General Education Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26 (60.5)</td>
<td>9 (12.9)</td>
<td>39 (39.8)</td>
<td>7 (20.6)</td>
<td>81 (33.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17 (39.5)</td>
<td>61 (87.1)</td>
<td>59 (60.2)</td>
<td>27 (79.4)</td>
<td>164 (66.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
<td>70 (100)</td>
<td>98 (100)</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
<td>245 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 20</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>1 (2.3)</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
<td>13 (13.3)</td>
<td>5 (14.7)</td>
<td>20 (8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (4.3)</td>
<td>16 (16.3)</td>
<td>6 (17.6)</td>
<td>25 (10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>7 (10)</td>
<td>13 (13.3)</td>
<td>4 (11.8)</td>
<td>30 (12.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>9 (20.9)</td>
<td>11 (15.7)</td>
<td>12 (12.2)</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
<td>33 (13.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>6 (8.6)</td>
<td>6 (6.1)</td>
<td>4 (11.8)</td>
<td>22 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>4 (9.3)</td>
<td>16 (22.9)</td>
<td>10 (10.2)</td>
<td>3 (8.8)</td>
<td>33 (13.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51+</td>
<td>17 (39.5)</td>
<td>25 (35.7)</td>
<td>28 (28.6)</td>
<td>11 (32.4)</td>
<td>81 (33.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
<td>70 (100)</td>
<td>98 (100)</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
<td>245 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian (White)</td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
<td>69 (98.6)</td>
<td>96 (98)</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
<td>242 (98.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
<td>70 (100)</td>
<td>98 (100)</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
<td>245 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Current Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>6 (14)</td>
<td>4 (5.7)</td>
<td>13 (13.3)</td>
<td>9 (26.5)</td>
<td>32 (13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>4 (9.3)</td>
<td>15 (21.4)</td>
<td>12 (12.2)</td>
<td>4 (11.8)</td>
<td>35 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>16 (37.2)</td>
<td>19 (27.1)</td>
<td>12 (12.2)</td>
<td>9 (26.5)</td>
<td>56 (22.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>10 (23.3)</td>
<td>18 (25.7)</td>
<td>18 (18.4)</td>
<td>5 (14.7)</td>
<td>51 (20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>2 (4.7)</td>
<td>5 (7.1)</td>
<td>16 (16.3)</td>
<td>2 (5.9)</td>
<td>25 (10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>2 (4.7)</td>
<td>5 (7.1)</td>
<td>4 (4.1)</td>
<td>3 (8.8)</td>
<td>14 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>4 (5.7)</td>
<td>23 (23.5)</td>
<td>2 (5.9)</td>
<td>32 (13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43 (100)</td>
<td>70 (100)</td>
<td>98 (100)</td>
<td>34 (100)</td>
<td>245 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Predictor Variables**

Table 11 displays the variables, acronyms and definitions used for the regression analyses. The logistic regression models were used to determine if any demographic data had an impact on the way respondents agreed with effectiveness of the service delivery and instructional models being used in their settings as well as the perceived outcomes for their student population. Would there be any significant differences found in variables showing where a
respondent is from or how old they are? A regression model looks to make a prediction of the dependent variable with an independent variable (Jaegar, 1993; H. Finch, personal communication, June 8, 2005). Below is a description of the predictor variables that were analyzed and how they were constructed from the demographic data that were collected.

Respondent position has been defined on the basis of his current employed position within an Indiana public school system. Position is divided into four sub-categories: general education administrator, special education administrator, general education teacher and special education teacher. The schools and special education planning districts/ cooperatives were systematically selected to provide a representative balance of respondents in each of the four categories.

The study found that general education teachers were underrepresented when analyzing the participation rate. The potential participant pool and selected sample did not indicate underrepresentation. This may have occurred because the study focused on special education and there was a high number of general education teachers not participating (n=1113). The other three groups showed a slight overrepresentation when compared to potential and sample participant pools. This again could be attributed to the nature of the study.

The gender and age of the respondent was viewed as a critical predictor variable within the study. Education has been and continues to be highly represented with females (Indiana Department of Education, 2007). This study continued to show this trend as it showed a 2:1 ratio of females to males (See Table 10). Therefore, the study analyzed to see if females showed more or less agreement with the models currently being used and the perceived outcomes. Age was also analyzed, but it was condensed for the analysis. The category was condensed to create better
n-values for analysis. There was a natural, chronological staffing pattern (i.e. young staff, veteran staff) used to create the new categories.

The original dataset contained eight age categories, and for the analysis three categories were developed, using the 51+ years of age category as the reference. The categories of younger than 20, 20-25, 26-30 and 31-35 years old were combined to make the first group (Age2035). The second group (Age3650) consisted of 36-40, 40-45 and 46-50 year old participants. The 51+ group was used as the reference category (RC).

The number of years a participant was in his current position was also condensed into fewer categories for the analysis. Seven categories were developed for the study, and this variable was also reconfigured into three groups. Again, the regrouping was done to create better n-values for analysis. The 21+ years was used as the reference category (RC). Those participants who had been in their position less than 1 year up to 5 years were now in a single grouping (YRSpos05). Participants that had been in their position six to twenty years were now grouped together (YRSpos620). These groupings were perceived as logical regroupings for analysis.

The roundtable or location of the participant was also analyzed. Indiana has 7 educational regions in place and the dataset accounted for all of these regions separately. When running the regression model, the regions were recoded into three grouping: 1) RdTabNORTH, which consisted of those individuals who work in Roundtables 1, 2, and 3; 2) RdTabSOUTH, which consisted of those individuals who work in Roundtables 5, 6, and 7; and 3) RdTabCENTRAL, the reference category (RC) which consisted of those individuals who work in Roundtable 4. The geographic rationale was used for the restructuring. The regrouping also lent to better distribution across categories.
**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variable is the response the researcher is measuring from the study (Norusis, 1994; “Independent and Dependent Variables”, 2006). The three dependent variables in the study were: 1) service delivery models (placement); 2) instructional models (personnel); and 3) transition outcomes reported by the participants.

**Table 11**

*Variable Names, Acronyms and Definitions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Dependent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery Model</td>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>The perceived current service delivery model or placement used in Indiana public high schools with students with emotional disabilities. (Regular Classroom; Resource Room; Separate Class; Separate Day School Facility; Residential Facility; Correctional Facility; Parentally Placed in Private Schools; Homebound/Hospital Placement; &amp; Do Not Know).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery Model Success</td>
<td>newSDMSucc</td>
<td>The perceived success of the current service delivery model or placement used in Indiana public high schools with students with emotional disabilities. 1 = Strongly Agree &amp; Agree, 0 = all others (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, &amp; Do Not Know).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Model</td>
<td>Pers</td>
<td>The perceived instructional model or personnel used in Indiana public high schools with students with emotional disabilities. (Teacher without Paraprofessional Support; Teacher with Paraprofessional Support; General Education Classroom Teacher with Resource/Pullout Program; General Education Classroom Teacher with Special Education Teacher Collaboration/Consultation Support; Team Teaching; Other; &amp; Do Not Know).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Model Success</td>
<td>newIMSucc</td>
<td>The perceived success of the current instructional model or personnel used in Indiana public high schools with students with emotional disabilities. 1 = Strongly Agree &amp; Agree, 0 = all others (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, &amp; Do Not Know).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes

The perceived transitional outcomes from Indiana public high schools for students with emotional disabilities. (Graduating with a Diploma; Graduating with a Certificate of Completion; Dropping Out of School; Reaching Maximum Age Requirement; Expulsion; Incarceration; & Do Not Know).

LOGTransComp

The perception that students with emotional disabilities are transitioning to the competitive work force. 1 = Strongly Agree & Agree, 0 = all others (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, & Do Not Know).

LOGTransColl

The perception that students with emotional disabilities are transitioning to college. 1 = Strongly Agree & Agree, 0 = all others (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, & Do Not Know).

II. Independent Variables

General Education Administrator

GENED Admin

Persons in the position of principal, assistant principal or dean of students within an Indiana public high school.

Special Education Administrator

SPCED Admin

Persons in the position of director, assistant director, transition coordinator or supervisor within an Indiana special education planning district or entity.

General Education Teacher

GENED Teacher

Certified staff teaching subject area courses, including elective courses (i.e. Career and Technical classes. Not to include nurses, media specialists/librarians or classified staff.

Special Education Teacher

SPCED Teacher

RC = Certified staff teaching special education courses (i.e. Resource Room). Not to include paraprofessionals.

III. Predictor Variables

Gender

Mgender

1 = Male respondents, 0 = all others

Fgender

RC = Female respondents

Age

Age2035

1 = Respondents in age group 20-35, 0 = all others.

Age3650

1 = Respondents in age group 36-50, 0 = all others.

Age51+

RC = Respondents in age group 51+.

Years in Position

YRSpos05

1 = Respondents who have been in their current position for 0-5 years, 0 = all others.

YRSpos620

1 = Respondents who have been in their current position for 6-20 years, 0 = all others.
Data Analysis

Chapter 4 provides a more comprehensive analysis. This section provides a brief explanation of the analyses used for all of the established research questions. The small return rates and n-values guided the analysis and its view as an exploratory study Questions were grouped and discussed according to tests and procedures performed. The analysis was conducted using the Statistical Program for Social Sciences 16.0 (SPSS) (2007) computer software.

**Question #1:** What are the current service delivery models used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

**Question #2:** How effective are the current service delivery models used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

**Question #3** What are the current instructional models being used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

**Question #4:** How effective are the current instructional models used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

**Question #7:** What are the current post-school exiting outcomes for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

Questions 1-4 and 7 analyzed and reported the frequency of respondent responses, both the numbers and percentages. These frequencies were reported using aggregate data to present...
how each model was represented overall. It was also presented showing how each model was perceived with the four sub-categorized positions of employment. The descriptive data provided perceptions pertaining to current service delivery and instructional models used in Indiana secondary schools as well as current perceptions of transitional outcomes. Effectiveness of these models was analyzed and reported.

*Question #5:* Are there differences among participant group perceptions for the service delivery models currently being used in Indiana high schools?

*Question #6:* Are there differences among participant group perceptions for the instructional models currently being used in Indiana high schools?

Questions 5 and 6 are looking to discover differences between respondent groups. To view these differences, ANOVA models were constructed and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to focus on any significant statistical differences between groups (Manichaikul, 2007). Bonferroni tests were also performed in order to see where any individual differences occurred (Manichaikul, 2007). Overall significance of the model was explored along with individual differences.

Means and standard deviations were also investigated with these questions. These tests were calculated and displayed using both tables and visually enhancing figures. These tests and calculations were used to provide another perspective of the data.

*Question #8:* What are the controlled/predictor variables that impact administrator and educator perceptions of service delivery models?

*Question #9:* What are the controlled/predictor variables that impact administrator and educator perceptions of instructional models?
**Question #10:** What are the controlled/predictor variables that impact administrator and educator perceptions of transitional outcomes?

Questions 8, 9 and 10 used a dichotomous, logistic regression model for analysis. The model takes variables such as age or gender into account to predict the chances of their responses either falling into agreement or disagreement with a given dependent variable. These predictor variables listed in Table 11 were analyzed using four dependent variables: 1) Service Delivery Model Success (newSDMSucc); 2) Instructional Model Success (newIMSucc); Transition to Competitive Workforce (LOGTransComp); and 4) Transition to College (LOGTransColl).

The dichotomous relationship was configured by taking the Strongly Agree and Agree categories and creating a single category, Agree =1. The Disagree category or “0” category was created by combing the Strongly Disagree and Disagree options. Using this new configuration, the predictor variables were analyzed using the regression models to identify any predictors that may have an impact on the rater’s perceptions of the specified dependent variables.

A final use of the descriptive statistics was to provide demographic data to be used in the analysis. The data for the analysis is displayed in the Participant Demographics section (See Table 10). These data, both numbers and percentages, represent respondent perceptions that were critical to the logistic regression analyses run for questions 8-10.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

There were 245 participants in this study which represents a small percentage of the general and special education administration and teachers from throughout the state of Indiana. Therefore, the findings in the study were viewed as exploratory. Frequencies, percentages, and crosstabs along with ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis, post-hoc Bonferroni and logistic regression models were used to present data in a clear and concise manner. The data analysis plan was organized and developed to answer the following 10 research questions. These questions were developed to capture the perceptions of general and special education administrators and teachers regarding the placement, personnel and transitional outcomes of students with emotional disabilities. The analysis of study data was done using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences 16.0 (SPSS) (2007).

Service Delivery Models

Research Question #1

What are the current service delivery models used in Indiana high schools for students with emotional disabilities?

Respondent perceptions regarding the service delivery model currently being used in their educational settings are shown in Table 12 (n=245). This includes do not know responses and the number of participants choosing not to answer the question. The table shows that regular classroom (n=139, 56.7%) and the resource room (n=65, 26.5%) were the dominant choices as all the others were reported as being less than 10%. The table also shows that 5.7% of the respondents did not know the current placement of these students and 2.4% of the sample did not
answer this question. It was found that general education teachers represented 85.7% (n=12) of those respondents who did not know the current model being used.

Table 12

*Overall Frequencies and Percentages of Service Delivery Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivery Models</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Classroom</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Room</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Class</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Day School Facility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 shows study participants (n=225) that had knowledge of which service delivery model was being used in their school’s setting. Analyzing those respondents who knew their service delivery model that was currently being used, 61.8% chose the regular classroom as their model of choice. This perception is double the national reported percentage of 30.3% and 19% higher than reported by Indiana for students with emotional disabilities being serviced in the regular classroom (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005; Binder & Parker, 2008). Nearly 29% of respondents chose the resource room as their current model. This choice was better aligned with the federal mark of approximately 23% of students being placed in the same setting, but 10% higher than reported by the Indiana Department of Education (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2005; Binder & Parker, 2008). Less than seven percent (6.7%) of respondents chose the separate classroom as the placement currently used. Separate day-school facility and residential facility reported 2.2% and 0.4% respectively as the current placement.
Research Question #2

How effective are the current service delivery models used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

Table 13 reports the effectiveness of the current service delivery reported by participants (n=245), including those who did not know and those who chose not to respond. Over 65% of respondents agree that the current placement being used for their students with emotional disabilities is effective. Conversely, over 19% of respondents reported that they did not view the current placement as being effective. The table also reports that nearly 15% of respondents either did not know or did not answer the question. Further analysis found that general education teachers represented 87.1% (n=27) of those study participants indicating they did not know if the current service delivery model was effective.
**Table 13**

*Overall Frequencies and Percentages of Current Service Delivery Model Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivery Model Effectiveness</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 shows those respondents who did know the effectiveness of the model (n=214) excluding those who did not know or did not provide an answer. With those individuals removed, Figure 2 shows over fifty percent (52.2%) agree that their current service delivery model is effective for students with emotional disabilities at their locations. Another 25.4%, strongly agree that their model is effective. This shows that over seventy-five percent (77.6%) of participants in the study were in agreement that the perceived model of service delivery currently being used in their school is effective for their population of students with emotional disabilities. It must again be noted that almost thirteen percent (12.7%) of participants did not know if their current model was effective. This percentage may be influenced by the approximately 6% of the respondent pool who did not know which particular model was being used at their location (See Table 12).
Table 14 reports respondents’ perceptions regarding the effectiveness of their current service delivery model. The numbers are reported as frequencies and percentages of the total respondent group. There were a total of 157 respondents (78.5%) that either agreed or strongly agreed that the model currently being used in their setting is effective for students with emotional disabilities. Within the agree or strongly agree grouping, 94 of the 157 participants (59.9%) reported that the regular classroom was the most effective. Another 48 respondents (30.6%) reported that the resource room was the most effective model. Of those reporting the use of a separate class (n=13, 6.5%), 11 (84.6%) answered with agreement or strong agreement. The separate day school and residential facility options had less than 5% (n=5) total responses.
Table 14

*Frequency and Percentages of Effectiveness by Current Service Delivery Models within Total Respondent Pool*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivery Models Effectiveness within Total</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Classroom</td>
<td>n 13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Room</td>
<td>n 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Class</td>
<td>n 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Day School Facility</td>
<td>n 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Facility</td>
<td>n 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows respondents’ perceptions regarding the effectiveness of their current service delivery model. Table 15 shows the breakdown from within the placement. When drilling down each placement, it should be noted that approximately 75% of those reporting the regular classroom as the model of choice were in agreement that it was effective for their students with ED. Also, over 85% of those choosing resource rooms were in agreement that the model was successful. Disagreement within the regular classroom option rose from 12% to 19% when analyzing the data from within the placement.

Table 15

*Frequency and Percentages of Effectiveness by Current Service Delivery Models within Individual Placement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDM Effectiveness within Placement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Classroom</td>
<td>n 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Room</td>
<td>n 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Class</td>
<td>n 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Day School Facility</td>
<td>n 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Facility</td>
<td>n 13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows respondents’ perceptions regarding the effectiveness of their current service delivery model. Table 15 shows the breakdown from within the placement. When drilling down each placement, it should be noted that approximately 75% of those reporting the regular classroom as the model of choice were in agreement that it was effective for their students with ED. Also, over 85% of those choosing resource rooms were in agreement that the model was successful. Disagreement within the regular classroom option rose from 12% to 19% when analyzing the data from within the placement.
Study participants were also asked to rate the materials and available resources provided for students with ED in their current placement as well as the overall adequacy of the current placement. Respondents reported an overall mean of 2.94 regarding their placement providing adequate materials for students with emotional disabilities, indicating a level of agreement. General education administrators (3.08) and special education administrators (3.07) reported the highest ratings regarding their placement providing adequate materials for students with ED. General education teachers had the lowest mean rating (2.77) regarding adequate materials. Special education teachers (2.91) also reported agreement when rating their placement and its ability to provide adequate materials. Respondents reported an overall mean of 2.80 concerning their site providing adequate resources for students with emotional disabilities, indicating they lean towards agreement. Special education administrators (2.91) and general education administrators (2.88) had the highest ratings regarding their site’s ability to provide adequate resources. General education (2.73) and special education (2.64) teachers indicated lower levels of agreement when reporting their site’s ability to provide adequate resources for students with emotional disabilities. Respondents reported an overall mean of 2.87, indicating general agreement, regarding the adequacy of the current placement of students with emotional disabilities. General education (2.98) and special education (3.08) administrators indicated more agreement with regards to the current placement being adequate for students with ED. General education teachers (2.73) and special education teachers (2.72) leaned toward agreement when reporting the adequate placement of students with ED.
Research Question #3

What are the current instructional models being used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

Table 16 reports the overall frequencies and percentages from the study’s participants regarding the perceived current instructional model used within their school setting. The models using paraprofessional support (n=84, 34%) and consultation/collaboration (n=54, 22%) were chosen as the most frequently used. The table indicates 4.5% of the respondents did not know the model currently being used. Further analysis revealed that general education teachers represented all of those respondents who did not know the current personnel used with their students.

Table 16

Overall Frequencies and Percentages of Instructional Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Models</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher without Paraprofessional Support</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher with Paraprofessional Support</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher with Resource/Pullout Program</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher with Special Education Teacher Collaboration/Cosultation Support</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 shows the data for study respondents who knew the current instructional models being used for students with emotional disabilities. Of the respondents who did report knowing their current model, 37.2% (n=84) indicated that teacher with paraprofessional support was most commonly used. Fifty-four respondents (23.9%) reported the general education teacher with
special education teacher collaboration/consultation support as their current model. Figure 3 also shows that 38 respondents (16.8%) chose the resource/pullout programs model. These three models represented 78% of respondent choice regarding current instructional models being used.

In addition, an approximate 11% (n=25) of participants chose other when responding. The other option provided a narrative to describe the current model in use. When answers were analyzed using frequency and percentages, three central themes were established. These themes were found to be: 1) use of all the models listed (n=7, 28%); 2) combination of models listed (n=6, 24%); and 3) models were selected based on the need of the student or the current IEP (n=6, 24%). It was found that nearly 30% of respondents reported that they use all of the models listed in their current setting. Twenty-four percent stated they do not use all of the models, but different combinations of the listed models. For example, they may use a teacher with paraprofessional support for some students and team teaching with others. Respondents did not commit to selecting one specific model. Models that were selected based on the need of the student or the current IEP was reported by approximately 24% of the participants. Other responses were not reported as they were limited and not in accordance with the above mentioned themes.
Research Question #4

*How effective are the current instructional models used in Indiana high schools for secondary students with emotional disabilities?*

Table 17 reports the perceived effectiveness in relationship to the current instructional model used at their site. Sixty-five percent of respondents reported that the personnel used with students with emotional disabilities in their school system were being effective. However, 16% disagreed that their personnel were effective when working with their ED student population. Fifteen percent of the respondent pool did not know if the model was effective. General education teachers represented 73% of those study participants who did not know the effectiveness of the current instructional model being used; non-respondents accounted for 4.1% (n=10).
Table 17

*Overall Frequencies and Percentages of Current Instructional Model Effectiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Models</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 shows the respondents who indicated they knew which model was being used in their setting. Of those indicating they knew the instructional model used with students with emotional disabilities in their school setting, 55.6% (n=110) agreed that their current model was successful in providing services to students with emotional disabilities. This respondent group, when combined with those that strongly agreed (24.2%), showed that nearly 80% of respondents concur that the model used in their school setting is effective. Approximately 16% (n=37) of respondents disagreed that their current instructional model was effective for their specific population.
Table 18 reports participants’ perceptions of the current instructional model or personnel being used to facilitate students with emotional disabilities. Of the 191 respondents who knew which model was being used, removing non-respondents and those that did not know from the analysis, 32% (n=61) agreed or strongly agreed that a teacher with a paraprofessional in the classroom was the most successful model. Thirty-nine participants, approximately 23%, also agreed or strongly agreed that general education teachers collaborating and consulting with the special education teachers was an effective model. Approximately 5% (n=9) of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their current instructional model, general education teacher with resource/pullout program, was working. This is significant as those nine respondents represent 30% of those respondents indicating they used the resource/pullout model. It is also important to note that those respondents selecting other as the current model had approximately 9% in agreement that their stated model was effective.
Table 18

Frequency and Percentages of Effectiveness by Current Instructional Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Model Effectiveness</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher without Paraprofessional Support</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher with Paraprofessional Support</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher with Resource/Pullout Program</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher with Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/Cosultation Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 reports each individual instructional model and its perceived effectiveness. Of those respondents choosing a teacher without paraprofessional support model, approximately 31% indicated this model was not effective. Nearly 85% of those choosing the teacher with paraprofessional support model agreed that it was effective. Also, of those surveyed selecting other, nearly one-fourth of them indicated that their model was not effective.

Table 19

Frequency and Percentages of Effectiveness by Current Instructional Models within Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Model Effectiveness</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher without Paraprofessional Support</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher with Paraprofessional Support</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher with Resource/Pullout Program</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher with Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/Cosultation Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study participants were also asked to rate if their personnel working with students with ED were highly qualified and if they were providing evidence-based instruction to teach this student population. Respondents reported an overall mean of 3.07 when rating if the staff working with students with emotional disabilities is highly qualified. This overall mean indicated agreement regarding the use of a highly qualified staff working with students with ED. General education administrators (3.10) and special education administrators (3.19) had the highest ratings regarding highly qualified staff working with students with ED. General and special education teachers had means of 2.98 and 3.03 respectively pertaining to highly qualified staff. All four study groups indicated agreement regarding the use of highly qualified staff for students with emotional disabilities. Respondents reported an overall mean of 2.79, indicating they leaned toward agreement, regarding their site providing evidence-based instruction for students with ED. General education administrators (2.92) and general education teachers (2.82) reported the highest ratings regarding evidence-based instructional practices being provided to students with emotional disabilities in instructional settings. Special education administrators reported the lowest rating (2.70) concerning evidence-based instructional practices. Special education teachers had a 2.77 rating. All four study groups indicated a level of agreement concerning evidence-based instructional practices for students with emotional disabilities.

Differences Among Participant Groups

Research Question #5

Are there differences among participant group perceptions for the service delivery models currently being used?

Table 20 reports the breakdown of service delivery models chosen within each position. When looking at Table 20, it indicates that within each position over fifty-percent of respondents
perceive the regular classroom as the main placement choice. Special education teachers show the highest number within their position regarding the regular classroom setting at nearly 73%, while general education administrators are the lowest at just over 50%. The resource room was reported by approximately a third of the administrators, both general and special education, as the perceived choice compared to only one quarter of the overall teachers. This same distribution was apparent when each category was analyzed individually. Only 10% of the entire respondent group identified something other than regular classroom or resource room as a response.

Table 20

Frequency and Percentages of Service Delivery Models Perception within Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivery Models within Position</th>
<th>General Education Administrators</th>
<th>Special Education Administrators</th>
<th>General Education Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Classroom</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Room</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Classroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Day School/Facility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Facility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. % of Position Total

Figure 5 is a comparison of the respondent groups for each service delivery model. The figure provides a visual of Table 20 utilizing only the percentages within each position (i.e. general education administrator). It was found that the distribution within resource room showed approximately the inverse of the distribution within regular classroom. Administrators, both special and general, reported a higher percentage of students utilizing the resource room than teachers. This is just the opposite of the findings within the regular classroom data. General education professionals, administrators/teachers, were the only respondents to identify students being placed in separate day school facilities and residential facilities.
Table 21 reports the means, utilizing aggregate data of the study groups, when rating the success of students with ED in their current placement. Special education administrators had the highest rating (3.04), followed by general education administrators (3.00), and both general and special education teachers each with 2.90 ratings. A small difference in ratings (.14) was found between the four comparison groups. This also shows that two groups were in agreement (Agree=3) and the two other groups were moving toward agreement that the current service delivery models presently used are observed as a major factor in their students’ success.

Table 21

Differences Between Positional Perceptions Regarding Success of Service Delivery Models
Further analyses were conducted to explore differences in respondent ratings. A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) (Parametric Test) and Kruskal-Wallis (Non-Parametric Test) were used to test for any statistical significance differences between the sub-groups (Hopkins, 1980; Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006; “Chapter Eleven”, 2000) (See Table 22). When using ANOVA tests, it is critical to answer three basic assumptions: 1) normal distribution of the independent variable; 2) independence of subjects; and 3) equal variances of groups (Levene’s Test) (Marascuilo & Serlin, 1988; H. Finch, personal communication, June 15, 2005). The first assumption was met using a Q-Q plot which identified a normal distribution (See Appendix C). The second assumption was met by allowing the subjects to take the survey confidentially with a coded link via the Internet. The final assumption, equal variances, was met by using Levene’s test (Levene’s statistic = 2.63, df1=3, df2=205, p=.051) and indentifying the needed p-value (p>0.05). Using a non-parametric test uses fewer assumptions and looks at ranked order (Hopkins, 1980; Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). The non-parametric test was used as a cross-reference in the analysis. The overall ANOVA (F=.440, p=.724) model did not find any statistical significance differences between study comparison groups. Post-hoc Bonferroni testing were also conducted in conjunction with the ANOVA analysis. These post-hoc tests did not find any statistical significance. The Kruskal-Wallis test ($\chi^2=1.358$, df=3, p=.715), being used to cross-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDM Success</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education Administrators</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Administrators</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teachers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reference, did not find statistical significance differences between employment positions. The analysis did not take into account which model was chosen providing a broad view of overall service delivery effectiveness.

Table 22

*Differences Between Positional Perceptions Regarding Success of Service Delivery Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDM Success</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>137.877</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Asymptotically F distributed

Figure 6 provides a visual representation of the perceptual differences of the employment positions regarding service delivery model success. The bar graph indicated overall consistency in respondents’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the service delivery mode being used for students with emotional disabilities in their school setting.
Figure 6

Mean Response Rates by Position of the Perceived Success of the Current Service Delivery Model

![Bar chart showing response rates by position.]

Note. Likert-type Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Agree; 4=Strongly Agree

Research Question #6

Are there differences among participant group perceptions for the instructional models currently being used?

Table 23 shows general education administrators as heavily favoring the teacher with paraprofessional support model as compared to any other choice within their grouping (68.4%). Model selection is more evenly distributed amongst the other groups within their groupings between: the teacher with paraprofessional support, resource/pullout program and general education teacher with collaboration/consultation support models. No other model within a
position showed more than 45% of the respondents choosing it as their perceived instructional model in use.

Table 23

*Frequency and Percentages of Perceived Instructional Models within Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Models within Position</th>
<th>General Education Administrators</th>
<th>Special Education Administrators</th>
<th>General Education Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher without Paraprofessional Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher with Paraprofessional Support</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher with Resource/Pullout Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Teacher with Special Education Teacher Collaboration/Consultation Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 provides a visual representation of the percentages for each position in regards to their perceived success of instructional models. Figure 7 represents data from Table 23. Data confirmed that a teacher with paraprofessional support is the most widely-used instructional model. The data also shows that both general and special education professionals are using the collaborative/consultative model. A more diverse distribution of instructional models was found by three of the comparison groups, excluding general education administrators who reported heavily using the teacher with paraprofessional model.
Table 24 compares the mean responses by position regarding the success of the personnel or the instructional model, currently used in their school. When strictly comparing the means and calculating their differences it was found that there was virtually no difference. General education administrators (i.e. principals, assistant principals, deans of students) had a mean rating of 3.05, the highest of the groups, while a 2.87 rating from the special education teachers was the lowest. All four groups stated that they agreed or moved towards agreement that the
instructional model used within their educational system was a major factor in their students with emotional disabilities success.

Table 24

*Differences Between Position Perceptions Regarding Success of Instructional Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IM Success</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Kruskal-Wallis test were conducted to look for any significant statistical difference between groups. The assumptions for the ANOVA analysis were recognized and met. A Q-Q plot was done (See Appendix C), subject independence was assumed and equal variances were tested using Levene’s test (Levene’s statistic=.664, df1=3, df2=194, p=.575). The ANOVA analysis did not find any statistically significant differences using the model (F=.407, p=.748) (See Table 25). Post-hoc Bonferroni testing were also conducted in conjunction with the ANOVA analysis. These post-hoc tests did not find any statistical significance. The Kruskal-Wallis test also did not find any significant statistical differences between groups ($\chi^2=1.496$, df=3, p=.683). The analysis did not take into account which model was chosen providing a broad view of overall instructional model effectiveness.
Table 25

*Differences Between Position Perceptions Regarding Success of Instructional Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IM Success</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>111.300</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Asymptotically F distributed

Figure 8 provides a visual representation of the means for each position in regards to their perceived success of instructional models. Figure 8 represents data from Table 24.

**Figure 8**

Mean Response Rates by Position of the Perceived Success of the Instructional Model

Note. Likert-type Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree
Outcomes

Research Question #7

What are the current post-school/transitional outcomes for secondary students with emotional disabilities?

Table 26 reports aggregated data of respondents’ views regarding the exiting outcomes for their student population, including those respondents who did not know or who did not answer. It is important to note that over 38% of the respondents did not know the outcomes for students with emotional difficulties within their setting. Further analyzing those respondents indicating they did not know how students with emotional disabilities were leaving their schools (outcomes), it was found that 55.3% of general education teachers represented this group. It was also found that special education administrators and teachers represented 37% of this group. Two percent of study participants did not answer the question.

Table 26

Transitional Outcomes for Indiana Secondary Students with Emotional Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating with a Diploma</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating with a Certificate of Completion</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropping Out of School</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching Maximum Age Requirement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9 shows data after removing non-respondents (n=94; 38%) and the entire category of do not know responses (n=5; 2%). Therefore, over 40% of the participant pool was removed from this analysis.

The data show that 54.8% of the respondent pool perceived students with emotional disabilities to be leaving high school with a diploma. Approximately 27% reported that students were exiting with a certificate of completion. These two outcomes account for over 80% of the responses given by participants. This aligns with Rusch’s (2008) findings for students with disabilities and their transitional outcomes. However, it was reported that approximately 16% of students with emotional disabilities were dropping out of their current educational setting.

Figure 9

Transitional Outcomes for Indiana Secondary Students with Emotional Disabilities
**Predictor Variables – Logistic Regressions**

Logistic regression models were used to “predict a discrete outcome”, such as respondent perceptions of their current service delivery models used in the state of Indiana (Marascuilo & Serlin, 1988; Logistic Regression, 2002, ¶2). The model looks at different variables (i.e. gender, age) and gauges the probability of the way respondents will respond to a dichotomous dependent variable (Howell, 2002, ¶2). The dependent variable for this set of analysis is the respondents’ answers to the five point Likert-type scale ratings for the question regarding effectiveness of the service delivery model. The scale ranged from 1=Strongly Disagree to 4=Strongly Agree with an option of Do Not Know (See Appendix B). In order to run the analysis, all given responses of do not know were removed from the dataset. The removal created the ability to construct the Agree (Agree and Strongly Agree responses) versus Disagree (Disagree and Strongly Disagree responses) dichotomous relationship needed for analysis. The two new categories were then recoded as (0, 1) for Disagree and Agree in the database for SPSS analysis. The recoded dataset was then used to complete the analysis. Of note, crosstabs regarding gender by position showed the following breakdown: General education administrators had more males (60%/40%), special education administrators (87%/13%), general education teachers (60%/40%), and special education teachers (80%/20%) had more females (refer to Table 10 for descriptors of predictor variables). Representation by gender for respondent’s position indicates that general education administrators were predominantly male whereas other positions were predominantly female.
Research Question #8

What are the controlled/predictor variables that impact administrator and educator perceptions of service delivery models?

Table 27 presents findings from the Service Delivery Model Success analysis using the logistic regression model. The model predicted variables correctly for nearly 82% of the participants regarding success of the placements used for Indiana secondary students with emotional disabilities. The overall model was significant ($\chi^2=30.541, p=.001$) and accounted for approximately 14% of the variance of the model (Cox & Snell $R^2=.136$). Looking beyond the overall significance, the model did show where there were some specific statistically significant differences.

The significance was found by using the Wald statistic from the analysis. The Wald statistic is used to test statistical significance by creating a Z statistic (Menard, 1995). This test looks at normal distribution with mean scores of 0 and standard deviations of 1 (StatSoft, 2009). This statistic is used to report findings regarding significance within the analysis.

The analysis did find that special education administrators were significant at the $p<.05$ level. This shows that special education administrators were more likely to agree that the service delivery model used at their site is effective than special education teachers (reference category). General and special education teachers did not show any significance when compared to the reference category.

In terms of gender, males were more likely to agree to the use of the model than females ($p<.01$). There were no significant differences found for those respondents in their jobs 0-5 years and 6-20 years when compared to the reference category (21+ years). When analyzing the age of the respondent, those respondents 20-35 years old were more likely to agree with the success of
the model than those in the reference category of 51 years or older (p<.05). Individuals in the 36-50 year old range showed no significance. Significance was also found when analyzing geographic location and making comparisons to the reference category of those working in the Central region. Respondents from the North were more likely to disagree with those working in the Central region regarding the success of the placement used for their students (p<.05). There was no significance indicated regarding the respondents from the South.

Table 27

Parameter Estimates for Service Delivery Models Used in Indiana Predictor Variables Logistic Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I. for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenAdmin</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCEDAdmin</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>4.326*</td>
<td>3.180</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenTeach</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGender</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>8.937**</td>
<td>4.099</td>
<td>1.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2035</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>5.927*</td>
<td>4.114</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age3650</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSpos05</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>2.093</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSpos620</td>
<td>-.713</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdTabNORTH</td>
<td>-1.258</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>6.603*</td>
<td>3.517</td>
<td>1.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdTabSOUTH</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Research Question #9

What are the controlled/predictor variables that impact administrator and educator perceptions of instructional models?

Table 28 reports findings from the Instructional Model Success analysis using the logistic regression model. Predictor variables correctly classified approximately 80% of the participants regarding the successful personnel used to provide services to Indiana secondary students with
emotional disabilities. The overall model was significant (-2 log likelihood=175.290, df=10, $\chi^2 =23.974$, p=.008) and accounted for 11% of the variance of the model (Cox & Snell $R^2=.114$).

Logistic regression analysis indicates that males were more likely to agree (p<.05) with their current instructional model’s success when compared to females. Respondents ranging in age from 20 to 35 years old were also more likely to agree with the model being successful when compared to respondents in the 51+ age category (p<.05). Respondents who have been in their positions 5 years or less were more likely to disagree that the model is successful than those who have been in their positions for 21 years or more (p<.05).

The model found that there was no significance when analyzing a respondent’s employment position or geographic location when compared to their respective reference category.

Table 28

Parameter Estimates for Instructional Models Used in Indiana Predictor Variables Logistic Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Instructional Model Success</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Wald</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>95% C.I. for EXP(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenAdmin</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCEDAdmin</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>3.395</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenTeach</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGender</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>4.870*</td>
<td>3.006</td>
<td>1.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2035</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>4.645*</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age3650</td>
<td>-.569</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSpos05</td>
<td>-2.003</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>5.095*</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSpos620</td>
<td>-1.253</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdTabNORTH</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdTabSOUTH</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.887</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Research Question #10

What are the controlled/predictor variables that impact administrator and educator perceptions of transitional outcomes?

Table 29 shows findings from the Transitions to Competitive Employment logistic regression model. Predictor variables correctly classified 75.5% of the participants regarding the transition of Indiana secondary students with emotional disabilities to the competitive workforce. The overall model showed significance (-2 log likelihood=174.089, df=10, $\chi^2=25.436$, p=.005) and accounted for approximately fifteen percent of the variance (Cox & Snell $R^2=.148$).

The model discovered that general education administrators were more likely to agree that students were transitioning into a competitive employment position when compared to special education teachers’ perceptions (reference category). No other variables within the model: gender, age, years in position, or geographic location were found to be statistically significant.

Table 29

Parameter Estimates for Transitions to Competitive Employment Used in Indiana Predictor Variables Logistic Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I. for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenAdmin</td>
<td>1.358</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>4.469*</td>
<td>3.887</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCEDAdmin</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>2.471</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenTeach</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>3.140</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGender</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>3.749</td>
<td>2.394</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2035</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>1.885</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age3650</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSpos05</td>
<td>-1.026</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>1.913</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSpos620</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdTabNORTH</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdTabSOUTH</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Table 30 shows findings from the Transitions to College logistic regression model. Predictor variables correctly classified approximately 83% of the participants regarding the transition of Indiana secondary students with emotional disabilities to college. The overall model was not significant (-2 log likelihood=141.942, df=10, \( \chi^2 =6.834 \), p=.741) and accounted for slightly more than four percent of the variance (Cox & Snell \( R^2 =.042 \)).

In addition to the overall model not being significant, no specific variables within the model were found to be statistically significant.

Table 30

Parameter Estimates for Transitions to College Used in Indiana Predictor Variables Logistic Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I. for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenAdmin</td>
<td>-.880</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCEDAdmin</td>
<td>-1.094</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenTeach</td>
<td>-.844</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>1.574</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGender</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2035</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age3650</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSpos05</td>
<td>-.729</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSpos620</td>
<td>-.995</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdTabNORTH</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdTabSOUTH</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Summary

Analysis of survey responses pointed out that there were both similarities and differences between respondent perceptions. Responses indicated that each group of employees agreed or was moving towards agreement when asked about the success of the current service delivery and instructional models used in their current setting throughout the state of Indiana. The difference
between the highest mean rating and the lowest was less than two-tenths when analyzing both placement and personnel. It is noteworthy to show that teachers stated the regular classroom was the dominant placement and administrators viewed the resource room as the placement of choice, regardless of their area of expertise.

When looking at predictor variables to gain insight as to what might predict a respondent’s perception, gender and age were recognized as significant predictors for both service and instructional model success. It was also found that those individuals working in the northern part of the state were more likely to disagree with their colleagues from the central region regarding the success of the placement used to educate secondary students with emotional disabilities. These findings are insightful; however, there were no consistent variables indicated from the analysis.

The respondent pool was predominantly made up of women (66.9%), who were Caucasian (98.8%) and who were general education teachers (75.8%). Nearly 13% of the respondents did not know if the current service delivery model used in their educational setting was successful or not. Also, over 15% of respondents did not know if the personnel (instructional model) currently used is effective. The findings and concerns will be discussed further in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER FIVE
Overview, Discussion and Recommendations

Study Overview

This exploratory study investigated the unique challenge of placing secondary students with emotional disabilities in the most effective setting utilizing appropriate personnel. Specifically, it investigated if there were differences in the perceptions of general and special education teachers and administrators in Indiana public school settings regarding service delivery and instructional models used with students with emotional disabilities. Differences in participant perceptions of the transitional outcomes for this student population were also investigated. An electronic survey was designed and sent to the nearly 1600 selected Indiana administrators and educators via the Internet. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. There were ten research questions developed for this study. These questions investigated the perceptions of Indiana general education and special education administrators and teachers regarding the service delivery and instructional models used with secondary students with emotional disabilities and the transitional outcomes for these students. The questions also explored the perceived effectiveness of the models and predictor variables regarding participant response.

Sample and Returns

An electronic survey and database was designed, housed and disseminated using the inQsit program provided by Ball State University. This survey was sent to 1598 selected educational professionals throughout the state of Indiana. These professionals were selected from 42 sites which reside in all seven special education roundtables geographically designed
throughout the state of Indiana. Every survey was distributed electronically using Microsoft Outlook email software.

The study period was an eight-week timeframe with four iterations of two-week follow-ups. The follow-ups would consist of those sampled participants who had not completed the survey. The follow-up email listing was updated after every two-week cycle in order to not send completed surveyors additional emails.

The study sent out 1598 surveys and there were 245 survey respondents for a 15.3% response rate. General education teachers had the highest return rate at 6.1% (n=98), followed by special education administrators 4.4% (n=70), general education administrators 2.7% (n=43), and special education teachers 2.1% (n=34). All of the information/data collected from the survey process was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical methods produced by Statistical Packages for Social Sciences software (SPSS 16).

Highlighted Study Findings

*Descriptive Statistics*

*Service Delivery Models*

Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, frequencies, and percentage to answer questions regarding the type of service delivery model used in Indiana’s secondary school settings. It was found that over 83% of the respondent pool perceived students with emotional disabilities being educated in either a regular classroom or resource room placement. It was also noteworthy that nearly 6% of participants did not know what type of service delivery model was currently being used.

It was found that over 65% of respondents felt their model was effective and that over 19% felt it was not effective. Approximately 13% of respondents did not know if the model was
effective or not. When analyzing the data using those respondents who did know (n=200) which model was being used it was found that 78% of respondents perceived their model was effective. It was also found that nearly 60% of participants agreed that the regular classroom was the most effective.

Respondents indicated general agreement regarding adequate materials (2.94) and resources (2.80) being provided for students with emotional disabilities. Respondents also indicated general agreement (2.87) with regards to the current placement being adequate for students with ED.

*Instructional Models*

Analysis of instructional models found that 84 respondents (34%) chose the use of paraprofessional support in the classroom as the most widely used model. It was found that 25 respondents (10%) selected the “other” category. From this category three central themes were found: 1) the use of all models was the current practice 2) use of a combination of the listed models was occurring; and 3) the models were selected based on student’s need. It was noted that 4.5% of the respondents did not know what instructional model was currently being used.

The study also found that approximately 65% of participants agreed that their current model was effective. It was also found that 15% (n=37) of the respondents did not know if the model was effective or not. When looking at the data using only those study participants who did know which model was being used (n=191) it was discovered that 32% stated the model being used was effective. It was also found that of those choosing the teacher without paraprofessional support, approximately 30% reported the model was not effective.
Respondents indicated agreement (3.07) regarding highly qualified staff working with students with emotional disabilities. Respondents also reported a general agreement (2.79) about evidence-based instructional practices being provided to students with ED.

*Transitional Outcomes*

It was found that a majority of the respondents reported that students were graduating with a diploma (n=80, 32.7%) or did not know (n=94, 38.4%) how students were leaving high school. After removing those 94 respondents, the data was analyzed using only those study participants who responded they did know about student outcomes. The study found that nearly 55% those knowing their students outcomes reported their population of students with emotional disabilities is graduating with a diploma. Graduating with a certificate of completion was reported nearly half as much (26.7%) as diploma and participants reported nearly 16% of students were dropping out of school.

*Group Differences*

*Service Delivery Models*

ANOVA models, Kruskal-Wallis, and Bonferroni tests, along with means and standard deviations were used to analyze differences among participant groups’ perceptions concerning service delivery models currently being used. There were not statistically significant differences between participant groups. Further analysis showed that group means were near or above 3.00 indicating that each group agreed or approached agreement regarding success of the current placement of students. It was also found that each group reported the general education classroom as the most widely used placement.
Instructional Models

Differences in participant groups involving instructional models were analyzed using the same models and statistical analyses as those regarding the service delivery models. Again, no statistically significant differences were found between groups using both parametric and non-parametric analysis. Data did report that all groups reported a mean response near 3.00, which shows that each group agreed or was approaching agreement about the effectiveness of the current personnel used with students with emotional disabilities. It was also found that general education administrators heavily favored the model using paraprofessional support (68.4%). The other participant groups also reported this model as their primary choice but at nearly half the rate.

Logistic Regression Models

Service Delivery Models

A logistic regression model was used to explore possible predictor variables regarding participant responses concerning the current placement of their students. It was found that males were more likely to agree about placement when compared to females at the p<.01 level. At the p<.05 level it was found that the following pairings would more likely agree with placement effectiveness than their counterpart: 1) special education administrators compared to special education teachers; and 2) 20-35 year old participants compared to 51+ year old participants. Data reported that respondents working in the northern part of the state were more likely to disagree with educational professionals who work in the central part of the state.

Instructional Models

The same regression model was used to analyze and report possible predictor variables regarding participant responses concerning the current personnel used to provide service to their
students. The regression model produced the following findings at the p<.05 level. These findings showed pairings that would be more likely to agree about personnel than their reference group: 1) males compared to females; 2) 20-35 year olds compared to 51+ year old participants; 3) respondents working 5 years or less in their position compared to those working 21+ years in their position. There was no evidence supporting significance when comparing geographic location.

Transitional Outcomes

An analysis was run to explore possible predictor variables concerning the perceived transitional outcomes for students with emotional disabilities by administrators and educators. The analysis found that general education teachers were more likely to agree that students were moving into competitive employment than special education teachers. This was the only variable that showed significance when investigating transition to competitive employment. Data also showed that there were no significant variables when analyzing perceptions regarding transition to college.

Discussion

Where We Are Now

Finding a placement that utilizes the appropriate personnel to enable a student with a disability, even more specifically a student with an emotional disability, to be successful is a monumental task. This process is going to take a cooperative, collaborative effort by all professionals working with the student. The current educational movement has asked students, parents, and most of all educators to closely examine their role in the educational process. This examination has placed immense pressure on school systems and all individuals within that system to meet the needs of today’s students.
Higher standards, more accountability and the need for student improvement have asked schools to re-evaluate their current educational settings and programs to provide the most effective course of educational development (Hess & Finn, 2007). As the current reform movement progresses, NCLB (2001) and IDEA (2004) have asked educational professionals to improve the quality of education in the United States. This movement has prompted schools to place their current educational institutions under the microscope. The idea that students will be better served within the walls of a general education classroom with their non-disabled peers also provides new challenges for today’s schools. The need to place students in the proper educational setting with the appropriate personnel has made schools investigate what best fits their students and their needs.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 established Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) which asked schools to improve in the core areas of education, specifically math and language arts. This initiative instructed schools to make an improvement in AYP for all students, even those who have some of the most difficult struggles in schools, students with emotional disabilities (Zhang, Katsiyannis, & Herbst, 2004). These difficulties have led to further powerful educational initiatives developed through deep rooted discussions and re-authorizations to create more opportunities for students with special needs.

*How We Arrived at Today’s System*

The 1990 passing of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) emphasized the importance of including students with special needs in classrooms with their non-disabled peers. Though this push was important, Kauffman and Hallahan (2005) maintained that this inclusion would be difficult for students with ED. The concept of moving students back into classrooms was pure in its intent but still provided obstacles for many students (Johns & Guetzlo, 2004).
The placement of these students is crucial as they can be taxing to even the most competent of teachers (Kauffman, Lloyd, Baker, & Riedel, 2005). The focus had to take a shift from not solely on where they are placed, but to what was happening within these placements. The minimum, universal services are not going to be enough for students with ED; it is going to take an individualized approach with a colossal effort (Fuchs, Fuchs, Fernstrom, & Hohn, 1991). Including students in a classroom does not mean they will be successful; they are going to need more.

**Impact and Implications**

The study found that over 60% of study participants reported that Indiana secondary students with emotional disabilities were being educated in the regular classroom. Another approximately 30% stated that their students were educated using a resource room model. The 90% perceived use of inclusive settings found by the study is higher than what is reported in Indiana. The importance of this finding is that it suggests that Indiana has made the commitment to include students with disabilities, and more importantly, students with emotional disabilities, in classrooms with their non-disabled peers. Narrative comments from study respondents regarding the use of all the necessary service models also provides insight into the commitment of schools to find the proper model for each student as an individual. Having the most effective placement is a solid foundation to success, but a student receiving the needed instruction from suitable personnel is also critical.

The inclusion movement focused on the placement of students whereas the re-authorization of the IDEA in 1997 focused on curriculum access. Providing students with exceptionalities access to the same curriculum as general education students was intended to better prepare students with disabilities for the rigorous standardized testing implemented
through the NCLB initiative. The newly afforded access would ask professionals to rethink and redesign their educational environments to better prepare their students with exceptional needs (Lipsky & Gartner, 1998).

Smith and Coutinho (1997) stated that educational professionals knew the complexity of educating students with emotional disabilities and that providing this curriculum created new challenges for both students and educators. Challenges would stem from student need, parent desires and possible backlash from general education professionals (Mock & Kauffman, 2005a). These new challenges are addressed utilizing strong personnel with an end in mind for these students.

General education administrators showed a strong belief in the traditional model of using a teacher with paraprofessional support. These findings may be a result of administrators (i.e. principals) not realizing the impact of the RTI initiative. All teacher respondents and special education administrators understand the traditional model is still being employed, but have also reported that there is a movement to the collaborative/consultative approach (See Figure 7). Their agreement indicates a better grasp of RTI and its ability to unite professionals to work cohesively. These professionals will need to rely on large skill sets to provide the needed access and vital instruction needed for today’s students.

IDEA 2004 stated that teachers be highly qualified and that transition/outcomes would be a focus in special education. Teachers are being asked to teach everything in today’s schools (Mastropieri, 2001). IDEA 2004 made sure these teachers were qualified to do so. Again, the intent of the law seemed viable; consequently, it placed major constraints on the personnel currently employed in schools. It was asking many professionals to perform duties they were not prepared to handle (Mock & Kauffman, 2005b). Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) found that one-
fourth of teachers felt ill-prepared or undertrained to work with students with disabilities in their classrooms. This shows that the educational system has many teachers moving into schools without the needed skills to work with today’s students with exceptional needs.

Indiana reported as late as the 2003-04 school year that 530 professionals were working with students with emotional disabilities in schools on limited or emergency licenses (Graves, 2005). This is twice the number of emergency licensed educational professionals working with students with specific learning disabilities or severe/profound disabilities. This poses concern that Indiana’s students with ED are not being educated by trained/certified professionals in the field of emotional disabilities. If students are not working with qualified staff and receiving quality instruction, are they to moving into a positive, societal role?

The answer to the aforementioned question is no. Carter and Wehby (2003) reported that students with ED have difficulties moving into competitive employment once they have exited secondary settings. Students with emotional disabilities have limited opportunities as they are not leaving school with the needed skills to obtain and maintain jobs (Frank & Sitlington, 1997). The Indiana Post School Follow-Up System reports that 24.8 % of students with disabilities are unemployed (Harvey & Choi, 2008). These rates are far higher when compared to students without disabilities and from other disability categories (Bullis, Moran, Benz, Todis, & Johnson, 2002). The need to revise, create, and implement programs with fidelity to better serve students with emotional issues is imperative.

One glaring statistic sheds immense light into why students with emotional disabilities are not having positive transitions into post secondary life: Nearly 40% of respondents did not know what types of outcomes their students had from secondary settings. This is quite alarming, but provides insight into the problem. If one does not know what is happening, how can he be
expected to make a change? Knowledge is a powerful tool and it was found that many professionals need to be provided information to help establish practices and procedures to help alleviate the problem.

The drive to better schools, their programs and students, and their outcomes for students is as powerful as ever. Schools will need to commit to meeting the needs of all students, specifically those with emotional disabilities, by placing them with the proper personnel in the appropriate educational setting to best serve them. This is not an easy task, but one that needs to be analyzed so that education can again move to the forefront in a positive light, knowing that it is serving students the best it can, and is providing the opportunities needed to be a successful, productive citizens. This can happen with informed educators planning, designing and implementing the best possible educational environments for students with emotional disabilities; this is not an easy task, but one that is critical to today’s society. The study found that too many individuals do not know what is happening regarding the educational process being offered to secondary students with emotional difficulties.

Limitations

This study was exploratory; it was designed to provide insight into an issue that is not only prominent in Indiana, but also throughout the country. The information and insight provided is both needed and helpful, it must be stated that any conclusions drawn from the study cannot be projected beyond the participants of the study. However, this important data provides educational professionals with a look into the proposed research and its impact on Indiana educational settings.

There are several possible factors that come into play as to why the response rate was low. One factor could be the ability to gather a large enough sample of willing participants for
the study. The study used a multi-stage, multi-phase design in order to provide a representative sample of Indiana. This comprehensive design made it difficult to find a large sample of educational settings and professionals willing to take time to participate. Also, within this limitation was the removal of counties that were within two roundtable boundaries. This limited the county selection process.

A second factor would be that not all 28 roundtable-tier school areas within the proposed design were utilized. Two areas were not represented by a high school and three other areas had more than one representative school. This suggests a limitation on generalizing information regarding the entire state of Indiana.

A third factor could be the limited response rate. The study only had a 15% response rate and this therefore limited not only the amount of analysis that could be performed, but also how the data would be reported and generalized.

A fourth factor would be the use of an electronic survey. The use of such a system has many different intangibles that were hard to account for when conducting the study. All of the following issues could be viewed as limitations to the study when using an electronically delivered survey. Stringent filtering systems used by schools today provide a barrier that is difficult to overcome. This issue was discussed with participating sites to minimize the issue, but still had its impact. When working with schools and their networking systems, it can be a cause of concern as those systems can fail with the large number of users. This system failure could be a deterrent to the study and its success.

As with the use of any technological or electronic process there are malfunctions regarding the software being used. This study used the inQsit system for data collection. One example of this would be the survey link not working properly and a respondent providing
feedback that they were unable to access to the survey. Database issues and how responses are recorded provide pitfalls when working with large amounts of data and its movement along the “cyber highway”.

A final factor would be human error and the inexperience of using an electronic survey. The inability of the user to properly open the survey link, answer and submit data electronically. These issues can come as links arrive to different users, different ways. If a user is not knowledgeable about different ways to open web links, than that could be a possible restriction in the study’s ability to survey all anticipated users.

All of these potential factors create limitations in the study that can be anticipated and prepared for, but not always solved. The study worked to lesson the possibility of these limitations.

**Recommendations**

Recognizing that this study was exploratory, generalizations could not be made about the perceptions of general education administrators, special education administrators, general education teachers and special education teachers in the state of Indiana from the limited respondents represented in this study. However, the study shows that there is some disconnect between perception and reality when discussing placement and personnel used with students with emotional disabilities in Indiana schools. More research would need to be done to further explore the educational settings of secondary students with emotional disabilities in the state.

Reid, Gonzalez, Nordness, Trout and Epstein (2004) report that students with ED experience higher course failure and academic difficulties resulting in higher dropout rates. This difficulty and failure is happening as the mandates and regulations become tougher for all students, including those with exceptional needs. These ideas have shifted schools from viewing
their duties of just being compliant to being accountable for student progress (Wasburn-Moses, 2005). It may be of interest to educational institutions to invest more research in keeping students with ED in schools and transitioning them into society with marketable skill sets.

Understanding that this was just an initial study into the placement and personnel models used statewide, it may be important to conduct a more comprehensive study initiated by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE). The study could investigate the curriculum and resources used by the personnel within the placement. It could also look into the qualifications of utilized personnel and the need for additional training of faculty and staff. This study could be conducted via a survey disseminated by the IDOE, in conjunction with ISEAS roundtable committees to possibly improve participation. A longitudinal study, similar to the NLTS2, could be put in place to follow a cohort of students from throughout the state to see how they progress through school. Again, with the assistance of roundtable committees, these cohorts could be followed and studied providing information data that could be discussed at the state, roundtable and local levels. This collaboration is needed to provide the best opportunities for students with ED while they are in school and after they leave school (Malmgren, Edgar, & Neel, 1998).

**Course of Action**

1. The Indiana Department of Education ‘s Center for Exceptional Learners with the support of the Indiana Special Education Administrator’s Services (ISEAS) develops a survey to investigate the current curriculums and staff used within Indiana high schools.

2. The Indiana Department of Education ‘s Center for Exceptional Learners with the support of the Indiana Special Education Administrator’s Services creates a cohort of students with emotional disabilities to be longitudinally studied regarding their progress through school.
3. The developed surveys would be disseminated to selected schools representing the seven ISEAS educational roundtables in order to increase participation.

4. Cohort groupings would be established within ISEAS educational roundtables to help promote a stronger local connection as compared to a state driven process.

5. Comprehensive reports would be created displaying findings and provided to roundtable committees to be discussed at the roundtable level. These reports would then be delivered and discussed with superintendents and principals of participating sites. All reports would be placed on the IDOE website for public utilization.

6. Annual assessments would be conducted. This would apply to either of the proposed processes.

7. Professional development sessions would be created for corporations and schools to use regarding the needed curricular materials, resources and appropriately trained staff to better serve students with emotional disabilities.
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APPENDIX A

Sampling and Recruitment Documents
MEMORANDUM

TO: Secondary School Principals
FROM: Robert A. Marra, Associate Superintendent, Division of Exceptional Learners
SUBJECT: Survey for the Indiana Post School Follow-Up System
DATE: November 2007

The staff working within the Indiana Department of Education, Division of Exceptional Learners has an ongoing desire to find ways to better serve students with exceptional learning needs who reside in the state. The Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System and the Indiana State Improvement Grant are just two statewide activities with a central outcome of improving the educational options of students in Indiana. Another is the Indiana Post School Follow-Up System, which is now coordinated by Mr. Adam Bauserman. The Division has enjoyed a collegial and supportive relationship with the team behind the Indiana Post School Follow-Up System for almost a decade.

As you may know, the Indiana Post School Follow-Up System has been developed to capture, analyze and report on information gathered about the current status, employment and/or post secondary education of individuals with disabilities one year ‘post’ high school. To supplement the data collected through the System, Mr. Bauserman has designed a research study to capture the perceptions of teachers and administrators throughout the state regarding the settings, services, and personnel used to coordinate transition services for students with emotional disabilities. The results of this study, together with the data from the Indiana Post School Follow-Up System, can provide insight regarding these students and the educational setting that affords them the best opportunities for success.

I ask that you please consider giving Mr. Bauserman your time and actively participate in this study. This brief time commitment on your part can provide us with more detailed information that will ultimately help better serve our students with unique learning needs.
Invitation to Participate in a Doctoral Research Study

I am conducting a research study focused on the placement and personnel used to provide services to students with emotional disabilities at the secondary level. The study is designed to provide insight about the perspectives of education professionals throughout the state of Indiana. This study intends to provide important data that sheds light on the current models being used in Indiana to improve the outcomes for students with emotional disabilities.

I am asking that you and your staff be a part of the research study. All that is needed from you is a staff directory that includes: last name, first name, position and email address. This would be emailed to me at adbauserman@bsu.edu. If this option is not available and you have a school website that provides this information I would be able to develop this listing.

Study Design

Participants
- The participants in the study will be general and special education administrators and teachers from the state of Indiana.

Delivery of Survey Instrument
- The participants will be surveyed using an electronic survey link via email
- Participation is strictly voluntary and completely confidential.

Dissemination of Data
- No identifiable data will be presented within the study.
- Researcher will be available to provide and discuss findings with sites.

Summary

Secondary students with special needs are being held to a higher standard than ever before. Therefore, the models in which these students are serviced need to be appropriate. Your participation will provide significant data to the field of education regarding the current reform agenda (i.e. NCLB, AYP, IDEA, FAPE).

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Adam Bauserman - adbauserman@bsu.edu - 765.285.7661
**Phone Call to Possible Participants**

__________________________, my name is Adam Bauserman and I am a Doctoral Candidate at Ball State University. I am calling to ask you and your staff to be part of my dissertation research study. I am conducting a short, electronic survey that investigates the perceptions of teachers and administrators on the placement and personnel used to service students with emotional disabilities. All I would need from you would be a listing of teachers and administrators by name, position and an email address. The whole survey process would take about 10 minutes.

**Upon acceptance**
I will send an email to you confirming our discussion and what I will need from your end. Thank you for participation.

**Upon refusal:**
Thank you for your time.
Thank you again for agreeing to participate in my dissertation research study. Due to the fast approaching close of the Fall semester and Winter Break, I have decided to send out the survey in January 2008. This will allow you and your staff ample time to complete the survey. The survey process will be the same as discussed. I will send an email to you containing a prompting statement for your staff approximately 3 days prior to the dissemination of the survey link. The survey link will then be delivered to all selected participants via an email. This email will be a blind carbon copy to secure the confidentiality of all participants. Again, this process is completely voluntary, but your participation is greatly appreciated. I look forward to working with you and your staff. Have a wonderful Holiday Season and Happy New Year! If you have any questions please feel free to contact me. adbauserman@bsu.edu -or- 765.285.7661.

Sincerely,

Adam Bauserman
Adam Bauserman - Ball State University - Research Study

Purpose of Study
- This study will investigate the current service delivery models and instructional models used with secondary students with emotional disabilities in the state of Indiana as perceived by 4 educational groups.
- The potential relationship between the service delivery and instructional models used by students with ED and their transitional outcomes may provide assistance to administrators, educators, and Individual Education Program (IEP) teams.

Participants
- The participants in the study will be general education administrators, general education teachers, special education administrators, and special education teachers from the state of Indiana.

Delivery of Survey Instrument
- The participants will be interviewed using an electronic survey using the inQsit system.
- Participation is strictly voluntary.

Dissemination of Data
- Data will be reported as aggregate data.
- State and roundtable data will be shown to compare responses between and within sub-groupings.
- No identifiable data will be presented within the study.
- All participating sites are welcome to the final data analysis (Chapter 4) upon request.
- Researcher willing to discuss findings with sites.

Summary
- Secondary students with special needs are being held to a higher standard and therefore the models in which these students are serviced need to be appropriate.
- This study intends to provide important data that will improve and refine the current models being used in Indiana to improve the outcomes for students with emotional disabilities.
Communication with Teachers
* Upon confirmation, this email will be distributed to administrators and directors.

Dear (Administrator/Director),

Thanks you for participation in my research. If you could, please share the following information with your staff:

1. All participation will be strictly voluntary.
2. All data is confidential.
3. All identifiable data will destroyed upon completion of the study.
4. The research will work to help the growing concern for placement and personnel used for students with emotional disabilities.
5. Their insight is critical for the development of successful programs in Indiana for secondary students with emotional disabilities.

Thank you again for participating and for your time and effort. If you have any questions or need any further information please do not hesitate to email me at adbauuserman@bsu.edu.

Sincerely,
Adam Bauserman

Contact Information:
Principal Investigator
Adam D. Bauserman, Graduate Student
Special Education
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 285-7661
Email: adbauuserman@bsu.edu

Faculty Supervisor:
Dr. Michael W. Harvey
Special Education
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 285-5715
Email: mwharvey@bsu.edu

* A follow-up email and/or phone call will be made 5 days after email is sent. The PI will be checking to make sure the email was received and to aid with any questions or concerns.

* The next email will be sent notifying the distribution of the survey.

* An email will follow the distribution answering any questions or concerns with the survey.
APPENDIX B

Survey and Supplement Documents
Informed Consent

Special Education Service Delivery and Instructional Models Used in Indiana for Secondary Students with Emotional Disabilities: Perceptions from the Field

The purpose of the study is to investigate the perceptions of administrators and teachers both in general and special education concerning the current service delivery and instructional models used for secondary students with emotional disabilities and this population’s post-secondary outcomes. For this project, you will be asked to complete an electronic survey using INQIST about your perceptions of the current models used in your school(s). It will take you approximately 45 minutes to complete the survey.

All data will be maintained as confidential. Data will be stored on the INQIST database until harvested and then on a locked computer used by the principal investigator and faculty advisor.

One benefit you may gain from your participation in this study is the data gathered, analyzed, and discussed will work to improve the current system used for students with emotional disabilities in the secondary setting. It will provide a better insight as to the models used for secondary students with disabilities used throughout the state of Indiana.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to not participate for any reason without penalty or prejudice from the investigator. If you do decide to participate, on this form, you will need to select the Yes button below the consent statement.

For one’s rights as a research subject, the following person may be contacted: Coordinator of Research Compliance, Office of Academic Research and Sponsored Programs, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070.

**********

I agree to participate in this research project entitled, “Special Education Service Delivery and Instructional Models Used in Indiana for Secondary Students with Emotional Disabilities: Perceptions from the Field.” I have had the study explained to me and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have read the description of this project and give my consent to participate.

( ) Yes
( ) No

Principal Investigator

Adam D. Bauserman, Graduate Student
Special Education
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 285-5700
Email: adbauserman@bsu.edu

Faculty Supervisor:

Dr. Michael W. Harvey
Special Education
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 285-5715
Email: mwharvey@bsu.edu
BausermanStudy

Important Information:

**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Model-</th>
<th>the personnel or staff providing instruction in the educational setting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery Model-</td>
<td>the percentage of time and the placement or setting a student receives instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Outcome-</td>
<td>the ways in which a student leaves the secondary setting and is no longer part of the educational system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SERVICE DELIVERY AND INSTRUCTIONAL MODELS USED IN INDIANA**

Part I. – Participant Demographic Data

1. What is your gender?
   - A. Male
   - B. Female

2. What is your current age?
   - A. Younger than 20
   - B. 20-25
   - C. 26-30
   - D. 31-35
   - E. 36-40
   - F. 40-45
   - G. 46-50
   - H. 50+

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   - A. African American
   - B. Asian American
   - C. Caucasian (White)
   - D. Hispanic
   - E. Native American
   - F. Other

4. Please select your school or special education cooperative.

5. Please select your current position.
   - A. General Education Administrator (i.e. Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean of Students)
   - B. Special Education Administrator (i.e. Director, Assistant Director, Coordinator, Supervisor)
   - C. General Education Teacher
   - D. Special Education Teacher
6. How many years have you been in your current position?
   ○ A. Less than 1 year
   ○ B. 1-2 years
   ○ C. 3-5 years
   ○ D. 6-10 years
   ○ E. 11-15 years
   ○ F. 16-20 years
   ○ G. More than 20+ years

7. Please select all licenses you hold?
   ○ A. Special Education with Emotional Disabilities
   ○ B. Special Education with Other Exceptionality Area
   ○ C. General Secondary Education
   ○ D. Emergency License
   ○ E. Other

Part II. – Service Delivery Models – Placement

8. Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting receive instruction in a... (pick which option best applies)
   ○ A. Regular Classroom – a student spends 80% or more of their instructional day in a general education setting
   ○ B. Resource Room – a student spends between 40%-79% of their instructional day in the general education setting
   ○ C. Separate Class – a student spends less than 40% of their instructional day in the general education setting
   ○ D. Separate Day School Facility – a student goes to a different school to be educated during the instructional day.
   ○ E. Residential Facility – a student is educated and resides at the same facility.
   ○ F. Correctional Facility – a student has been placed in a facility by the court system in conjunction with adjudication.
   ○ G. Parentally placed in private schools – a student is placed in a private school/facility by parental choice.
   ○ H. Homebound/Hospital Placement – a student is educated at home or by a tutor in a neutral location or at a hospital facility.
   ○ I. Don't Know

9. Please rate using the Likert-type Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your current service delivery model (educational setting/placement) provides adequate materials for students with emotional disabilities.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your current service delivery model (educational setting/placement) provides adequate resources for students with emotional disabilities.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your current service delivery model (educational setting/placement) provides an adequate placement for students with emotional disabilities.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service delivery model (educational setting/placement) used in your school building/setting is a major factor in the success of students with</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
emotional disabilities.

10. Please select the **Primary reason** why it is difficult to work with students that have emotional disabilities using your current service delivery model (educational setting/placement).
   - A. Lack of motivation
   - B. Poor attendance
   - C. Poor academic skills
   - D. Behavior – Verbal (inappropriate language, outbursts)
   - E. Behavior – Physical (violence, fighting)
   - F. Inappropriate placement for student
   - G. Other
   Please specify

   Please select a **Secondary reason** why it is difficult to work with students that have emotional disabilities using your current service delivery model (educational setting/placement).
   - A. Lack of motivation
   - B. Poor attendance
   - C. Poor academic skills
   - D. Behavior – Verbal (inappropriate language, outbursts)
   - E. Behavior – Physical (violence, fighting)
   - F. Inappropriate placement for student
   - G. Other
   Please specify

   Please list two ways to improve the service delivery model (educational setting/placement) currently being used for students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting.

11. One:

   ___________________________________________

   Two:

   ___________________________________________

**Part III. – Instructional Models – Staffing**

12. Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting receive instruction from (a) ...
   - A. Teacher without paraprofessional support
   - B. Teacher with paraprofessional support
   - C. General education teacher with resource pullout program
   - D. General education classroom teacher with special education teacher collaboration/consultation support
   - E. Team teaching
   - F. Other
   - G. Do not know
   Please specify Other:
13. Please rate using the Likert-type Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your current instructional model (personnel/staff) has highly qualified faculty working with students that have emotional disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your current instructional model (personnel/staff) provides evidence-based instruction for students with emotional disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructional model (personnel/staff) used in your school building/setting is a major factor in the success of students with emotional disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list two reasons as to why it is difficult to work with students that have emotional disabilities using your current instruction model (personnel/staff).

14. One: ________________________________________________________________

Two: ________________________________________________________________

Please list two ways to improve the instructional model (personnel/staff) currently being used for students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting.

15. One: ________________________________________________________________

Two: ________________________________________________________________

Part IV. – Academics

16. Please rate using the Likert-type Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting receive instruction using the general education curriculum in Language Arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting receive instruction using the general education curriculum in mathematics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting receive instruction using the general education curriculum in science.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting receive instruction using the general education curriculum in social studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting receive instruction using a standards-based curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting receive instruction using a grade-level appropriate curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part V. – Social Skills/Life Skills

17. **Please rate using the Likert-type Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting are receiving the appropriate social skills needed to be productive citizens (i.e. communication skills, social events, recreational activities).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting are receiving the appropriate life skills needed to be productive citizens (i.e. daily living skills, personal hygiene, budgeting, home/car care).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting are receiving the appropriate work skills needed to be productive citizens (i.e. résumé, job search, interview process).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part VI. – Outcomes

18. Students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting most frequently exit/transition by...
   - A. Graduating with Diploma
   - B. Graduating with a Certificate of Complletion
   - C. Dropping out of school
   - D. Reaching maximum age requirement
   - E. Expulsion
   - F. Incarceration
   - G. Do not know

19. **Please rate using the Likert-type Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities are transitioning from your school building/setting into the competitive work force.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities are transitioning from your school building/setting into college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with emotional disabilities are transitioning from your school building/setting into the military.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list two improvements needed to assist students with emotional disabilities in your school building/setting transition into post-secondary life.

20. One: _______________________________________________________________________
    Two: _______________________________________________________________________
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

TO: 
Adam Bauerman
Special Education

FROM: 
Institutional Review Board
Leonard Kaminsky, Chair
Melanie L. Morris, Coordinator of Research Compliance

DATE: 
February 21, 2007

RE: 
Human Subjects Protocol – IRB # 07-149

TITLE: 
Special Education Service Delivery and Instructional Models Used in Indiana for Secondary Students with Emotional Disabilities: Perceptions from the Field

The Institutional Review Board reviewed your protocol on January 31, 2007 and has determined the procedures you have proposed qualify as "exempt." Projects determined to be exempt on or after March 3, 2005 are no longer required to be actively monitored by the IRB. As such, there will be no further review of your protocol, and you are cleared to proceed with the procedures outlined in your protocol. As an exempt study, there is no requirement for continuing review. Your protocol will remain on file with Academic Research and Sponsored Programs as a matter of record.

Editorial notes: Please submit a copy of all revised documents for your file. This will not delay the beginning of your study.

1. Your study was determined to be exempt under the second exemption category, as you propose to conduct surveys/interviews/observations with adults either in an anonymous fashion or on a topic that will not reveal sensitive information about the participants that could place the participants at risk.
   - Please also include contact information for the faculty advisor for your study in communications with subjects.
   - Please be advised that study data are not anonymous if the codes assigned to subjects and their data are associated with identifiers, even if the data are stored separately.
   - We offer the suggestion that you may wish to proofread your introductory letters and other communications to subjects.

While your project does not require continuing review, it is the responsibility of the P.I. (and, if applicable, faculty supervisor) to inform the IRB if the procedures presented in this protocol are to be modified or if problems related to human research participants arise in connection with this project. Any procedural modifications must be evaluated by the IRB before being implemented, as some modifications may change the review status of this project.

Please contact Melanie L. Morris in Academic Research and Sponsored Programs (morrisml@bsu.edu, 765-285-5070) if you are unsure whether your proposed modification requires review. Proposed modifications should be addressed in writing to the IRB at Academic Research and Sponsored Programs (2100 W. Riverside Avenue). Please reference the above identification number (IRB #) in any communication to the IRB regarding this project.
Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams

Completion Certificate

This is to certify that

Adam Bauserman

has completed the Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), on 04/01/2005.

This course included the following:

- key historical events and current issues that impact guidelines and legislation on human participant protection in research.
- ethical principles and guidelines that should assist in resolving the ethical issues inherent in the conduct of research with human participants.
- the use of key ethical principles and federal regulations to protect human participants at various stages in the research process.
- a description of guidelines for the protection of special populations in research.
- a definition of informed consent and components necessary for a valid consent.
- a description of the role of the IRB in the research process.
- the roles, responsibilities, and interactions of federal agencies, institutions, and researchers in conducting research with human participants.

National Institutes of Health
http://www.nih.gov
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Q-Q Plots
APPENDIX D

High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation

HOUSSSE Rubric
Former High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation or HOUSSE Rubric

Clarification

May 18, 2006

Teachers who earned 100 points on the “old HOUSSE” rubric (grid located at the bottom of the “old HOUSSE”) are highly qualified and do NOT need to complete the new 2006 HOUSSE rubric (unless their teaching assignment has changed).

Teachers who answered “yes” to the licensure questions located above the “old HOUSSE” rubric and did not complete the rubric are not highly qualified. Answering “yes” to the licensure questions on the “old HOUSSE” indicates which license the teacher holds and does not indicate which highly qualified requirement the teacher completed. Licensure alone does not make a teacher highly qualified. Licensure and completing one of the highly qualified requirements per No Child Left Behind makes a teacher highly qualified. The United States Education Department’s federal representatives charged with monitoring the implementation of the highly qualified mandate want to know which highly qualified requirement the licensed teacher completed. Teachers are highly qualified only if they have met the following No Child Left Behind requirements listed below:

Please note: The highly qualified requirements are different for new teachers (teachers who have taught with a valid teaching license for less than one year); veteran teachers (teachers who have taught with a valid teaching license for one or more years); elementary teachers; middle and secondary school teachers.

Please note: Special education teachers who are the primary instructors of the core academic elementary subjects OR the core academic subjects (middle and secondary
school level) must meet the same highly qualified requirements as general education teachers (listed below).

**To be highly qualified, Veteran Elementary School Teachers must** hold a valid Indiana teaching license appropriate for elementary school grades, **AND COMPLETED ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:**

- Passed the PRAXIS II (#10011) licensing exam entitled Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment; OR
- Passed the National Teacher Exam (NTE) (code number 20010) Specialty test called “Education in the Elementary School”; OR
- Earned 100 points on the HOUSSE rubric.

**To be highly qualified, New Elementary School Teachers must** hold a valid Indiana teaching license appropriate for elementary school grades, **AND PASSED THE REQUIRED PRAXIS II (#10011) LICENSING EXAM ENTITLED Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment.**

**To be highly qualified, Veteran Junior High/Middle and Secondary School Teachers must** hold a valid Indiana teaching license appropriate for the school setting, **AND COMPLETED ONE of the following FOR EACH CORE ACADEMIC (CAS) subject the teacher teaches:**

- Passed the PRAXIS II exam in the CAS; OR
• Passed the NTE specialty exam in the CAS; OR

• Earned a bachelor’s degree or completed 24 college credit hours in the CAS; OR

• Earned a master’s degree in the CAS they teach; OR

• Completed the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certification in the CAS; OR

• Earned 100 points on the HOUSSE rubric.

**To be highly qualified, New Junior High/Middle or Secondary School Teachers must** hold a valid Indiana teaching license appropriate for the elementary school setting, AND **COMPLETED ONE of the following FOR EACH CORE ACADEMIC SUBJECT (CAS) the teacher teaches:**

• Passed the required PRAXIS II licensing exam in the CAS; OR

• Earned a bachelor’s degree or completed 24 credit hours in the CAS; OR

• Earned a master’s degree in the CAS.
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Response to Intervention
**Tier 3:**
- Few Students
- Increased Frequency
- Longer Duration

**Services across tiers are fluid and data-driven**
- District/Community Team
- Building Core Team

**Tier 2:**
- At-Risk Students
- Small Group

**Tier 1:**
- All Students
- Preventative, Proactive

**Core Curriculum, Instruction, and Learning Environment**

**Intense, Individualized Support**

**Targeted, Supplemental Supports**

**Building Core Team**

**Grade Level Teams**
- Building Core Team
- School Improvement Team