NEWFOUNDLAND'S SPECIAL EDUCATION POLICY: PILOT SCHOOLS' PERCEPTION OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES NECESSARY FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION

MARY LARNER-PARDY, B.A.(Ed.), B.Sp.Ed.

NEWFOUNDLAND'S SPECIAL EDUCATION POLICY: PILOT SCHOOLS' PERCEPTION OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES NECESSARY FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION

BY

Mary Larner-Pardy, B.A.(Ed.), B.Sp.Ed.

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Educational Psychology

Department of Education

Memorial University of Newfoundland

July 1991

St. John's Newfoundland

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to (1) determine competencies judged to be important by various educational professionals for the successful implementation of the Special Education Policy in the province of Newfoundland and, in turn, (2) to determine how competent those professionals perceived themselves to be on those important competencies.

A questionnaire consisting of 118 items, pertaining to 8 different categories of competencies deemed to be important through expert judgement, was developed by the researcher and administered to the fifteen pilot schools selected by the Department of Education in Newfoundland. These pilot schools were those designated as schools which would receive in-service support over a three year period as they implemented the new Special Education Policy. They were to also serve as exemplary sites for their respective school districts as well.

Respondents were asked to rate each item on two Likert-type scales. The first scale asked the respondent to indicate the level of item importance for professionals in the same role as that of the respondent. The second scale required the respondent to rate how competent they perceived themselves to be on that item.

Mean scores were computed for each questionnaire item and, in turn, each category, according to a respondent's professional title and year in policy implementation. Comparisons were then made between respondents on the basis of: type of professional responding; pilot school's year in policy implementation; and grade level taught by respondents.

Results of the study revealed the following:

(a) Those competencies which the various respondents felt important for policy implementation and competent in delivering.

(b) Competencies respondents felt important for implementation but perceived themselves as being less competent in carrying out were also identified.

(c) All of the eight professional competency categories were deemed to be important for successful implementation, and all respondents perceived themselves to be competent on the two categories which they felt to be most important for successful implementation, namely, the ability to develop a positive, accepting classroom and school atmosphere which, in turn, fosters constructive interaction between all students and possessing the individual personal characteristics thought to be important traits for any teacher to possess, but specifically for those with special need children in their class.

(d) Compared to regular classroom teachers and school administrators, special education teachers perceived themselves to be the most competent on items they felt important for successful implementation.

(e) As compared to special educators and school administrators, regular classroom teachers perceived themselves to be the least competent on items they felt to be important.

(f) Respondents perceived themselves to be competent on the majority of items they felt to be important for successful implementation of Newfoundland's Special Education Policy.

(g) As professionals progressed through the three years of policy implementation, their perceived level of competency increased.

(h) Regular classroom teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators at all levels of policy implementation perceived themselves as less than competent on competencies dealing with professional knowledge of the characteristics of special needs children and adaptations necessary to effectively teach them.

(i) Special education teachers and professionals in their third year of policy implementation perceived themselves as more competent on assessment

competencies than did professionals at earlier stages of policy implementation.

(j) Regular classroom teachers and school administrators perceived themselves to be less than competent in the areas of communication with parents, colleagues and administrators, and goal setting competencies.

(k) The importance placed on instructional strategy competencies and personal characteristics of those responsible for meeting the needs of exceptional students, significantly increased as professionals reached their third year of policy implementation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are numerous individuals who deserve my appreciation and heartful thanks for assisting me in completing this study.

To Dr. Glenn Sheppard, my supervisor throughout this research; Dr. Peter Chow, Dr. Jeff Bulcock, and especially Michelle Shaptner for their assistance in the analysis of the research data; I am especially grateful for your invaluable assistance.

To my husband and my mother who have continued to encourage and support my endeavours, I truly owe a great deal of gratitude. Without your patience, understanding, and subtle 'pushes', I would not have been able to complete this thesis. For I know that for every minute I have spent on this thesis, they too have also shared that minute with me.

Most of all, I would like to thank my 1 year old son, Jonathan, to whom I dedicate this thesis. You have brought so much happiness to my life and I apologize to you for not having this thesis completed before your arrival. I look forward, Jonathan, to sharing as much time with you and your Dad in the future as I can, and making up for that time we've lost.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Accompanying the various changes occurring in the education of students with special needs, is the realization that there are new roles and expectations facing educational professionals. Additional competencies or further refinement of existing skills, through either pre-service or in-service means, are essential for successful implementation of new and emerging special education policies. This study was designed to gather data to determine what competencies regular classroom teachers, special educators, and administrators in pilot schools selected in the Province of Newfoundland deem important, in order to successfully implement that Province's New Special Education Policy. Those pilot schools were those selected as sites of in-service support as they implemented the new policy and they were intended to serve as exemplary sites for other schools within their region. This study also attempted to determine how competent those educators perceived themselves to be in relation to those competencies they judged as being essential.

Educational Trends

> There is a significant population (perhaps as many as 30%) who fail to make desired progress in schools for a variety of reasons. These students pose a significant challenge for most

> teachers and in the past few decades many have been removed from regular classrooms often due to the inability of teacher and student to find a medium for educational success (cited in Grosenick & Reynolds, 1978, p. 213).

The realm of educational provisions for children with special needs has undergone dramatic changes over the past two decades. Changes in organizational, instructional and curriculum approaches have evolved as a result of significant changes in ideologies and educational philosophies regarding how best to meet the needs of these children. Attempts are now being made to adapt the curriculum to their needs, rather than vice-versa. With this adaptation also comes the realization that the education of these students is a shared responsibility, which rests with not only the special educator as previously thought, but with all professionals involved with the educational development of these children. Algozzine and Ysseldyke (1983) point out that before these adaptations occurred, a silent, unwritten agreement often existed between special and regular educators.

> The former asserted a particular body of expertise and unique caring for 'special' students, thus laying claim both to professional obligation and student benefit. And the latter, either due to the lack of skills and resources, or to prejudice, was happy to hand over 'these' students to a welcoming special education system. This included not only those with the traditional handicapping conditions, but ever increasing numbers of students labelled "learning disabled", a category which presently incorporates such a grab-bag of students that under one or another

> definition, over half of a school's populations could be included (p. 246).

Today, education for special needs students is quite different from what it was only a decade or two ago. It is much more comprehensive and better accepted by educators and the public in general (Gearheart & Weishahn, 1984). Now, many more special needs students are receiving their education within the regular classroom than ever before.

When one takes a retrospective view of how our society has treated handicapped individuals, the idea of providing educational services to them is a relatively recent development. Reynolds and Birch (1977) summarize the history of the education of handicapped children as "a simple story of massive neglect, denial and rejection."

Hallahan and Kauffman (1978) point out that there is substantial agreement that the foundations for special education were laid in the nineteenth century by the work of such individuals as Jean Marc Itard (1775-1838), Edouard Seguin (1812-1880) and Maria Montessori (1870-1952). Through individuals such as these, the concepts of individualized instruction, sequenced educational tasks, the importance of stimulation, rewards, structured educational environments and the teaching of functional skills were generated. The premise that every child can learn and should therefore be educated to the fullest

extent possible is also relatively new, developing near the end of the nineteenth century.

Despite these exciting developments, difficulties arose which dampened the enthusiasm for the education of exceptional children. With compulsory school attendance laws came problems with providing education for all children, including handicapped individuals. Since residential schools were often in place for blind and deaf students, and severely mentally retarded children were often institutionalized at an early age, mildly handicapped students became the target population for integration (Osdol & Perryman, 1974). These students were placed within the regular classroom in the beginning. The schools, like other institutions, were interested in 'curing' the students' problems and returning them to 'normalcy'. The students were viewed as being able to learn exactly the same as all other students, so the practice of failing or repeating until they could complete almost all the work of a given grade was introduced. Needless to say, many of these early classes were unsatisfactory and soon abandoned. These unsuccessful methods, along with related behavior problems, gave rise to the 'special class' (Gearheart & Weishahn, 1984). With the introduction of intellectual assessment instruments (i.e., Stanford-Binet) which could determine degrees of mental retardation, classes for mildly handicapped learners began and met with

enough success to warrant continuation. These handicapped students, along with a few others with similar learning problems but not those with low intelligence, were lost to the special class. The creation of the terms 'Special Education Classes' and 'Special Education Teacher' sprang up around the 1920's (Will, Wang, Reynolds & Walberg, 1987). Public disappointment with the inability of professionals to cure handicapped individuals, disagreement among professionals in the field, and a growing belief that handicapped people were inherently inferior and unteachable, were some of the reasons which led to a lapse in the concern for the education of these individuals from around the late 1800's until about 1950 (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1978).

Organizations such as the Council for Exceptional Children and government departments responsible for educational programs for handicapped children provided meaningful definitions of special education. Examinations of the effectiveness of programs for handicapped students in 1966 saw the development of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the United States, its main function being to fulfill the dictates of federal legislation designed to promote the development of better programs for handicapped individuals (Day, Kirk & Gallager, 1985).

Some critics thus refer to the first 30 to 40 years of the 20th century as to the 'era of the special class'

because this was the main means by which mildly handicapped students were served.

> It was characterized by general educators happily sending problem students to the special class for the mentally handicapped and by special educators accepting a number of students who should not have been so placed. Toward the end of the era it became a time of contradictory and inconclusive efficacy studies as well as claims - verified in court - that special classes were sometimes dumping grounds, other times a vehicle of degregation, and in some geographic areas a convenient way to do something for culturally different or bilingual children without actually starting a bilingual program (Gearheart & Weishahn, 1984, p. 11).

This period, although not without its flaws, was one which saw slowly improving programs and services for handicapped children. By the mid-20th century dramatic and radical events took place which helped change society's and educators' views of handicapped individuals. Haglund and Stevens (1980), who wrote of the marked improvements in attitudes towards handicapped individuals during this time, point out that much of the reason for this attitude change came from W. Wolfenberger's "Principal of Normalization" in 1972. Wolfenberger proposed new ways of humanizing the treatment of handicapped individuals, according to examples found in Scandinavian countries. This principle simply implied that these people should be allowed to live their lives as equal to a normal existence as possible and to expect rights and obligations similar to those of other people. He stressed that handicapped individuals were to

be accepted, even when their exceptionalities could not be remediated. Court actions, particularly in the United States, began questioning whether special education classes lead to stigma, inadequate education and irreparable injury. On the other hand, lawsuits were carried out by students who were not served by special education but who were in serious need of such service. Parent advocates and organized professional groups worked as catalysts for change and they influenced the United States Congress enough that a series of legislation was passed supporting better educational programs and services for special needs learners. These areas established the handicapped students' right to a free, appropriate public education and to protection from inappropriate assessment and classification procedures as well as the parents' right to be totally involved in educational planning. The efforts of such litigation and lobbying resulted in the passing of PL 94-142. The Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 established the framework for education of handicapped children as it exists today in the United States (Day et al., 1985).

This law required that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment should occur only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes cannot be achieved

satisfactorily (Weintraub, Abeson, Ballard & LaVor, 1976). Thus the term "least restrictive environment" was born. This meant that educators were to maximize the opportunities for handicapped students to receive their education in normal educational environments along with their non-handicapped peers. It did not mean that all mildly handicapped students were to be educated all day in the regular classroom or that there may not be a need for some specially oriented classes for certain purposes and/or certain students.

Thus, the education of handicapped children within the regular classroom was mandated by the United States federal government, whenever it was appropriate. Through its mandate it has required the availability of a variety of appropriate educational settings; the parents' right to due process in presenting their concerns or complaints about their child's education; and the development of an individualized educational program plan for each student receiving special education.

The legislation for this mandate (P.L. 94-142) in the United States has become a springboard for other countries such as Canada in their development of policies and legislation concerning the education for special learners.

In addition to the changes occurring in the United States, Britain was also introducing legislation to outline various levels of educational integration for special

learners in their country. In 1978, Britain's Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Youth (better known as the Warnock report) outlined three levels of integration necessary to meet the needs of handicapped children. These were: (1) Location integration - referring to the sharing of the same site, but not necessarily the same facilities; (2) Social integration - referred to sharing the same site and engaging in social mixing between handicapped and non-handicapped learners; and (3) Functional integration - which referred to the fullest form of integration where handicapped learners share the same educational programs with ordinary pupils, thus making more demands on the school staff and can only occur when both locational and social integration have already been achieved (Galloway & Goodwin, 1979).

Canadian Perspective

Meeting the needs of handicapped individuals in Canada has followed much the same route as that in the United States and Britain. Our attitudes, it would seem, were shaped by the changes occurring in Europe and the United States, developing later and more slowly however. Our realization of the inadequacies of "special classes" occurred around the mid to late 1960's. Our means of presenting special classes for just about every type of

exceptionality led David Kendall to conclude "that in many places special education has come to be identified with special classes, and not with children with special needs" (cited in Day, Kirk & Gallager, 1985, p. 5). Special classes, possibly as a result of these criticisms, began to change. Some special needs students now receive annual assessments to try and ensure that they are placed in the least restrictive environment.

In increasing numbers, special needs children are being educated in the regular classrooms of public and private schools in Canada. This results from the developing belief that these children should be educated with non-handicapped students to the maximum extent possible. In Canada, education is a provincial responsibility. Each provincial Education Act governs the policies and practices of the School Boards within their jurisdiction. There is no Canadian equivalent to PL 94-142, and each province/territory deals with education in its own manner. Near the beginning of the 1980's, six provinces in Canada (i.e., Manitoba, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan) had mandatory legislation patterning after the United States legislation emphasizing a free and appropriate education for all children, regardless of their disability (Day, Kirk & Gallagher, 1985). The other permissive provinces have the option of providing educational services to special

learners, but are not required to do so. The remaining provinces and territories are in various stages of policy review and/or revision, and most at least in practice seem to endorse the concept of "least restrictive environments."

In the last decade, many school boards across Canada have thoughtfully examined their legislative policies and procedures concerning exceptional children in order to ensure that the needs of these students are being met. According to Day and his associates (1985), "the most outstanding contributions to the growth of legislation to protect the rights of handicapped individuals can be attributed to the patriation of the Constitution, the parents of handicapped children, and the handicapped themselves, the Council for Exceptional Children and the United States Public Law 94-142" (p. 17).

Section 15(1) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms states that all individuals are "equal before and under the law" and have the "right to the equal protection of the law without discrimination" (cited in Day et al., 1985, p. 17).

The Charter's impact on the education for special needs learners can be verified through the examination of one of the early cases challenging it, Elwood vs. Halifax County Bedford District School Board - 1987. Here discrimination on the basis of a mental disability was challenged and a pre-trial agreement resulted in the child

being integrated into the local regular public school classroom (Hill, 1988). It would seem obvious that regardless of a province's legislation, integration of special learners will increase as a result of the Charter. With this increased practice of integration, the composition of the regular classroom is changing and professional educators are being challenged to meet the needs of a population of students with specific educational needs.

Through the enactment of this section of the Charter, families are provided with a means by which to challenge decisions regarding provision of services made by school boards. However, it is not yet clear how this provision in the Charter will be interpreted by the courts with respect to the rights of children with special needs. One can speculate, though, that possibly profound effects on the educational rights of handicapped individuals may be experienced in provinces which currently do not legislate the right to an education for all, regardless of their disabilities.

The Council for Exceptional Children in Canada completed two nation-wide surveys between 1969-74, which helped to set standards for teacher training in special education, and develop principles to guide the formulation of legislation. The first survey, acknowledging that all provinces had developed special education programmes, also

pointed out that nowhere in Canada were there clear guidelines stating what the rights of exceptional children were regarding education or what responsibilities school districts had in providing education for these students. The second report, entitled One Million Children in 1970, also emphasized the lack of appropriate legislative provisions to ensure the rights of exceptional children to an education. This report also recommended changes to teacher education programs because it was felt that teachers of exceptional children were inadequately trained to carry out their job.

These reports and special committee's recommendations contributed to the Federal Government's inclusion of Section 15(1) in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Newfoundland Scene

In Newfoundland, legislation was passed in December of 1979, mandating school boards to provide special education services in all categories of exceptionality up to age 21. This legislation, however, did not make any reference as to the type of service to be offered, or how, when, or where to implement the service. Recommendation 8:35 of the Task Force on Education advocated that arrangements be made wherever possible for the integration of exceptional students (Crocker & Riggs, 1979). These events gave

significant impetus to the development of Newfoundland's Special Education Policy, initiated in 1986, which attempted to reorganize services for exceptional students by emphasizing appropriate education for all children in a setting that is as close as possible to the regular classroom.

In this permissive policy, special emphasis is placed on a team of professionals developing individualized instructional programs for use with special children. These programs may be carried out in a number of settings within the school environment with the final selection being that one which best meets the needs of the individual child. With this new policy, recommendations, accommodations and adaptations are being made within most schools to integrate special need learners within the regular class setting. Practically all teachers in Newfoundland can expect to encounter exceptional learners in their classrooms. These encounters mean that the special needs of these children have become not the sole responsibility of the special educator as previously thought, but instead have become the shared responsibility of regular teachers, counsellors, psychologists, and other members of the educational team including the parents of these children. The educational professionals most particularly affected with this integration of special learners is the regular classroom teacher. They, along

with special educators, must develop new skills in order to participate successfully in mainstreaming ventures.

Although the Special Education Policy in Newfoundland endorses the concept of 'least restrictive environment' and, in general, outlines a set of procedures for ensuring that the needs of exceptional children are met within the regular classroom to the maximum extent possible, the extent to which the implementation of this policy is experienced within the public school system will ultimately depend on several factors. The educational practices of teachers and administrators, their commitment to the policy's principles, and the competency with which they carry out their roles are but a few of the factors which will have an enormous effect on the success of the policy. Many writers (Karagianis & Nesbit, 1979; Adamson, Matthews, & Schuller, 1990; Austin, Bagley, Goldstein, Rowe & Singley, 1987; Glavin, 1973; Thruman, Langley & Wood, 1976) suggest that the major determining factor in attaining the goal of appropriate education for most special learners is the regular classroom teacher. They must have the knowledge and skill to help special students develop cognitively, emotionally, socially and physically.

Margaret Winzer (1989) believes that today we adhere to the notion that all students have the right to learn in the educational environment most suited to their academic and social needs. Within our educational system there is a

powerful move to abandon many special classes and replace them with regular class programs supported by special education services. This trend is motivated by increasing awareness of and respect for the different learning characteristics among children and a belief that educational mainstreaming can accommodate individual differences by developing appropriate programs. Helping exceptional students fit into the mainstream of school, society, and community life has become a major goal of special education during the past decade.

With these changes and emphasis on integration of exceptional children, the need for educational professionals to know more about exceptional children and special education has never been more pronounced. This need has also contributed to teachers' feelings of inadequacies in dealing with special children; worries about their ability to teach them successfully and fears of whether exceptional students will dilute educational programs or demand a disproportionate amount of teacher time. It would seem that in-service training and ongoing technical assistance in effective instruction will be invaluable to facilitate the change process. As Carnine and Kameenui (1990) point out, the immediate challenge of integration is that of providing appropriate and effective in-service training for teachers in the field. The future of exceptional students will thus be strongly influenced by

the pre-service programs provided by teacher education facilities. Specifically, the conceptual and pedagogical models of teacher training will most assuredly determine the competence of future teachers to teach students with special needs. Both experts and teachers alike express doubt concerning their adequacy in educating special learners (Gear & Gable, 1979). A critical need exists to establish training priorities to ensure teachers are both receptive to integration efforts and capable of providing for the educational and psychological needs of exceptional students. Little, however, has been done to seek out the views of these professionals and determine their view of what new roles or skills are essential for them and how apt they are in performing these essential competencies.

General Research Questions

General research questions explored in this study are:

1. What competencies are deemed to be essential by the regular classroom teachers, special educators, and administrators in pilot schools in Newfoundland, in order to successfully implement the New Special Education Policy?
2. How competent do teachers perceive themselves to be in relation to those competencies identified as being essential?

3. Are there any differences in essential and perceived competencies identified between pilot schools in the first, second and third year of policy implementation?
4. Are there any differences in essential and perceived competencies identified between regular educators, special educators and administrators?

Limitations of this Study

1. Relationship to perceived strengths or weaknesses and essential competencies is limited to the discrepancy as defined and measured by the instrument used.
2. Interpretation is limited by the realization that there may not always be congruence between subjective assessment of competency and its more objective assessment.
3. This study did not seek teacher identification of competencies, but rather teacher ratings of competencies suggested from experts and the literature. Some essential competencies may therefore be omitted.
4. This study is limited to the investigation of self-perceived importance of various competency statements as with reference to type of professional year in policy implementation and grade level taught, and one's own perceived level of competency attainment.
5. The return rate of this research paper was

approximately 45%. Although it is an acceptable level, caution must be used when making generalizations concerning the attitudes of all pilot school participants.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The progressive inclusion of exceptional students into our educational system has a lengthy, complex and fascinating history. As a result of influences such as Wolfenberger's Principles of Normalization (Wolfenberger, 1972), United States Public Law 94-142 (1975), Britain's Warnock Report (Warnock, 1978), and other legislative and special committee recommendations, there have been significant changes in the education of special needs children. These historical documents both reflect and have contributed to today's emphasis on integrating exceptional children into the regular classroom to the maximum extent possible. In order to do this successfully, many writers such as Mori (1988), Riggar (1978), and Morrison and Brady (1985) point out that new roles and competencies are required of professional educators. One new role evolves from the strong emphasis on the development of individualized educational programs. These programs consist of a written statement developed by a team of professionals and includes an analysis of the child's present level of functioning; a list of short-term and annual goals; identification of specific services that will be provided toward meeting those goals; indication of the

extent to which the child will be able to participate in regular school programs and notation of when these services will be provided and how long they will last; as well as a schedule for checking on progress being achieved under the plan and for making any revisions in it that seem necessary (Myers & Sinco, 1980).

This concept of individualized program planning is also the major emphasis of the New Special Education Policy in the province of Newfoundland. This policy follows an adaptation of Deno's (1970) 'Cascade' model which proposes that:

> ... regular classes be made educationally diverse, with emphasis on moving specialized instruction into regular classroom settings, with special help. The view is that most students should begin their formal education in regular classroom settings with special help. Students should be moved to specialized and limited settings only when this is required by their instructional program (Newfoundland's Special Education Policy p. 2.A.4 (1), 1986).

As a result of this emphasis on integration, various changes in teacher roles, attitudes and training needs have surfaced.

Changing Professional Roles

As a result of the significant changes, both in policy and practise, in how schools organize to meet the needs of exceptional children, professionals throughout the educational system are finding themselves involved in

different roles. Developing systematic observation skills, modifying instructional strategies, teaching special needs children in the regular classroom, conferencing with other professionals and parents to develop an educational plan for a child, interpreting and, in some cases, administering informal assessment devices, are but a few of the changing roles professionals now have to take on (Gear & Gable, 1979; Grosenick & Reynolds, 1978; Haglund & Stevens, 1980).

In the view of Safer, Morrissey, Kaufman and Lewis (1978), one of the consequences of the emerging educational policies in special education is that the authority and responsibility for decisions related to instructional programming would be shared between special and regular educators, parents, support personnel and, in some cases, the special needs students themselves. Greater accountability is also implied in assuring that each student's instructional program is in accordance with the individualized educational document generated by the group (Hayes & Higgins, 1978). To some extent the nature of the role of the special education teacher will change from one of primary provider of instruction to one of an instructional manager (Idol-Maestas, 1983).

As Thruman, Langley and Wood (1976) point out, a major task resulting from wider classroom heterogeneity is the identification of feasible curricula and management techniques for regular classes that will allow integration

of ability levels without lowering the academic achievement of any child and possibly improving the academic achievement of all children. Special management techniques must be developed that will ease the time and energy burdens on teachers (Glavin, 1973). The regular teachers will be responsible for adapting the curriculum to the needs of their special students while simultaneously teaching a large number of non-handicapped students.

The sequence for providing such individualized instruction should include:

1. Prior to placement, and periodically throughout, a precise educationally relevant diagnosis should be made pinpointing a student's level of achievement, identifying any problems in helping the child learn, and outlining the most appropriate educational goals, methods and materials for ensuring success.
2. On the basis of the diagnosis, an individualized instructional program would be cooperatively developed by the school, parents, and possibly the child.
3. Throughout the program, the teacher would precisely monitor the success, or failure, of the educational strategies by collecting and analyzing data on the child's performance (Affleck, Lowerbraum & Archer, 1980).

Training Changes

As a result of the changes in special education philosophies, many teachers might be displeased that special education classes are being drastically restructured from their initial establishment. Teachers recognize that adding to their classes children whose abilities and behaviors are somewhat different, will add to the already enormous burden of individualizing instruction for the entire class of children. Intensive efforts will be needed to ensure the provision of necessary assistance for teachers and administrators as the new policies are implemented (Grosenick & Reynolds, 1978). However, without research which identifies the most important competencies needed by professionals in order to carry out the services required by the policy, assistance in terms of pre and in-service education is lacking the scientific data to substantiate existing objectives of in-service as well as guidelines for further program development and growth.

Karagianis and Nesbit (1979) also recognize the importance of equipping professionals with the appropriate training for dealing with special needs children within the classroom. The authors found that many teachers were not trained to:

> facilitate educational, psychological, and social adjustment of a child who, in many cases, is significantly different from his/her classmates. This situation must be handled carefully if the child is to make a reasonable and happy

> adjustment. Handled poorly, the move into the regular classroom may be a retrogressive step. The special child is placed in a very vulnerable position if s/he is not carefully guided through the transition period (p. ix).

The CELDIC Report (Commission on Emotional and Learning Disorders in Canada, 1970) also recommended the need for teacher training institutions to redesign the curricula (i.e., courses and practicum experiences) to facilitate greater understanding of individual differences and the characteristics, causes and treatment of learning disorders on behalf of teachers (Hill, 1988). The SEECC Report (Standards for Educators of Exceptional Children in Canada) also suggested the need for all teachers to receive a basic orientation to exceptional children (Hardy, McLeod, Minto, Perkins & Quance, 1971).

Robichaud and Ennus (1980) stated that graduates of teacher training institutes were often "ill-equipped" to teach in integrated settings and that preparation of regular teachers was essential for successful integration. They recommended "handicapped students should not be integrated in the regular class before regular teachers are properly trained to receive them" (p. 211). Concerns were also raised that even certified teachers are not necessarily qualified to work with special needs children.

> They are not qualified to meet the changing requirements embodied in such concepts and practices as mainstreaming, the least restrictive environment, normalization of human services, integration of the handicapped learner, zero-

> reject, diagnostic-prescriptive teaching, mastery learning, individualized planning.... There is a shortage of teachers with certain skills - skills which are necessary now as part of the basic preparation of all teachers; skills which conventionally have been viewed as those of the special educator" (Robichaud and Ennus, 1980, p. 243).

Considering the emphasis placed on the importance of professionals being appropriately prepared to deliver services to special needs children, it is surprising that there is such a lack of research conducted to identify necessary competencies for these professionals.

Current Attitudes of Professionals Towards Integration

Throughout the literature there are constant reminders that teachers feel inadequate with regards to their professional readiness to meet the needs of special students. Marie Sedor writes:

> Some regular classroom teachers are not comfortable with a special student because they do not have realistic expectations, the pace is often very slow and this is often perceived to be a reflection of their teaching ability, and they have not been trained to deal with them (cited in Tanguay, 1985, p. 22).

Gugan (1979) pointed out that both regular and special educators, initially, and perhaps still today, reacted to the integration movement negatively. Regular classroom teachers saw their workload increased by integration and themselves as facing problems for which they had no training. Special education teachers felt their role was

being infringed upon, and that integration and the regular classroom initiative questioned their territory as well as that of the regular educator. Nor were they sure about what the future would hold for them and their students. Serious doubts existed as to whether integration would actually benefit exceptional children.

The success of the integrated classroom as pointed out by many writers (D'Zamko & Hedges, 1985; Paul, Turnbull & Cruickshank, 1977; Hart, 1981; Leyser, 1985; Bender, 1983; Gans, 1987; Edmond, 1984) is largely dependent on teachers' attitudes and abilities to adjust classroom practice to meet the particular needs of exceptional pupils. Regular classroom teachers' resistance to the integration movement often has resulted from teachers' lack of knowledge about these atypical students, as well as lack of skill in techniques for teaching them. Regular classroom teachers seem to have been expected to meet the diverse needs of these pupils when they feel their training has been inadequate (Savage and Wienke, 1989).

Graham, Hudson, Burdg and Carpenter (1980) also found that even when regular teachers supported the idea of integration, they did not feel they possessed adequate skills to carry it through. As Cuff (1980) stated, that view was supported by the CELDIC Report (1970) which expressed discouragement in how inadequately trained most teachers felt themselves to be. The overall consensus

seemed to be that the training regular teachers received did little to help them recognize, understand or work with individual differences in children or prepare them for those aspects of the teachers' role that have to do with working with other people, especially other professionals and parents.

Poor teacher training is often named as the number one negative aspect by professionals engaged in educating special students within the regular classroom. Gersten, Darch, Davis and George (1991) point out that, while much research has been carried out on effective strategies for teaching special needs students, most classroom teachers continue to receive virtually no training in how to effectively work with these children within the constraints of the regular classroom setting. As a result, most teachers do not adapt their teaching style or strategies to meet the needs of their students. When some kind of in-service preparation is received by a staff, it is often sporadic, informal and lacking in follow-up efforts. The need for pre-service training on special needs children is highlighted as professionals demand that educational institutions be carefully evaluated and brought more in line with modern research and educational trends. Although Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank (1977) point out that many universities have made, and are continuing to make, tremendous progress in the direction of redesigning teacher

defining and assessing problems; (b) solving problems; (c) reinforcing and controlling behavior; (d) measuring progress; (e) requesting help; (f) involving others in the classroom; and (g) evaluating one's own performance.

Redden and Blackhurst (1978) also attempted to identify specific competencies which were believed by regular classroom teachers to be prerequisites to effective teaching of special students. They identified six competency functions which were: (a) development of orientation strategies for mainstream entry; (b) assess needs and set goals; (c) plan teaching strategies and use resources; (d) implement teaching strategies and use resources; (e) facilitate learning; and (f) evaluate learning.

Gear and Gable (1979) conducted a needs assessment on teacher preparation for educating handicapped children in the regular classroom. Perceived training needs were specific to four categories: Assessment of Student Needs, Resources for Learning, Professional Knowledge, and Communication. Extremely important skills within these categories included ability to adjust curriculum to suit ability, needs and interests of exceptional children; planning and implementing a variety of instruction techniques; managing behavior; promoting an accepting classroom climate; establishing appropriate goals, administering and interpreting appropriate tests to

determine a child's needs and abilities; professional knowledge of fundamental issues, of terminology, and of the rationale for integration. Surprisingly, the three lowest ranked categories on this needs assessment were evaluation of student progress, managing resources for instruction of exceptional children and communicating with parents, colleagues, and the community about the goals and activities associated with integration.

Other systematic attempts to identify such competencies have included in their lists general competency areas of professional orientation, knowledge of curriculum, learning styles, motivation, classroom climate and acceptance, diagnostic skills, remediation techniques, and again, behavior management techniques. As well, special attention is given to specify that the training of regular educators must be given priority status if they are to be expected to accept the increased responsibility attendant upon the placement of special students in their classes.

It is felt that the regular classroom teacher is the pivotal person, ultimately determining the success, or lack of success, of the new initiatives. Regular teachers will be expected to accept more responsibility for the direct instruction of special needs students. Of course, the regular teacher will not replace the specialist, but rather, will work cooperatively and collaboratively, to

facilitate the child's development within the regular classroom environment (Mori, 1988). This collaborative, combined effort between regular educators, special educators, administrators and any auxiliary personnel will hold the key to any successful implementation.

Without the appropriate level of preparation for implementation, teachers will find it extremely difficult and frustrating to carry out their new roles. Support for this statement comes from a study by Alberto, Castricone and Cohen (1978) which identified approximately 60% of their regular classroom subjects who expressed feelings that additional or remedial training should precede the placement of these exceptional children in their classrooms.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This Chapter describes the following: (1) the sample included in this study; (2) the research design; (3) the nature and construction of the instrument used; (4) reliability; (4) validity of the instrument used; and (5) methods of data analysis.

The Sample

The sample in this study consisted of 14 of the 15 Pilot Schools located throughout the Pr vince of Newfoundland. (One school declined participation.)

As can be seen from Table 1, the highest rate of questionnaires returned came from those pilot schools in their first year of policy implementation.

Research Design

In May of 1989, teachers and administrators of the various pilot schools agreed to complete a detailed questionnaire concerning competencies related to the implementation of the Province's Special Education Policy (Appendix D).

Table 1

Names of Pilot Schools Participating in this Study and Number and Percentage of Questionnaires Returned

Policy Schools	No. of Questionnaires Returned/No. of Questionnaires Sent	Return Rate Percentage	School Code
3rd Year			
Humber Elementary - Corner Brook	5/12		01
St. Michael's Elementary - Stephenville Crossing	13/25	23.5%	02
Leo Burke Academy - Bishop's Falls	5/23		03
Upper Gullies Elementary - Upper Gullies	5/27		04
2nd Year			
St. John Elementary - Whitbourne	13/16		05
Grant Collegiate High - Springdale	5/22	22.8%	06
J.R. Smallwood High - Wabush	8/30		07
MacPherson Junior High - St. John's	13/32		08
1st Year			
Sacred Heart Elementary - Marystown	11/20		09
Gill Memorial - Musgrave Harbour	8/12		10
Green Island Elementary - Green Island Cove	9/10		11
Florence M. Williams School - Pool's Cove	4/5	43.7%	12
Greenwood Elementary - Milltown	12/14		13
Valmont Academy - King's Point	8/18		14
Greenwood High - Milltown	0/22		15
Total Respondents -	119	44.7%	

Of 266 questionnaires sent out, 71 were returned prior to the first follow-up. In September of 1989, schools were contacted by telephone and, as a result, additional questionnaires were sent to the schools for completion. A further telephone follow-up was conducted in November of 1989, requesting schools to please encourage those who had not completed the questionnaire previously, to please do so as soon as possible. As a result, an additional 48 questionnaires were returned for a total of 119, indicating approximately a 45% response rate.

Classroom teachers, special education teachers, vice-principals and principals at the primary, elementary and high school levels were represented. Tables 2 to 5 show the breakdown of the sample according to gender, age, grade level taught, and current professional title. Because of the relatively small sample of Guidance Counsellors, Educational Therapists and Specialist Teachers, these respondents were excluded from the data analysis. Also, vice-principal and principal questionnaires were grouped together in the analysis of the data to represent the administration category of respondents.

Table 2

Gender of Respondents in Sample

Female	-	75
Male	-	44
Total	-	119

Table 3

Age of Respondents

Age	No.
25 and under	5
26-30	14
31-35	22
36-40	32
41-45	29
46-50	10
51-55	6
	1
Total	119

Tables 2 and 3, respectively, present the gender and age of the participants in this study. Sixty-three percent of the teachers were female and 62 percent of them were between the ages of 36 and 45.

Table 4

Number of Participants by Professional Title

Title	No.
Regular Classroom Teachers	62
Special Education Teachers	39
Vice-Principal	4
Principals	9
Guidance Counsellors	2
Educational Therapist	1
Specialist Teachers	2
Total	119

Approximately 52% of the survey's respondents were Regular Classroom Teachers, 33% were Special Educators, and 11% were school administrators (Principals and Vice Principals).

Table 5

Respondents by Grade Level Taught

Grade Level Taught	No.
Primary	47
Elementary	39
Junior High	35
Senior High	11
K-12	1
Developmental Unit	2
Other (Remedial grade 4, 8/9)	1
Principal - No Teaching Duties	1
Total	137

The total number in Table 5 is accounted for by the fact that a number of respondents selected more than one grade level to indicate the level which they teach.

Nature and Construction of the Instrument Used

This study used a questionnaire of competencies felt to be necessary for various professionals in order to successfully implement Newfoundland's New Special Education Policy. The questionnaire statements were generated from the literature, as well as from consultations held with Department of Education professionals, in the Province of Newfoundland, and interviews held with various professionals from one of the first pilot schools to implement the policy - Upper Gullies Elementary School, Upper Gullies, Newfoundland.

This list of competencies was then categorized under the following headings:

(a) professional knowledge - these competencies refer to the knowledge and understanding, as a professional educator, of the characteristics of special needs children, and the adaptations necessary to effectively teach them.

(b) instructional strategies - reflects the ability to demonstrate maximum flexibility regarding modification and adaptation of teaching strategies, in order to accommodate different learning styles and abilities within the various instructional settings.

(c) assessment - the use and interpretation of various educational assessment devices and procedures appropriate for determining

student strengths, weaknesses, and levels of achievement in various domains of development and learning.

(d) evaluation of student progress - determining, through various and appropriate evaluation criteria, the level of student mastery of individualized program plan objectives; and the ability to use this data to initiate modifications in instructional or programmatic objectives.

(e) communication with parents, colleagues and administrators - engaging in collaborative consultation to disseminate and gather information concerning special need students. This consultation exhibits a willingness and deep commitment on behalf of all involved to work together for the benefit of the child.

(f) goal setting - developing measurable and observable objectives for instruction, based upon results of assessment.

(g) developing a positive classroom environment for special needs students - the ability to develop a positive, accepting classroom and school atmosphere, which fosters constructive interaction between all students.

(h) personal characteristics - individual, personal characteristics, thought to be important traits for any teacher to possess, but specifically for those with special need children in their class.

The initial list of competencies was then anonymously examined by thirteen members perceived to be experts in the field (10 University Professors of Special Education and 3 Special Services

Consultants from the Department of Education who were responsible for providing in-service education to the pilot schools during the policy implementation period).

The basic assumptions for using this group's input in the development of the final questionnaire were that:

(a) expert consensus represents a high probability of an accurate forecast, therefore the items which they agreed upon should indeed accurately identify important competencies,

(b) recognized experts in a field are good predictors of what competencies are important in this instance and therefore should be able to identify essential competencies for this questionnaire, and

(c) anonymity is a valuable feature. These experts were asked anonymously to use their critical reasoning abilities in hopes of improving the reliability of their input (West & Cannon, 1988).

These experts were asked to make the following judgements:

- Determine which competency statements were important for inclusion in the final questionnaire. Ratings included:
    - (1) essential for inclusion.
    - (2) very important.
    - (3) somewhat important, but not essential.
    - (4) not important, should be excluded.
- If the competencies were important for inclusion, were they found under the appropriate competency category. If not,

suggestions were sought as to which category they should be associated with.

- If there were any additional competencies they felt were essential but omitted from the generated list.

Statements with consensus of less than 100% (combining the first two rating categories) were excluded. Of the 181 initial statement items, 118 were retained for the final questionnaire.

Pilot school participants were then asked to rate each questionnaire statement on two Likert Scales. The first scale asked the subjects to rate the statement in terms of its level of importance for professionals in the same role as that of the respondent. The second scale requested the respondent to rate the same statement according to their perceived level of competency in executing that item task.

Reliability

To determine the reliability of this questionnaire, Cronback's 'Alpha' procedure was used. This consistency measure looked at the sum of the variance between questionnaire items within a given category for all returned questionnaires. As there were 16 categories given on this questionnaire (8 for level of importance and 8 for perceived level of competency), 16 reliability coefficients were calculated ranging from .77 to .98, indicating for the most part, very high category reliabilities.

Table 6

Alpha Reliability of Questionnaire Categories

Category	Level of Importance Scale	Perceived Competency Scale
A	.94	.94
B	.95	.95
C	.96	.96
D	.96	.93
E	.98	.97
F	.93	.92
G	.85	.77
H	.95	.92

Validity

Validity refers to the degree to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Noll, Scannell & Craig, 1979). Hopkins and Stanley (1981) point out that the validity of a test can be viewed as the accuracy of specified inferences made from its scores. Inferences pertain to:

1. performance on a universe of items (content validity),
2. performance on some criterion (criterion-related validity), or
3. the degree to which certain psychological traits or constructs are actually represented by test performance (construct-validity) (Hopkins & Stanley, 1981, p. 76).

Content Validity

The process of determining content validity requires careful and critical examination of the questionnaire items in relation to the purpose for the questionnaire.

Content validity was established for this questionnaire in two ways. First, an indepth search for expert opinion took place in the relevant literature to identify potential competencies for the initial questionnaire. Secondly, thirteen expert evaluations of the initial list of generated competency statements was conducted. Experts were asked to rate each statement in terms of its importance for educational professionals to possess in order to implement the Provincial Policy successfully. From their evaluations came the questionnaire items used in this survey.

Criterion-Related Validity

Criterion-related validity is generally based on agreement between the scores on an instrument and some outside measure.

As Cuff (1980) points out, most researchers, when given the choice between self-report or behavioral measures of some phenomenon choose the behavioral measure. If, however, one uses self-report methods, the validity is often determined by utilizing a behavioral measure as the criterion.

Howard, Schmeck and Bray (1979) state that at times behavioral measures are unavailable or difficult to obtain. Such is the case when one attempts to measure self-reports of perceived importance and perceived competency, for example.

Brokenshire (1971) notes that when we use self-reports, the respondents themselves serve as the raters. We assume these raters have an 'internalized' standard for judging the level of function with regard to the particular domain.

Another concern with the measurement of self-reports is that what one agrees or disagrees with on paper is not necessarily a reflection of how he or she really feels (Noll et al., 1979). Although there is no way of determining whether respondents are honestly expressing what they believe, there are some precautions which can be taken to try and avoid socially desirable answers.

The assurance of anonymity, for example, can encourage more valid responses as a probable threat of repercussions may be removed. In other words, a non-threatening environment is supplied by this research instrument, thus hopefully eliminating any inhibitions one might have from answering truthfully.

Although not easily validated, "much of the research suggests that there is a positive correlation in the neighborhood of .50-.60 between scores on self-report scales and actual performance or behavior. This is not a close relationship, but it does indicate a substantial tendency" (Noll et al., 1979, p. 366).

This method of self-reporting was used in this study under the assumption that the participants would be candid and straighforward in their assessments. Although a subjective rating, this is essentially what this study set out to explore.

Construct Validity

"Construct validity is the analysis of test scores in terms of psychological constructs" (cited in Hopkins & Stanley, 1981, p. 105). As such, this type of validity is concerned with the rationale behind

an instrument, rather than its successful prediction. Competencies for implementing the province's policy on Special Education were determined on the theory that:

(a) in order for the various educational professionals to successfully implement the policy, they each should have particular competencies relative to their field of expertise and role in implementation, or

(b) knowledge of characteristics and adaptations to effectively teach special needs students, ability to modify curricula, assessment of student strengths and weaknesses, and collaborative consultation are essential for successful implementation to be experienced, and particularly relevant for certain professionals implementing the policy.

(c) The competencies for this questionnaire were selected from an indepth review of contemporary literature in the field of education, in which theorists and educators identified competencies necessary to effectively integrate special needs students.

Analysis of the Data

From the returned questionnaires demographic information was compiled and questionnaire statements were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlational analysis, analysis of variance, multiple regressions, and cross-tabulations.

All of the questionnaires were coded and analyzed according to year in policy implementation, type of educational professional responding and grade level respondents taught.

As mentioned previously, the questionnaire contained two Likert scales. The first scale, used to determine how important the item was for professionals similar to the respondent, ranged from 1 - very low importance to 5 - very high importance. The second Likert scale, used to determine how competent respondents perceived themselves to be on an item, ranged in scores from, again, 1 - in need of a lot more competency, to 5 - highly competent.

To determine whether respondents felt they were competent on those statements they perceived to be important correlational coefficients were calculated for each statement and its perceived competency rating. From discrepancies found between these ratings, it was hoped objectives for pre- and in-service training needs could be identified for both first, second and third phases of future policy implementors, as well as needs for the various professionals involved in implementing the policy. From there, analysis of variance was used to determine:

1. whether various professionals differed in their view of (a) what competency categories were important for implementing the policy, and (b) how competent they perceived themselves on the various categories.

2. whether the grade level taught by the respondents affected how competent they perceived themselves to be on the various categories.
3. whether policy schools in the first, second and third year of implementation, differed on the categories they felt to be important and competent in.

Student-Newman-Keuls (S-N-K) were used in the anovas to determine significant relationships. S-N-K is a sequential range test for comparing treatment means. As Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Brent (1975) point out, S-N-K's use different range values for different size subsets. It holds the experimentwise error rate to alpha (.05) for each stage of the testing procedure (for tests involving the same number of means). If the range is not significant, no further testing is done and the set of means is declared the same (Steel & Torrie, 1980).

Multiple regressions were conducted also using the variables of 'year in policy implementation', 'professional title', and 'grade level taught'. Here 'grade level taught' data was compressed to achieve 3 levels:

1 - primary and elementary schools.

2 - junior high and senior high.

3 - K-12, developmental units, and others.

These three variables were regressed on each of the sixteen categories.

Those variables found to be significant in the multiple regression, were then analyzed using cross tabulations and the Gamma statistic which measures the strength of the relationship between significant variables. Gamma has the advantage that it is operational in that its meaning is direct. It is simple to compute and it gives a good, though inflated estimate of the relationship between two variables. This is very useful when one wishes to get every possible degree of association out of a cross tabulation (Besag & Besag, 1985).

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the competencies regular classroom teachers, special educators and school administrators in pilot schools in Newfoundland, felt were important for successfully implementing that province's Special Education Policy. The investigation also wished to determine how competent the various respondents perceived themselves to be on those competencies identified as significantly important.

This chapter deals with the various questionnaire statements individually and categorically, according to the various respondents. Descriptive statistics are presented first, followed by category rank ordering; correlational coefficients for statements and categories; analysis of variance, multiple regression and cross-tabulation results.

Item Analysis

Descriptive statistics for each questionnaire item, in addition to each questionnaire category, was computed. A mean of 4 or above was used to suggest high importance and perceived competency, while a mean below 4 suggested slight or low importance and inadequate competency.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Year in Policy Implementation and Type of Professional for each Questionnaire Item by Category According to the Level of Importance

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
A-1	1st yr.	4.029	.453	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.303	.728	3	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.306	.668	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.290	.663	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.263	.601	3	5	38
	Admin.	3.923	.641	3	5	13
A-2	1st yr.	3.714	.710	2	5	35
	2nd yr.	3.794	.914	1	5	34
	3rd yr.	4.028	.878	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.823	.840	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.795	.894	1	5	39
	Admin.	4.231	.725	3	5	13
A-3	1st yr.	4.4	.651	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.441	.613	3	5	34
	3rd yr.	4.278	.779	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.339	.723	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.590	.498	4	5	39
	Admin.	4.231	.725	3	5	13
A-4	1st yr.	4.343	.639	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.441	.613	3	5	34
	3rd yr.	4.472	.654	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.452	.694	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.410	.549	3	5	39
	Admin.	4.385	.506	3	5	13
A-5	1st yr.	4.353	.597	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.294	.676	3	5	34
	3rd yr.	4.528	.609	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.419	.666	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.436	.598	3	5	39
	Admin.	4.417	.515	4	5	12

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge Competencies

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	4.059	.694	3	5	34
A-6	2nd yr.	3.912	.712	2	5	34
	3rd yr.	3.914	.887	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.919	.816	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4	.667	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.846	.899	2	5	13
	1st yr.	3.971	.834	2	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.121	.820	2	5	33
A-7	3rd yr.	4.257	.741	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.950	.852	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	4.395	.679	3	5	38
	Admin.	4	.816	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4	.804	2	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.059	.736	2	5	34
A-8	3rd yr.	4.171	.822	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.984	.820	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.256	.677	3	5	39
	Admin.	4.083	.900	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.229	.646	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.176	.797	3	5	34
A-9	3rd yr.	4.429	.698	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.258	.700	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.333	.737	3	5	39
	Admin.	4.5	.522	4	5	12
	1st yr.	4.257	.657	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.265	.567	3	5	34
A-10	3rd yr.	4.571	.608	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.339	.676	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.513	.556	3	5	39
	Admin.	4.417	.515	4	5	12
	1st yr.	4.059	.649	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.088	.668	3	5	34
A-11	3rd yr.	4.353	.646	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.065	.721	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.297	.661	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.5	.522	4	5	12

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge Competencies

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
A-12	1st yr.	3.794	.729	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	3.676	.878	2	5	34
	3rd yr.	3.545	1.034	1	5	33
	Reg.Ter.	3.656	.947	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.811	.845	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.417	.669	2	4	12
A-13	1st yr.	3.765	.741	2	5	34
	2nd yr.	4	.696	2	5	34
	3rd yr.	4	.750	2	5	33
	Reg.Ter.	3.951	.805	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4	.745	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.833	.389	3	4	12
A-14	1st yr.	4.114	.631	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.118	.640	3	5	34
	3rd yr.	4.314	.631	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.387	.636	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4	.607	3	5	39
	Admin.	4	.426	3	5	12
A-15	1st yr.	4.2	.677	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	3.824	.834	2	5	34
	3rd yr.	4.314	.796	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.210	.813	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.256	.751	2	5	39
	Admin.	3.750	.452	3	4	12
A-16	1st yr.	4.257	.611	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	3.941	.814	2	5	34
	3rd yr.	4.429	.778	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.323	.785	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.308	.694	2	5	39
	Admin.	3.833	.389	3	4	12
A-17	1st yr.	4.171	.568	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.029	.717	2	5	34
	3rd yr.	4.257	.741	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.242	.740	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.308	.569	3	5	39
	Admin.	3.833	.389	3	4	12

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge Competencies

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	4.143	.692	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.147	.558	3	5	34
A-18	3rd yr.	4.472	.560	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.258	.700	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.385	.544	3	5	39
	Admin.	4	.577	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4.171	.664	2	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.235	.606	3	5	34
A-19	3rd yr.	4.472	.560	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.258	.651	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.487	.556	3	5	39
	Admin.	4	.577	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4.029	.618	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.059	.736	2	5	34
A-20	3rd yr.	4.417	.649	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.226	.711	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.308	.569	3	5	39
	Admin.	3.923	.641	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4.029	.514	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.176	.626	3	5	34
A-21	3rd yr.	4.417	.649	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.258	.676	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.359	.486	4	5	39
	Admin.	3.923	.641	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4.2	.719	2	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.118	.64	3	5	34
A-22	3rd yr.	4.278	.741	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.242	.761	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.359	.584	3	5	39
	Admin.	3.923	.641	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.857	.692	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	3.912	.866	2	5	34
A-23	3rd yr.	4.250	.770	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.065	.807	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.231	.706	3	5	39
	Admin.	3.692	.630	3	5	13

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge Competencies

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	3.971	.577	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.029	.627	3	5	34
B-1	3rd yr.	4.114	.676	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.097	.620	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.026	.592	3	5	38
	Admin.	3.917	.669	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.229	.646	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.206	.592	3	5	34
B-2	3rd yr.	4.514	.507	4	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.258	.571	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.436	.552	3	5	39
	Admin.	4.250	.754	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.324	.727	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.206	.592	3	5	34
B-3	3rd yr.	4.429	.608	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.290	.637	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.553	.555	3	5	38
	Admin.	4.083	.669	3	5	12
	1st yr.	3.971	.618	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.032	.875	1	5	31
B-4	3rd yr.	4.333	.692	3	5	33
	Reg.Ter.	4.155	.670	3	5	58
	Spec.Ed.	4.158	.679	3	5	38
	Admin.	4	.632	3	5	11
	1st yr.	4.229	.646	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.182	.846	1	5	33
B-5	3rd yr.	4.5	.615	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.274	.632	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.5	.558	3	5	36
	Admin.	4.273	.786	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.343	.591	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.273	.839	1	5	33
B-6	3rd yr.	4.457	.701	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.274	.632	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.605	.495	4	5	36
	Admin.	4.333	.778	3	5	12

Legend: Category B = Instructional Strategies

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	4.286	.710	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.250	.842	1	5	32
B-7	3rd yr.	4.588	.609	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.344	.680	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.579	.552	3	5	38
	Admin.	4.167	.835	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.324	.535	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.406	.837	1	5	32
B-8	3rd yr.	4.529	.563	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.387	.583	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.5	.507	4	5	26
	Admin.	4.5	.674	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.206	.687	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.219	.659	2	5	32
B-9	3rd yr.	4.364	.603	3	5	33
	Reg.Ter.	4.197	.654	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.429	.502	4	5	35
	Admin.	4.417	.669	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.265	.618	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.091	.879	1	5	33
B-10	3rd yr.	4.543	.561	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.226	.612	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.541	.505	4	5	37
	Admin.	4.417	.669	3	5	12
	1st yr.	3.971	.627	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	3.970	.847	1	5	33
B-11	3rd yr.	4.382	.604	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.210	.631	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.194	.624	3	5	36
	Admin.	3.917	.669	3	5	12
	1st yr.	3.971	.717	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	3.909	.980	1	5	33
B-12	3rd yr.	4.171	.747	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.177	.690	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.973	.799	2	5	37
	Admin.	4.083	.669	3	5	12

Legend: Category B = Instructional Strategies

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	4.206	.592	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.212	.893	1	5	33
B-13	3rd yr.	4.457	.505	4	5	33
	Reg.Ter.	4.323	.621	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.459	.558	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.167	.577	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.176	.626	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.219	.870	1	5	32
B-14	3rd yr.	4.353	.597	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.317	.651	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	4.324	.626	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.426	3	5	12
	1st yr.	3.912	.712	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.063	.914	1	5	32
B-15	3rd yr.	4.371	.646	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.133	.791	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	4.189	.701	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.603	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4	.739	2	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.032	.875	2	5	31
B-16	3rd yr.	4.353	.544	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.150	.732	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	4.250	.732	2	5	36
	Admin.	4	.426	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.114	.676	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.063	.759	2	5	32
C-1	3rd yr.	4	.840	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.033	.816	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.263	.685	3	5	38
	Admin.	3.667	.651	3	5	12
	1st yr.	3.818	.882	2	5	33
	2nd yr.	3.812	.965	1	5	32
C-2	3rd yr.	3.857	.879	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.852	.910	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.028	.845	2	5	36
	Admin.	3.667	.651	3	5	12

Legend: Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	4.147	.744	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.156	.884	1	5	32
C-3	3rd yr.	4.294	.629	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.167	.668	3	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	4.432	.647	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.739	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.412	.701	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.303	.847	2	5	33
C-4	3rd yr.	4.457	.561	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.355	.680	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.541	.605	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.5	.674	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.121	.740	3	5	33
	2nd yr.	3.625	1.185	1	5	32
C-5	3rd yr.	4.176	.797	2	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	3.885	.985	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.143	.912	1	5	34
	Admin.	4.333	.651	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.118	.729	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.121	.696	2	5	33
C-6	3rd yr.	4.353	.774	1	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.230	.739	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.351	.633	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.083	.793	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.029	.747	2	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.125	.833	1	5	32
C-7	3rd yr.	4.235	.606	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.117	.666	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	4.342	.627	3	5	38
	Admin.	3.917	.793	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.088	.668	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.031	.740	2	5	32
C-8	3rd yr.	4.2	.632	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.164	.637	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.135	.713	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.917	.793	3	5	12

Legend: Category C = Assessment

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	4.235	.654	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.156	.628	3	5	32
C-9	3rd yr.	4.4	.651	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.279	.636	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.459	.650	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.833	.718	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4	.816	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.031	.740	3	5	32
C-10	3rd yr.	4.229	.770	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.082	.759	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.216	.787	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.739	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.257	.657	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.188	.644	3	5	32
C-11	3rd yr.	4.429	.655	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.230	.643	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.553	.555	3	5	38
	Admin.	4.083	.669	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.118	.729	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.094	.689	3	5	32
C-12	3rd yr.	4.286	.789	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.131	.741	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.378	.639	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.917	.793	3	5	12
	1st yr.	3.971	.664	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	3.875	.793	2	5	32
C-13	3rd yr.	4.086	.702	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.951	.669	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.079	.673	3	5	38
	Admin.	4.083	.793	2	5	12
	1st yr.	4.2	.632	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.121	.650	3	5	33
C-14	3rd yr.	4.314	.832	1	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.129	.757	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.395	.638	3	5	38
	Admin.	4.333	.492	4	5	12

Legend: Category C = Assessment

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
C-15	1st yr.	4.412	.657	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.281	.683	3	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.343	.725	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.283	.739	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	4.541	.605	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.5	.522	4	5	12
C-16	1st yr.	3.941	.694	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.063	.619	3	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.2	.759	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.016	.719	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.189	.701	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.739	3	5	12
C-17	1st yr.	3.941	.851	2	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.063	.619	3	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.265	.666	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.050	.746	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	4.216	.672	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.739	3	5	12
C-18	1st yr.	4.088	.753	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	3.875	.751	2	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.2	.632	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.049	.717	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.162	.688	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.739	3	5	12
C-19	1st yr.	4.091	.678	3	5	33
	2nd yr.	4.063	.759	2	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.371	.808	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.082	.781	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.444	.607	3	5	36
	Admin.	4.250	.622	3	5	12
D-1	1st yr.	4.206	.641	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	3.970	.883	1	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.2	.584	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.177	.666	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.270	.652	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.083	.289	4	5	12

Legend: Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
D-2	1st yr.	4.382	.652	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.061	.933	1	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.471	.563	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.355	.680	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.472	.560	3	5	36
	Admin.	4.333	.492	4	5	12
D-3	1st yr.	4.257	.657	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	3.969	.999	1	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.2	.797	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.164	.711	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.289	.732	2	5	38
	Admin.	4.250	.622	3	5	12
D-4	1st yr.	4.294	.629	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.125	.871	1	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.371	.598	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.311	.696	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.378	.594	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.333	.492	4	5	12
D-5	1st yr.	4.2	.632	3	5	35
	2nd yr.	4.125	.871	1	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.4	.604	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.279	.636	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.421	.599	3	5	38
	Admin.	4.083	.669	3	5	12
D-6	1st yr.	4.235	.699	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.094	.856	1	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.286	.710	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.230	.739	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.324	.626	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.167	.577	3	5	12
D-7	1st yr.	4.147	.821	2	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.031	.897	1	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.086	.781	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.131	.866	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.216	.672	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.083	.515	3	5	12

Legend: Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress

Questionnaire Item	Category	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
E-1	1st yr.	4.182	.635	3	5	33
	2nd yr.	3.909	.805	2	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.139	.867	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.855	.827	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.405	.644	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.167	.577	3	5	12
E-2	1st yr.	4.303	.637	3	5	33
	2nd yr.	4.125	.660	3	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.333	.676	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.180	.695	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.405	.599	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.417	.515	4	5	12
E-3	1st yr.	4.088	.570	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.030	.684	3	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.306	.710	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.113	.704	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.297	.618	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.231	.439	4	5	13
E-4	1st yr.	4.265	.666	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.250	.762	3	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.389	.688	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.164	.734	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.568	.603	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.462	.519	4	5	13
E-5	1st yr.	4.206	.479	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.125	.660	3	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.389	.599	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.213	.609	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.432	.555	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.231	.439	4	5	13
E-6	1st yr.	4.176	.521	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.031	.782	2	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.333	.717	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.131	.718	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.324	.580	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.308	.480	4	5	13

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	4.176	.626	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.063	.716	2	5	32
E-7	3rd yr.	4.472	.560	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.197	.654	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.459	.558	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.154	.555	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4.118	.537	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	3.937	.948	1	5	32
E-8	3rd yr.	4.139	.867	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.082	.759	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.162	.834	1	5	37
	Admin.	4.154	.555	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4.088	.668	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	4.188	.644	3	5	32
E-9	3rd yr.	4.333	.676	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.164	.711	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.324	.626	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.231	.599	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.971	.797	1	5	34
	2nd yr.	3.719	1.085	1	5	32
E-10	3rd yr.	4	.926	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.934	.910	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.973	.897	1	5	37
	Admin.	4.077	.760	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4.086	.702	2	5	35
	2nd yr.	3.813	.780	2	5	32
E-11	3rd yr.	4.194	.786	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.016	.826	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.289	.654	3	5	38
	Admin.	4.077	.494	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4.088	.753	3	5	34
	2nd yr.	3.844	.723	2	5	32
E-12	3rd yr.	4.028	.878	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.836	.800	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.270	.732	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.707	3	5	13

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
C-3	1st yr.	3.559	.786	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.531	.718	2	4	32
	3rd yr.	3.706	.871	1	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	3.35	.880	1	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.838	.727	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.25	1.138	1	5	12
C-4	1st yr.	3.794	.770	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.879	.650	3	5	33
	3rd yr.	3.857	.772	2	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	3.726	.926	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.811	.66	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.833	.718	3	5	12
C-5	1st yr.	3.121	.770	1	5	33
	2nd yr	3.879	.650	1	4	32
	3rd yr.	3.857	.772	1	5	33
	Reg.Ter.	3.726	.926	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.811	.66	1	5	34
	Admin.	3.833	.718	2	4	12
C-6	1st yr.	3.324	.878	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.394	.747	2	5	33
	3rd yr.	3.371	.910	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.194	.902	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.514	.837	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.333	.778	2	4	12
C-7	1st yr.	3.294	.836	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.364	.742	2	5	33
	3rd yr.	3.394	.827	1	5	33
	Reg.Ter.	3.18	.958	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.528	.736	2	5	36
	Admin.	3.083	.793	2	5	12
C-8	1st yr.	3.206	.808	1	5	34
	2nd yr	3.242	.792	1	4	33
	3rd yr.	3.343	.906	1	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.210	1.010	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.081	.862	1	5	37
	Admin.	3.25	.622	3	5	12

Legend: Category C = Assessment

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	3.545	.564	3	5	33
	2nd yr	3.545	.711	2	5	33
C-9	3rd yr.	3.657	.906	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.452	.970	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.583	.692	2	5	36
	Admin.	3.25	.666	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.529	.825	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.531	.803	2	5	32
C-10	3rd yr.	3.857	.912	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.393	1.037	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.730	.838	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.583	.793	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.606	.788	1	5	33
	2nd yr	3.625	.751	2	5	32
C-11	3rd yr.	3.914	.951	1	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.344	1.031	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.056	.583	3	5	36
	Admin.	3.583	.9	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.265	.963	1	5	34
	2nd yr	3.344	.865	1	5	32
C-12	3rd yr.	3.6	.881	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.016	1.057	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.703	.702	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.417	.793	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.441	.786	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.394	.704	2	5	33
C-13	3rd yr.	3.371	.843	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.113	.851	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.541	.767	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.583	.669	3	5	12
	1st yr.	3.588	.783	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.645	.661	2	5	31
C-14	3rd yr.	3.771	.843	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.4	.924	1	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.838	.688	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.75	.622	3	5	12

Legend: Category C = Assessment

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	3.647	.849	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.563	.564	3	5	32
C-15	3rd yr.	3.686	.823	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.4	.942	1	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.757	.723	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.667	.778	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.353	.950	1	5	34
	2nd yr	3.394	.747	2	5	33
C-16	3rd yr.	3.629	.942	1	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.194	1.038	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.595	.865	1	5	37
	Admin.	3.333	.888	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.353	.884	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.455	.711	2	5	33
C-17	3rd yr.	3.559	.960	1	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	3.113	.994	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.694	.624	3	5	36
	Admin.	3.333	1.155	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.441	.860	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.606	.659	2	5	33
C-18	3rd yr.	3.914	.658	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.594	.858	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.676	.626	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.417	.996	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.212	.960	1	5	33
	2nd yr	3.656	.827	2	5	32
C-19	3rd yr.	3.914	.887	1	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.279	1.113	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.778	.76	3	5	36
	Admin.	3.83	1.03	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.455	.711	2	5	33
	2nd yr	3.697	.770	2	5	33
D-1	3rd yr.	3.886	.758	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.468	.936	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.778	.722	2	5	36
	Admin.	3.417	.996	2	5	12

Legend: Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress

Questionnaire Item	Category	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
D-2	1st yr.	3.853	.657	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.818	.584	3	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.147	.702	2	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	3.871	.778	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.028	.506	3	5	36
	Admin.	3.583	.793	2	5	12
D-3	1st yr.	3.853	.744	2	5	34
	2nd yr	4.065	.442	3	5	31
	3rd yr.	4.171	.664	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.836	.763	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.135	.585	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.833	.835	2	5	12
D-4	1st yr.	3.824	.758	2	5	34
	2nd yr	4.030	.521	3	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.114	.676	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.758	.9	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.108	.567	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.917	.793	2	5	12
D-5	1st yr.	3.706	.760	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.697	.684	2	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.143	.601	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.694	.898	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4	.527	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.667	.778	2	5	12
D-6	1st yr.	3.765	.781	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.788	.600	3	5	33
	3rd yr.	3.857	.912	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.629	.927	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.919	.682	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.583	.793	2	5	12
D-7	1st yr.	3.818	.727	2	5	33
	2nd yr	3.938	.504	3	5	32
	3rd yr.	3.829	.822	1	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.705	.937	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.944	.532	3	5	36
	Admin.	3.75	.866	2	5	12

Legend: Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	3.294	.938	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.212	.740	2	4	33
E-1	3rd yr.	3.611	.964	1	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.048	.982	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.676	.915	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.385	.87	2	5	13
	1st yr.	3.853	.702	3	5	34
	2nd yr	3.906	.530	3	5	32
E-2	3rd yr.	4.056	.715	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.705	.803	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.081	.595	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.077	.76	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.794	.687	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.576	.708	2	5	33
E-3	3rd yr.	3.944	.924	1	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.532	.9	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.054	.621	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.846	.689	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.794	.687	3	5	34
	2nd yr	3.844	.574	3	5	32
E-4	3rd yr.	4	.862	1	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.689	.765	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4	.667	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.707	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.588	.892	1	5	34
	2nd yr	3.813	.535	3	5	32
E-5	3rd yr.	3.972	.654	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.623	.82	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.919	.64	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.923	.76	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.794	.687	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.636	.822	2	5	33
E-6	3rd yr.	4.028	.910	1	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.563	.952	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.108	.516	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.846	.987	2	5	13

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	3.765	.606	3	5	34
	2nd yr	3.875	.660	2	5	32
E-7	3rd yr.	4.028	.810	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.656	.854	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.054	.575	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.846	.899	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.912	.688	3	5	34
	2nd yr	4.031	.538	3	5	32
E-8	3rd yr.	3.806	.822	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.803	.792	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.919	.722	2	5	37
	Admin.	4	.707	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.853	.657	3	5	34
	2nd yr	4.125	.554	3	5	32
E-9	3rd yr.	4.028	.736	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.934	.75	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.946	.667	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.154	.689	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.618	.817	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.844	.574	2	5	32
E-10	3rd yr.	3.889	.820	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.7	.869	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.784	.672	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.923	.76	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.500	.862	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.719	.683	2	5	32
E-11	3rd yr.	3.889	.887	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.459	.941	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.973	.687	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.769	.832	2	5	13
	1st yr.	3.529	.788	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.781	.659	2	5	32
E-12	3rd yr.	3.943	.873	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.483	.873	1	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.919	.759	2	5	37
	Admin.	4.077	.76	3	5	13

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others

Questionnaire Item Category	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
1st yr.	3.588	.783	2	5	34
2nd yr	3.875	.609	3	5	32
E-13 3rd yr.	4	.793	2	5	36
Reg.Ter.	3.574	.939	1	5	61
Spec.Ed.	3.973	.6	3	5	37
Admin.	4.154	.801	3	5	13
1st yr.	3.545	.833	1	5	33
2nd yr	3.719	.772	2	5	32
E-14 3rd yr.	3.917	.906	2	5	36
Reg.Ter.	3.410	.920	1	5	61
Spec.Ed.	3.944	.754	2	5	36
Admin.	4.077	.76	3	5	13
1st yr.	3.758	.614	3	5	33
2nd yr	3.935	.629	3	5	31
E-15 3rd yr.	4.083	.692	2	5	36
Reg.Ter.	3.724	.72	2	5	58
Spec.Ed.	4.081	.547	3	5	37
Admin.	4.077	.76	3	5	13
1st yr.	3.676	.727	2	5	34
2nd yr	3.813	.780	2	5	32
E-16 3rd yr.	3.861	.798	2	5	36
Reg.Ter.	3.583	.809	2	5	60
Spec.Ed.	3.892	.699	2	5	37
Admin.	4.077	.862	3	5	13
1st yr.	3.912	.793	2	5	34
2nd yr	4.031	.647	3	5	32
E-17 3rd yr.	4.111	.622	3	5	36
Reg.Ter.	3.951	.74	3	5	61
Spec.Ed.	4	.667	2	5	37
Admin.	4.077	.76	3	5	13
1st yr.	3.303	.918	2	5	33
2nd yr	3.375	.833	1	5	32
E-18 3rd yr.	3.618	.888	2	5	34
Reg.Ter.	3.153	.979	1	5	59
Spec.Ed.	3.629	.808	2	5	35
Admin.	3.615	.961	2	5	13

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others

Questionnaire Item Category	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
1st yr.	3.667	.736	2	5	33
2nd yr	3.806	.703	2	5	31
E-19 3rd yr.	3.611	.838	2	5	36
Reg.Ter.	3.475	.924	1	5	61
Spec.Ed.	3.829	.568	3	5	35
Admin.	4	.707	3	5	13
1st yr.	3.588	.701	2	5	34
2nd yr	3.516	.811	2	5	31
E-20 3rd yr.	3.611	.964	1	5	36
Reg.Ter.	3.426	1.040	1	5	61
Spec.Ed.	3.639	.683	2	5	36
Admin.	3.462	.877	2	5	13
1st yr.	2.656	1.153	1	5	32
2nd yr	2.688	1.176	1	5	32
E-21 3rd yr.	2.765	1.130	1	5	34
Reg.Ter.	2.439	1..02	1	5	57
Spec.Ed.	2.771	1.215	1	5	35
Admin.	3.321	1.092	1	5	13
1st yr.	3.294	.906	1	5	34
2nd yr	3.121	.893	1	4	33
E-22 3rd yr.	3.389	.903	1	5	36
Reg.Ter.	3.065	.956	1	5	62
Spec.Ed.	3.324	.973	1	5	37
Admin.	3.615	.87	1	4	13
1st yr.	3.353	.812	1	5	34
2nd yr	3.419	.923	1	5	31
E-23 3rd yr.	3.444	.809	2	5	36
Reg.Ter.	3.183	.873	1	5	60
Spec.Ed.	3.417	.996	1	5	36
Admin.	3.769	.599	3	5	13
1st yr.	3.0	1.044	1	5	34
2nd yr	3.188	.931	1	5	32
E-24 3rd yr.	3.294	1.001	1	5	34
Reg.Ter.	2.883	1.059	1	5	60
Spec.Ed.	3.306	.951	1	5	36
Admin.	2.923	1.115	1	5	13

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others

Questionnaire Item Category	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
1st yr.	3.441	.746	2	5	34
2nd yr	3.563	.619	2	4	32
E-25 3rd yr.	3.471	.992	1	5	34
Reg.Ter.	3.316	.848	1	5	57
Spec.Ed.	3.622	.721	2	5	31
Admin.	3.308	1.109	1	5	13
1st yr.	3.235	.855	2	5	34
2nd yr	3.594	.665	2	5	32
E-26 3rd yr.	3.735	.828	1	5	34
Reg.Ter.	3.153	.687	1	5	59
Spec.Ed.	3.703	.740	2	5	37
Admin.	3.692	.947	2	5	13
1st yr.	3.206	.914	2	5	34
2nd yr	3.452	.768	2	5	31
E-27 3rd yr.	3.553	.860	2	5	34
Reg.Ter.	3.224	.899	1	5	58
Spec.Ed.	3.324	.747	2	5	37
Admin.	3.692	1.109	2	5	13
1st yr.	3.529	.615	2	5	34
2nd yr	3.875	.660	2	5	32
E-28 3rd yr.	3.914	.887	1	5	35
Reg.Ter.	3.483	.892	1	5	60
Spec.Ed.	3.892	.658	3	5	37
Admin.	3.923	.954	1		13
1st yr.	3.882	.640	3	5	34
2nd yr	4.094	.588	3	5	32
E-29 3rd yr.	4.057	.765	2	5	35
Reg.Ter.	3.867	.791	2	5	60
Spec.Ed.	4.054	.621	3	5	37
Admin.	4.154	.689	3	5	13
1st yr.	3.545	.711	2	5	33
2nd yr	3.531	.803	1	5	32
E-30 3rd yr.	3.618	.817	2	5	34
Reg.Ter.	3.345	.849	1	5	58
Spec.Ed.	3.649	.919	1	5	37
Admin.	3.692	.63	3	5	13

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	3.406	.837	2	5	32
	2nd yr	3.781	.608	3	5	32
E-31	3rd yr.	3.875	.707	3	5	32
	Reg.Ter.	3.5	.77	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.875	.793	2	5	32
	Admin.	3.846	.689	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.559	.746	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.656	.653	2	5	32
E-32	3rd yr.	3.457	.817	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.317	.93	1	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.595	.798	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.692	.63	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.559	.927	1	5	34
	2nd yr	3.636	.822	2	5	33
F-1	3rd yr.	3.676	.976	1	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	3.492	1.01	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.811	.877	1	5	37
	Admin.	3.25	.866	2	5	12
	1st yr.	3.559	.927	1	5	34
	2nd yr	3.781	.706	2	5	32
F-2	3rd yr.	4.029	.647	3	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	3.517	1.017	1	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.973	.726	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.583	.669	3	5	12
	1st yr.	3.667	.854	2	5	33
	2nd yr	3.656	.701	2	5	32
F-3	3rd yr.	3.743	.852	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.424	.951	1	5	59
	Spec.Ed.	3.892	.737	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.462	.877	2	5	13
	1st yr.	3.559	.860	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.594	.837	2	5	32
F-4	3rd yr.	3.629	.910	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.35	1.022	1	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.730	1.804	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.385	.87	2	5	13

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	3.588	.892	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.485	.906	2	5	33
F-5	3rd yr.	3.543	1.067	1	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.295	.989	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.865	.822	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.077	1.115	1	5	13
	1st yr.	4.031	.647	3	5	32
	2nd yr	3.931	.593	3	5	29
F-6	3rd yr.	4.063	.619	2	5	32
	Reg.Ter.	3.807	.743	2	5	57
	Spec.Ed.	4.235	.496	3	5	34
	Admin.	3.727	.647	3	5	11
	1st yr.	3.971	.758	2	5	34
	2nd yr	4.152	.566	3	5	33
G-1	3rd yr.	4.147	.784	2	5	34
	Reg.Ter.	4.097	.74	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.135	.673	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.727	.786	2	5	11
	1st yr.	3.882	.640	2	5	34
	2nd yr	4.161	.583	3	5	31
G-2	3rd yr.	3.971	.857	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.049	.74	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4	.667	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.75	.622	3	5	12
	1st yr.	3.971	.674	2	5	34
	2nd yr	4.063	.669	3	5	32
G-3	3rd yr.	4	.767	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.0	.796	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.027	.6	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.833	.577	3	5	12
	1st yr.	4.176	.459	3	5	34
	2nd yr	4.156	.628	3	5	32
G-4	3rd yr.	4.029	.707	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.098	.7	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.108	.516	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.603	3	5	12

Legend: Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
G-5	1st yr.	4.353	.710	1	5	34
	2nd yr	3.939	.747	2	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.029	.664	3	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	4.145	.956	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.027	.645	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.426	3		12
H-1	1st yr.	4.088	.621	3	5	34
	2nd yr	4.182	.528	3	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.278	.615	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.161	.682	2	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.189	.569	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.577	3	5	13
H-2	1st yr.	4.118	.591	3	5	34
	2nd yr	4.273	.517	3	5	33
	3rd yr.	4.333	.535	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.161	.606	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.297	.463	4	5	37
	Admin.	4.154	.555	3	5	13
H-3	1st yr.	3.765	.606	3	5	34
	2nd yr	3.871	.619	3	5	31
	3rd yr.	3.857	.692	2	5	35
	Reg.Ter.	3.867	.7	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.778	.591	3	5	36
	Admin.	3.923	.76	3		13
H-4	1st yr.	3.848	.712	2	5	33
	2nd yr	3.935	.629	3	5	31
	3rd yr.	3.944	.715	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.95	.746	2	5	60
	Spec.Ed.	3.191	.595	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.917	.793	3	5	12
H-5	1st yr.	4.088	.570	3	5	34
	2nd yr	4.187	.644	3	5	32
	3rd yr.	4.389	.645	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.246	.675	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.270	.508	3	5	37
	Admin.	4.154	.801	3	5	13

Legend: Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

Questionnaire Item Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
	1st yr.	3.735	.710	1	5	34
	2nd yr	4	.622	3	5	32
H-6	3rd yr.	4.194	.577	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.918	.759	1	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.081	.433	3	5	37
	Admin.	4	.816	3	5	13
	1st yr.	3.5	.826	1	5	34
	2nd yr	3.697	.728	2	5	33
H-7	3rd yr.	3.833	.697	2	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.661	.788	1	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	3.678	.709	2	5	37
	Admin.	3.768	.927	2	5	13
	1st yr.	3.853	.702	2	5	34
	2nd yr	3.75	.622	3	5	32
H-8	3rd yr.	3.806	.668	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	3.803	.679	2	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	3.811	.701	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.769	.599	3		13
	1st yr.	4.029	.674	3	5	34
	2nd yr	4.121	.60	3	5	33
H-9	3rd yr.	4.306	.577	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.113	.630	3	5	62
	Spec.Ed.	4.297	.618	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.846	.689	3	5	13
	1st yr.	4.235	.606	3	5	34
	2nd yr	4.25	.568	3	5	32
H-10	3rd yr.	4.333	.586	3	5	36
	Reg.Ter.	4.213	.609	3	5	61
	Spec.Ed.	4.378	.545	3	5	37
	Admin.	3.231	.725	3	5	13

Legend: Category H = Personal Characteristics

When one calculates the percentages for scores with means between 3.5 and 5, which would indicate, using the rounding procedure, areas of adequate competency, we find the following results for perceived competency:

- First year pilot schools felt competent on 60% of the questionnaire items.
- Second year pilot schools felt competent on 70% of questionnaire items.
- Third year pilot schools felt competent on 77% of questionnaire items.
- Regular classroom teachers felt competent on 47% of questionnaire items.
- Special Education teachers felt competent on 77% of questionnaire items.
- Administrators felt competent on 65% of questionnaire items.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Year in Policy Implementation and Professional Title According to Questionnaire Categories for Importance and Perceived Competency

Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
A - Imp	1st	94.394	9.549	75	115	33
	2nd	94.500	11.562	64	115	32
Minimum	3rd	98.484	11.419	67	115	31
Score	Reg.Ter.	96.083	12.723	64	115	60
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	98.706	8.307	86	115	34
= 23	Admin.	71.727	6.798	82	102	11
Maximum Score Obtainable = 115						
B - Imp	1st	66.441	7.225	48	80	34
	2nd	67.893	10.064	28	80	28
Minimum	3rd	71.258	6.593	54	80	31
Score	Reg.Ter.	68.268	7.494	48	80	56
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	70.257	5.736	58	80	35
= 16	Admin.	66.545	9.213	48	80	11
Maximum Score Obtainable = 80						
C - Imp	1st	78.323	10.913	57	95	31
	2nd	77.065	11.054	49	95	31
Minimum	3rd	80.882	9.942	49	95	34
Score	Reg.Ter.	78.508	10.482	49	95	59
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	82.455	9.827	57	95	33
= 19	Admin.	77.083	9.746	63	95	12
Maximum Score Obtainable = 95						

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
IMP = Likert Scale for Level of Importance

Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
D - Imp	1st	29.735	4.266	21	35	34
	2nd	28.375	5.999	7	35	32
Minimum	3rd	30	3.693	20	35	34
Score	Reg.Ter.	29.656	4.509	20	35	61
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	30.389	3.728	21	35	36
= 7	Admin.	29.333	2.674	27	35	12
Maximum Score Obtainable = 35						
E - Imp	1st	131.875	16.484	98	160	32
	2nd	112.667	22.417	82	160	30
Minimum	3rd	133.281	17.811	92	160	32
Score	Reg.Ter.	128.423	19.931	88	160	52
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	134.200	17.832	88	160	35
= 32	Admin.	133.167	13.966	114	160	12
Maximum Score Obtainable = 160						
F - Imp	1st	24.938	4.016	15	30	32
	2nd	24.345	4.125	17	30	29
Minimum	3rd	26.032	3.401	17	30	31
Score	Reg.Ter.	24.877	3.991	15	30	57
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	26.324	3.319	18	30	34
= 6	Admin.	23.909	3.727	18	30	11
Maximum Score Obtainable = 30						
G - Imp	1st	22.559	3.135	15	25	34
	2nd	21.375	3.554	13	25	32
Minimum	3rd	22.686	2.323	18	25	35
Score	Reg.Ter.	22.295	3.051	15	25	61
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	22.595	2.803	14	25	37
= 5	Admin.	21.750	2.417	20	25	12
Maximum Score Obtainable = 25						

Legend: Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
IMP = Likert Scale for Level of Importance

Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
H - Imp	1st	43.667	4.967	30	50	33
	2nd	41.938	5.622	30	50	32
Minimum	3rd	45.194	4.892	30	50	36
Score	Reg.Ter.	43.082	5.877	30	50	61
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	44.973	4.839	30	50	37
= 10	Admin.	44.417	4.542	39	50	12
Maximum Score Obtainable = 50						
A - Comp	1st	71.515	11.402	50	94	33
	2nd	74.161	10.982	51	103	31
Minimum	3rd	78.406	14.869	31	108	32
Score	Reg.Ter.	69.895	16.039	31	108	57
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	77.257	11.213	50	98	35
= 23	Admin.	72.909	9.690	61	88	11
Maximum Score Obtainable = 115						
B - Comp	1st	56.333	10.508	23	75	33
	2nd	59.321	8.731	41	78	28
Minimum	3rd	62.071	9.451	39	78	28
Score	Reg.Ter.	57.944	12.927	23	78	54
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	59.353	7.442	45	74	34
= 16	Admin.	55.100	8.439	40	63	10
Maximum Score Obtainable = 80						
C - Comp	1st	64.800	12.856	43	95	30
	2nd	66.483	8.266	48	79	29
Minimum	3rd	67.844	12.319	41	92	32
Score	Reg.Ter.	61.982	14.261	21	90	57
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	69.767	10.868	51	95	30
= 19	Admin.	64.500	11.564	51	92	12
Maximum Score Obtainable = 95						

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category H = Personal Characteristics
IMP = Likert Scale for Level of Importance
COMP = Likert Scale for Level of Perceived Competency

Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
D - Comp	1st	26.394	4.337	15	33	33
	2nd	27.129	3.284	21	35	31
Minimum	3rd	28.206	3.391	17	35	34
Score	Reg.Ter.	26.049	5.274	10	35	61
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	28.114	2.720	21	33	35
= 7	Admin.	25.750	4.789	15	35	12
Maximum Score Obtainable = 35						
E - Comp	1st	115.3	18.299	81	160	30
	2nd	119.852	14.149	93	145	27
Minimum	3rd	119.161	18.889	66	157	31
Score	Reg.Ter.	112.020	20.679	58	156	49
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	122.133	15.956	81	160	30
= 32	Admin.	121.923	19.350	90	157	13
Maximum Score Obtainable = 160						
F - Comp	1st	22.065	4.090	15	30	31
	2nd	22.103	3.867	14	29	29
Minimum	3rd	22.581	4.072	14	30	31
Score	Reg.Ter.	21.091	4.808	8	30	55
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	23.206	3.616	14	30	34
= 6	Admin.	20.636	4.411	15	30	11
Maximum Score Obtainable = 30						
G - Comp	1st	20.353	2.868	12	25	34
	2nd	20.767	2.542	16	25	30
Minimum	3rd	20.294	3	15	25	34
Score	Reg.Ter.	20.517	2.694	12	25	60
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	20.297	2.581	16	25	37
= 5	Admin.	19.636	1.963	16	24	11
Maximum Score Obtainable = 25						

Legend: Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
COMP = Likert Scale for Level of Perceived Competency

Category		Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Valid Number
H - Comp	1st	39.242	5.244	26	50	33
	2nd	40.533	4.240	34	50	30
Minimum	3rd	41.257	4.693	31	50	35
Score	Reg.Ter.	40.220	5.443	26	50	59
Obtainable	Spec.Ed.	40.667	3.680	35	50	36
= 10	Admin.	39.750	6.426	30	50	12
Maximum Score Obtainable = 50						

Legend: Category H = Personal Characteristics
COMP = Likert Scale for Level of Perceived Competency

Table 9 presents the descriptive statistics for each category on the questionnaire. The interpretation of these category means is best seen through the rank orderings of each category as presented in Tables 10 and 11.

Table 10

Rank Ordering of Category Means for Level of Importance According to Year in Policy Implementation and Type of Professional

Variable	Most Impt. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Least Impt. 8
	Rank Order							
1st yr. Pilot Sch.	4.505 G	4.351 H	4.246 D	4.157 F	4.149 B	4.116 E	4.111 C	4.093 A
2nd yr. Pilot Sch.	4.272 G	4.187 H	4.144 B	4.093 A	4.055 C	4.054 D	4.037 F	3.919 E
3rd yr. Pilot Sch.	4.525 G	4.519 H	4.404 B	4.297 F	4.288 D	4.281 A	4.247 C	4.195 E
Reg. Ter.	4.456 G	4.304 H	4.238 B	4.235 D	4.170 A	4.143 F	4.110 C	3.904 E
Spec. Educ.	4.513 G	4.487 H	4.393 F	4.381 E	4.35 B	4.339 D	4.309 C	4.265 A
Admin.	4.423 H	4.328 G	4.190 D	4.158 B	4.146 E	4.057 C	4.029 A	3.900 F
Overall Rankings	G 4.433	H 4.379	B 4.242	D 4.225	A 4.1552	F 4.1545	C 4.148	E 4.110

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

Table 11

Rank Ordering of Category Means for Level of Perceived Competency According to Year in Policy Implementation and Type of Professional

Variable	Most Comp. 1	2	3	Rank Order 4	5	6	7	Least Comp. 8
1st yr. Pilot Sch.	4.071 G	3.926 H	3.753 D	3.661 F	3.545 E	3.501 B	3.396 C	3.106 A
2nd yr. Pilot Sch.	4.094 G	4.040 H	3.862 D	3.681 F	3.669 E	3.585 B	3.439 C	3.220 A
3rd yr. Pilot Sch.	4.127 H	4.035 G	4.021 D	3.878 B	3.781 F	3.768 E	3.573 C	3.390 A
Reg. Ter.	4.078 G	4.001 H	3.709 D	3.603 B	3.481 F	3.446 E	3.238 C	3.028 A
Spec. Educ.	4.059 G	3.997 H	3.987 D	3.918 F	3.780 E	3.692 B	3.618 C	3.348 A
Admin.	3.976 H	3.860 G	3.813 E	3.679 D	3.571 B	3.414 F	3.395 C	3.200 A
Overall Rankings	G 4.033	H 4.011	D 3.835	E 3.670	F 3.656	B 3.638	C 3.443	A 3.215

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

The rank ordering of the questionnaire category means shows that there seems to be major agreement among all respondent types that Categories G (Personal Characteristics) and H (Developing A Positive Classroom Environment For Special Need Students) are the two most important areas in the implementation of the new policy. In addition, all respondents perceived themselves to be more competent in these two areas than any of the others.

Comparison of the rank ordering of importance and perceived competency category means also shows that while schools in their first and second year of policy implementation, along with regular classroom teachers and administrators, felt Category C (Assessment) to be very important, they perceived themselves to be somewhat less than adequate in that area, receiving mean category scores for perceived competency of 3.396, 3.439, 3.238 and 3.395, respectively.

All respondent types felt Category A (Professional Knowledge Competencies) to be very important for successfully implementing the policy; however, they all felt somewhat less than adequate in their perceived competency. Although Category A received a mean score indicating high importance, attention is drawn to the fact that some respondent types, for example those in their first year of policy implementation and special education

teachers, ranked this category as their eighth, or lowest choice. If one, however, calculates the difference between the respondents' highest and lowest choice rankings, you find very small variance - approximately a mean difference of .4. Thus, one is still able to generalize that Category A is indeed still of high importance. While all respondent types felt Category F (Goal Setting) to be of high importance, both regular classroom teachers and administrators felt themselves to be only somewhat competent in that area.

Regular classroom teachers also agreed with all other respondent types that Category E (Communication With Parents, Colleagues and Administrators) was of high importance for implementation; however, they were the only group of respondents who felt they were only somewhat competent in this area.

Significant Relationships Between Importance of Questionnaire Statements and Level of Perceived Competency

Tables 12 to 15 show questionnaire statements which are significantly related in terms of degree of importance and level of perceived competency for the various respondent types. The tables first present the individual questionnaire items and the significant relationships between importance and competency and then, in Tables 14

and 15, significant relationships are presented for questionnaire categories according to respondent types.

Table 12

Correlation Coefficients for Questionnaire Items which are Statistically Significant for First, Second, and Third Year Pilot Schools for Statement Importance and Level of Competency

Ques. Item Category/ Item No.	1st Year r	1st Year N	1st Year p	2nd Year r	2nd Year N	2nd Year p	3rd Year r	3rd Year N	3rd Year p
A-1	.2953	51	.018	.5038	36	.001			
A-2	.4031	51	.001	.3961	37	.008			
A-3				.4719	37	.002			
A-4	.3198	51	.011						
A-5	.2955	50	.019	.2843	37	.044			
A-6	.2437	51	.042	.6301	36	.000	.4512	27	.009
A-7	.4092	51	.001	.6272	35	.000	.6757	28	.000
A-8				.3338	37	.002			
A-9	.3193	51	.011	.4564	37	.002			
A-10									
A-11	.2464	51	.041						
A-12	.3120	51	.013	.4599	36	.002			
A-13				.3921	36	.009			
A-14				.3570	37	.015			
A-15				.4550	37	.002			
A-16				.5161	37	.001			
A-17				.3146	37	.029			
A-18				.3960	37	.008			
A-19									
A-20				.3874	37	.009			
A-21				.3866	37	.009			
A-22				.3119	37	.030			

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge

Ques. Item Category/ Item No.	1st Year r	1st Year N	1st Year p	2nd Year r	2nd Year N	2nd Year p	3rd Year r	3rd Year N	3rd Year p
A-23				.3129	37	.030			
B-1				.2911	36	.043			
B-2				.3470	36	.019			
B-3	.2965	51	.017	.4287	36	.005			
B-4	.4530	49	.001	.5443	34	.001			
B-5	.3000	51	.016	.5278	34	.001			
B-6	.3061	51	.014	.5142	35	.001			
B-7				.3986	31	.013			
B-8				.6281	34	.000	.4427	26	.012
B-9	.3958	51	.002	.5869	34	.000	.3433	26	.043
B-10	.4507	50	.001	.5725	35	.000			
B-11	.2766	51	.025	.5390	35	.000			
B-12	.2766	51	.015	.6355	35	.000			
B-13				.4905	35	.001			
B-14				.5523	34	.000			
B-15				.3572	34	.019			
B-16	.4942	50	.000	.4721	33	.003	.3485	26	.041
C-1	.3074	51	.015	.6503	34	.000			
C-2	.2513	49	.041	.3418	34	.024			
C-3	.5576	50	.000	.5178	33	.001			
C-4				.3530	35	.019			
C-5	.3431	48	.008						
C-6				.3257	34	.030			
C-7	.3407	51	.007						
C-8				.4828	34	.002			

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment

Ques. Item Category/ Item No.	1st Year r	1st Year N	1st Year p	2nd Year r	2nd Year N	2nd Year p	3rd Year r	3rd Year N	3rd Year p
C-9				.4208	34	.007			
C-10	.3568	51	.005						
C-11	.3351	50	.009						
C-12	.2789	51	.024	.4948	34	.001			
C-13	.5322	51	.000	.3858	34	.012	.3829	28	.022
C-14	.2809	49	.025	.5302	35	.001			
C-15	.4069	51	.014						
C-16	.3079	51	.014	.4526	34	.004			
C-17	.4839	51	.000						
C-18									
C-19	.5364	50	.000	.3068	34	.039	.4039	28	.017
D-1	.4213	50	.001	.3663	35	.015			
D-2	.4272	51	.001	.3538	35	.019			
D-3				.3371	33	.028			
D-4	.2889	51	.020						
D-5	.3453	51	.007	.3887	34	.012			
D-6	.3347	51	.008	.5078	34	.001			
D-7	.4374	50	.029	.3761	34	.014	.3587	28	.030
E-1	.2698	50	.029	.5839	36	.000			
E-2	.3760	50	.004						
E-3	.3299	51	.009	.5712	36	.000			
E-4				.5474	35	.000			
E-5				.4749	35	.002			
E-6	.2996	51	.016	.4393	35	.004			
E-7				.4686	35	.002			

Legend: Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others

Ques. Item Category/ Item No.	1st Year r	1st Year N	1st Year p	2nd Year r	2nd Year N	2nd Year p	3rd Year r	3rd Year N	3rd Year p
E-8				.3309	35	.026	.3980	28	.018
E-9	.2554	51	.035	.3305	35	.026			
E-10				.4203	35	.006	.4421	27	.010
E-11				.3356	35	.024	.3853	28	.021
E-12				.4930	35	.001	.5097	27	.003
E-13	.2960	51	.017						
E-14	.3259	49	.011				.5139	28	.003
E-15	.3870	49	.003	.3892	33	.013			
E-16	.3873	51	.002	.4597	34	.003			
E-17	.5008	51	.000						
E-18	.2381	49	.050	.5478	35	.000			
E-19	.3319	49	.010	.2906	35	.045			
E-20	.4655	50	.000	.4244	35	.006			
E-21				.6849	35	.000			
E-22				.4983	35	.001			
E-23	.2337	51	.049	.6468	34	.000			
E-24	.2883	51	.020	.4666	34	.003	.3483	27	.038
E-25				.5465	34	.000	.4176	25	.019
E-26				.2995	34	.043	.4059	27	.018
E-27				.3363	33	.028	.4185	27	.015
E-28	.2502	51	.038						
E-29	.2775	50	.026	.3243	34	.031			
E-30				.6180	34	.000			
E-31				.3924	34	.011			
E-32	.4999	51	.000	.5420	34	.000			

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others

Ques. Item Category/ Item No.	1st Year r	1st Year N	1st Year p	2nd Year r	2nd Year N	2nd Year p	3rd Year r	3rd Year N	3rd Year p
F-1	.4178	51	.001	.4084	33	.009	.3956	28	.019
F-2	.2880	51	.020						
F-3				.4765	34	.002	.4132	28	.014
F-4	.3489	51	.006	.3078	34	.038			
F-5	.3653	51	.004	.4148	34	.007	.6299	28	.000
F-6	.4995	47	.000	.3103	31	.045	.3381	25	.049
G-1	.3206	51	.011	.3802	34	.013			
G-2	.4205	51	.001	.3802	34	.013			
G-3	.5346	51	.000	.5032	35	.001	.3500	27	.037
G-4							.5976	27	.000
G-5	.8963	51	.000	.3552	36	.017	.4899	27	.005
H-1	.2457	51	.041	.7725	35	.000	.3816	28	.023
H-2				.6510	36	.000	.3568	28	.031
H-3	.3790	50	.003						
H-4	.4972	49	.000	.6588	35	.000			
H-5	.3634	49	.005	.4307	35	.005			
H-6	.4223	50	.001	.3878	35	.011	.4378	28	.010
H-7	.4010	50	.002	.4221	36	.005	.4275	28	.012
H-8	.5456	51	.000						
H-9	.2786	50	.025	.5677	36	.000			
H-10	.2674	50	.030	.5941	36	.000			

Legend: Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

Table 13

Correlation Coefficients for Questionnaire Items which are Statistically Significant for Regular Teachers, Special Educators, and Administrators According to Level of Importance Level of Perceived Competency

Ques. Item Category/ Number	Reg. Ter. r	N	p	Spec. Ed. r	N	p	Admin. r	N	p
A-1	.2365	62	.032	.3835	37	.010			
A-2	.4321	62	.000	.3437	38	.017			
A-3									
A-4	.3400	62	.003						
A-5	.3349	62	.004	.3118	38	.028			
A-6	.3171	61	.006	.4345	37	.004	.7594	13	.001
A-7	.5241	60	.000	.5311	38	.000			
A-8									
A-9	.2696	62	.017	.4260	38	.004	.6312	12	.014
A-10									
A-11				.3252	37	.025			
A-12				.4896	36	.001	.5987	12	.020
A-13				.3564	37	.015			
A-14									
A-15				.5045	38	.001			
A-16	.2542	62	.023	.4547	38	.002			
A-17									
A-18				.2794	38	.045	.5563	13	.024
A-19				.3013	38	.033			
A-20									
A-21									

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge

Ques. Item Category/ Number	Reg. Ter. r	Reg. Ter. N	Reg. Ter. p	Spec. Ed. r	Spec. Ed. N	Spec. Ed. p	Admin. r	Admin. N	Admin. p
A-22									
A-23				.4746	38	.001			
B-1							.5346	12	.037
B-2									
B-3	.3036	62	.008				.5822	12	.024
B-4	.4652	58	.000				.6770	11	.011
B-5	.2737	62	.016				.6775	11	.011
B-6	.3044	62	.008						
B-7	.2229	61	.042						
B-8	.3388	62	.004	.4087	35	.007	.7171	11	.006
B-9	.4412	61	.000				.6949	12	.006
B-10	.4880	62	.000				.6244	12	.015
B-11	.3064	61	.008	.2970	36	.039			
B-12	.2954	61	.010	.3878	37	.009	.5244	11	.049
B-13	.2429	61	.030						
B-14	.2628	59	.022				.5345	12	.037
B-15									
B-16	.4975	58	.000	.4413	36	.004			
C-1	.2770	61	.015				.8576	12	.000
C-2							.8038	12	.001
C-3	.3317	60	.005	.2830	36	.047	.8652	12	.000
C-4									
C-5									
C-6									
C-7	.2296	60	.039	.2863	36	.045	.5904	12	.022

Legend: Category A = Profesional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment

Ques. Item Category/ Number	Reg. Ter. r	Reg. Ter. N	Reg. Ter. p	Spec. Ed. r	Spec. Ed. N	Spec. Ed. p	Admin. r	Admin. N	Admin. p
C-8				.2978	37	.037			
C-9	.2983	61	.010				.5119	12	.044
C-10				.3439	37	.019	.6209	12	.016
C-11	.2309	61	.037				.5160	12	.043
C-12	.2952	61	.010				.6386	12	.013
C-13	.4744	61	.000	.5508	37	.000			
C-14				.5918	37	.000			
C-15				.4993	37	.001			
C-16				.4052	37	.006			
C-17	.3573	60	.003	.2988	36	.038			
C-18				.3191	37	.027			
C-19	.4529	61	.000	.4680	36	.002			
D-1	.3381	62	.004	.3660	36	.014	.5005	12	.049
D-2	.3977	62	.001				.6209	12	.016
D-3									
D-4				.3701	37	.012	.5433	12	.034
D-5	.3496	61	.003	.3497	37	.017			
D-6	.3158	61	.007	.3234	37	.025			
D-7	.3362	61	.004	.5088	36	.001	.8664	12	.000
E-1				.5598	37	.000			
E-2	.2760	61	.016	.4505	37	.003			
E-3	.2659	62	.018	.3190	37	.027	.6792	13	.005
E-4	.2408	61	.031						
E-5				.4143	37	.005			
E-6	.2791	61	.015	.4369	37	.003			

Legend: Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others

Ques. Item Category/ Number	Reg. Ter. r	Reg. Ter. N	Reg. Ter. p	Spec. Ed. r	Spec. Ed. N	Spec. Ed. p	Admin. r	Admin. N	Admin. p
E-7				.3538	37	.016	.5529	13	.025
E-8	.2767	61	.015						
E-9							.5126	13	.037
E-10				.3124	37	.030	.7333	13	.002
E-11				.3242	37	.025			
E-12				.3403	37	.020	.6206	13	.012
E-13							.6515	13	.008
E-14	.3245	60	.006	.2927	36	.042			
E-15	.3062	57	.010	.4537	37	.002			
E-16	.3809	60	.001	.3834	37	.010	.5919	13	.017
E-17	.2900	61	.012	.3108	37	.031			
E-18	.2474	59	.029	.3818	35	.012			
E-19	.2979	61	.010						
E-20	.4164	61	.000	.3462	36	.019	.4838	13	.047
E-21	.2615	55	.027	.3247	35	.029			
E-22				.5022	37	.001			
E-23	.3445	59	.004	.4872	36	.001	.5367	13	.029
E-24	.3447	60	.003	.3739	36	.012			
E-25	.3064	57	.010						
E-26	.2515	58	.028						
E-27	.2229	58	.046	.3349	37	.021	.5007	13	.041
E-28				.4924	37	.001			
E-29				.3038	37	.034			
E-30				.6700	37	.000	.5020	13	.040
E-31	.2156	60	.049	.3038	32	.045			
E-32	.3782	60	.001	.4406	37	.003	.5797	13	.019

Legend: Category E = Communication with Others

Ques. Item Category/ Number	Reg. Ter. r	N	p	Spec. Ed. r	N	p	Admin. r	N	p
F-1	.3299	60	.005	.5435	37	.000			
F-2	.2399	60	.032	.2830	37	.045			
F-3	.3700	59	.002						
F-4	.2413	60	.032	.2932	37	.039	.5935	13	.016
F-5	.3350	60	.004	.4380	37	.003	.6733	13	.006
F-6	.2475	56	.033	.5476	34	.000	.7223	11	.006
G-1	.2694	62	.017	.3787	37	.010			
G-2	.3208	61	.006				.5659	12	.028
G-3	.4407	61	.000	.4565	37	.002			
G-4	.3375	60	.004				.6124	12	.017
G-5	.8721	62	.000	.3477	37	.017			
H-1	.4646	61	.000	.2814	37	.046			
H-2	.3559	62	.002	.4036	37	.007			
H-3	.3294	60	.005						
H-4	.4427	60	.000						
H-5	.3148	60	.007	.4828	37	.001			
H-6	.4009	61	.001	.4562	37	.002			
H-7	.5390	62	.000						
H-8	.4110	61	.000	.4437	37	.003			
H-9	.3582	62	.002	.5242	37	.000			
H-10	.2759	61	.016	.4655	37	.002			

Legend: Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

Table 14

Significant Relationships Between Questionnaire Categories Degree of Importance and Level of Perceived Competency for a School's Year in Policy Implementation

School's Year In Policy Implementation		A IMP A COMP	B IMP B COMP	C IMP C COMP	D IMP D COMP	E IMP E COMP	F IMP F COMP	G IMP G COMP	H IMP H COMP
First Year	r	.3204	---	.3356	.4548	---	.4401	.6404	.4579
	N	33	---	29	33	---	31	35	33
	p	.035	---	.038	.004	---	.007	.000	.004
Second Year	r	---	.7180	.5282	.5722	.5239	.5999	.4153	.5658
	N	---	27	29	31	26	29	30	30
	p	---	.000	.002	.000	.003	.000	.011	.001
Third Year	r	---	---	.3869	.3375	.5138	.4609	.4558	.4516
	N	---	---	32	34	30	30	34	35
	p	---	---	.014	.025	.002	.005	.003	.003

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics
IMP = Likert Scale for Level of Importance
COMP = Likert Scale for Level of Perceived Competency

Table 15

Significant Relationships Between Questionnaire Categories Degree of Importance and Level of Perceived Competency for the Different Professional Titles

Type of Professional		A IMP A COMP	B IMP B COMP	C IMP C COMP	D IMP D COMP	E IMP E COMP	F IMP F COMP	G IMP G COMP	H IMP H COMP
Regular	r	---	.4221	.2816	.3498	.3179	.3990	.5101	.4866
Classroom	N	---	53	57	61	47	54	60	59
Teachers	p	---	.001	.017	.003	.015	.001	.000	.000
Special	r	.3049	.2971	---	.2837	.5300	.4437	.4088	.4738
Education	N	34	33	---	35	40	34	37	36
Teachers	p	.040	.047	---	.049	.001	.004	.006	.002
	r	.5415	---	.5779	---	.5850	.5453	.5949	---
Admin.	N	11	---	12	---	12	11	11	---
	p	.043	---	.025	---	.023	.041	.027	---

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics
IMP = Likert Scale for Level of Importance
COMP = Likert Scale for Level of Perceived Competency

Using these tables, in conjunction with the means presented in Tables 7 and 8, one is able to identify specific questionnaire items which respondents perceived as either having high importance and adequate competency, or high importance and inadequate competency. These items are presented in the following tables:

Table 16

Breakdown of Significantly Related Questionnaire Statements According to Competency and Incompetency for Schools in their First Year of Policy Implementation

1st Year Pilot School Category	Items of High Importance and Competency	Items of High Importance Low Competency
A	5, 7, 9, 11	1, 2, 4, 6, 12
B	3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12	4, 16
C	3, 10, 11, 14, 15	1, 2, 5, 7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19
D	2, 4, 5, 6, 7	1
E	2, 3, 6, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 28, 29, 32	1, 18, 23, 24
F	1, 2, 4, 5, 6	
G	1, 2, 3, 5	
H	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

Table 17

Breakdown of Significantly Related Questionnaire Statements According to Competency and Incompetency for Schools in their Second Year of Policy Implementation

2nd Year Pilot School Category	Item Numbers of High Importance and Competency	Items of High Importance Low Competency
A	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	1, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23
B	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	1, 4, 15, 16
C	3, 4, 9, 14, 19	1, 2, 6, 8, 12, 13, 16
D	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7	
E	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32	1, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27
F	1, 3, 4, 6	
G	1, 2, 3, 5	
H	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10	

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

Table 18

Breakdown of Significantly Related Questionnaire Statements According to Competency and Incompetency for Schools in their Third Year of Policy Implementation

3rd Year Pilot School Category	Item Numbers of High Importance and Competency	Items of High Importance Low Competency
A	6, 7	
B	8, 9, 16	
C	19	13
D	7	
E	8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 26, 27	24, 25
F	1, 3, 5, 6	
G	3, 4, 5	
H	1, 2, 6, 7	

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

Table 19

Breakdown of Significantly Related Questionnaire Statements According to Competency and Incompetency for Regular Classroom Teachers

Regular Teachers Category	Item Numbers of High Importance and Competency	Items of High Importance Low Competency
A	5, 9	1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 16
B	3, 5, 7 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16	4, 6, 9
C		1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19
D	2, 5, 6, 7	1
E	2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 15, 16, 17, 31	14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32
F	2, 6	1, 3, 4, 5
G	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	
H	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

Table 20

Breakdown of Significantly Related Questionnaire Statements According to Competency and Incompetency for Special Education Teachers

Special Educators Category	Item Numbers of High Importance and Competency	Items of High Importance Low Competency
A	2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 13	1, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19 23
B	8, 11, 12	16
C	3, 7, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20	8
D	4, 5, 6, 7	
E	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31	21, 22, 23, 24
F	1, 2, 4, 5, 6	
G	1, 3, 5	
H	1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10	

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

Table 21

Breakdown of Significantly Related Questionnaire Statements According to Competency and Incompetency for Administrators

Administrators Category	Item Numbers of High Importance and Competency	Items of High Importance Low Competency
A		6, 9, 12, 18
B	3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14	1, 4
C	9, 10 11	1, 2, 3, 7, 12
D	2, 4, 7	1
E	3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 23, 27, 30, 32	20
F	6	4, 5
G	2, 4	
H		

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category E = Communication with Others
Category F = Goal Setting
Category G = Development of a Positive Class Environment
Category H = Personal Characteristics

In viewing these tables one can see that in the majority of cases, respondents felt themselves to be competent on the competencies they deemed to be very important for implementation. The following percentages show how competent the different respondent types felt on items deemed to be significantly correlated.

Table 22

Percentages of Significantly Correlated Items the Various Respondent Types Perceived Competent and Incompetent On

Type of Respondent	% Competent	% Incompetent
First Year Implementing Schools	72%	28%
Second Year Implementing Schools	68%	32%
Third Year Implementing Schools	89%	11%
Regular Classroom Teachers	55%	45%
Special Education Teachers	81%	19%
Administrators	64%	36%

It would seem that as policy schools reached their third year of implementation, they perceived themselves to be relatively more competent in areas they felt to be important for successful implementation, than did first or second year policy schools. Also, regular classroom teachers appeared to perceive themselves as least competent of the different professional titles, while special educators perceived themselves to be the most competent on items felt to be very important for successful implementation.

Variables Associated With Questionnaire Categories Level of Importance and Perceived Competency

Table 23

Analysis of Variance Between Questionnaire Categories and Year in Policy Implementation (Significant Relationships Only)

Category	Year in Policy	Mean	D.F.	F Ratio	F Prob.
B-IMP	1st	66.441			
	3rd	71.258	2	3.048	.05
H-IMP	2nd	41.938			
	3rd	45.194	2	3.378	.04

Table 24

Analysis of Variance for Professional Title and Questionnaire Categories

Category	Professional Title	Mean	D.F.	F Ratio	F Prob.
	Reg. Ter.	69.895			
A-COMP	Spec. Educ.	77.257	2	2.997	.05
	Reg. Ter.	61.983			
C-COMP	Spec. Educ.	69.767	2	3.511	.03
	Reg. Ter.	26.049			
D-COMP	Spec. Educ.	28.114	2	2.577	.08
	Reg. Ter.	21.091			
F-COMP	Spec. Educ.	23.206	2	2.835	.06

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category C = Assessment
Category D = Evaluation of Student Progress
Category F = Goal Setting
Category H = Personal Characteristics
IMP = Likert Scale for Level of Importance
COMP = Likert Scale for Level of Perceived Competency

The year of a school's policy implementation was significantly related to only two categories of importance for successful implementation.

The tables show that schools in their third year of policy implementation felt "Instructional Strategies" (Category B) to be significantly more important than did schools in their first year of policy implementation. Third year pilot schools also felt that "Personal Characteristics" (Category H) was also significantly more important than did schools in their second year of policy implementation.

No significant relationships were found between a school's year of policy implementation and how competent they perceived themselves to be.

Special educators, however, perceived themselves to be more competent on Category A (Professional Knowledge Competencies) and Category C (Assessment Competencies) than did regular classroom teachers.

It should be noted here that while only four significant relationships are apparent in Tables 23 and 24, it is quite possible that other significant relationships might have been evident amongst the other categories mentioned if a larger sample size had been obtained.

While some significant relationships did exist between professional title and level of perceived category

competency, no such relationships were found regarding level of category importance.

The grade level which respondents taught at (i.e., primary, elementary, high school, etc.) did not significantly affect how respondents felt about questionnaire category importance or perceived competency.

Table 25 shows the relationship between each of the variables discussed thus far, i.e., Year in Policy Implementation - Professional Title and Grade Level taught, and their ratings of category importance and perceived competency.

Table 25

Multiple Regression Between Year In Policy Implementation, Professional Title, and Grade Level Taught for Each Questionnaire Category

Category	Variable	Beta	T.	Sig. T.
B-IMP	1st year	-.268	-2.545	.012
H-IMP	2nd year	-.238	-2.210	.029
A-COMP	1st year	-.236	-2.247	.027
B-COMP	1st year	-.227	-2.115	.037
E-COMP	Reg. Ters.	-.306	-2.021	.046

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category E = Communication with Others
Category H = Personal Characteristics
IMP = Likert Scale for Level of Importance
COMP = Likert Scale for Level of Perceived Competency

This table suggests that schools in their first year of policy implementation felt that Category B (Instructional Strategies) was significantly less important for them than for either 2nd or 3rd year policy schools. Schools in their second year of policy implementation felt that Category H (Personal Characteristics) was significantly less important for them, than did either first or third year policy schools.

First year policy schools also felt significantly less competent on Category A (Professional Knowledge Competencies) and Category B (Instructional Strategies) than second or third year policy schools.

Also, regular classroom teachers perceived themselves to be less competent on Category E (Communications with Parents, Colleagues and Administrators) than did either special educators or administrators.

The significant relationships of Table 25 were further analyzed through cross-tabulation, the results of which are presented in Table 26.

Table 26

Cross-Tabulations for Items Found to be Significantly Related in the Multiple Regression

Variables	Gamma Value	T-Value
B-IMP by 1st year Schools	-.29547	-2.38302
H-IMP by 2nd year Schools	-.28499	-2.08648
A-IMP by 1st year Schools	-.27961	-2.21776
E-COMP by Regular Teachers	-.27614	-2.37478
B-COMP by 1st year Teachers	-.24442	-1.94324

Legend: Category A = Professional Knowledge
Category B = Instructional Strategies
Category E = Communication with Others
Category H = Personal Characteristics
IMP = Likert Scale for Level of Importance
COMP = Likert Scale for Level of Perceived Competency

This table further supports the findings of Table 25 with the exception of first year teachers feeling less competent on Category B (Instructional Strategies). Here the T-value of -1.943 is not significant. The cross-tabulations did show the following:

- that first year policy schools received a significant gamma value of -.29547, which indicates that they felt Category B (Instructional Strategies) to be less important as indicated by the negative gamma value for successful implementation than did either second or third year policy schools

- that second year policy schools felt Category H (Personal Characteristics) to be less important than first or third year policy schools.
- that first year policy schools felt less competent on Category A (Professional Knowledge Competencies) than did second or third year policy schools.
- and, lastly, that regular teachers felt less competent on Category E (Communication with Parents, Colleagues and Administrators) than did special educators or administrators.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This exploratory study offers a wealth of information concerning how competent various professionals, at different stages of policy implementation, perceived themselves to be in areas they see as important for successful implementation of Newfoundland's new Special Education policy. The summary and recommendations which resulted from this study are presented in this chapter, as well as implications for further research.

Conclusions

There seems to be major consensus among all professionals involved with the implementation of the Special Education policy in Newfoundland, with respect to the expertise required to implement that policy successfully. Approximately ninety-nine percent of the questionnaire competencies were felt to be important by all professionals in order to meet the current policy emphasis on meeting the needs of children with special needs.

Generally speaking, regular classroom teachers, special educators, and school administrators, perceived themselves to be competent on competencies they felt important for professionals in their respective educational

roles. The fact that as professionals progressed through the various levels of policy implementation (i.e., first, second or third year), their perceived level of competency increased lends support for the 'piloting' procedure used for the implementation of this policy. It would seem that the more time spent in the pilot schools, the more competent professionals perceived themselves in being equipped to successfully implement the policy. Some may question how much of this perceived compentency was due to the self-fulfilling prophecy. It one ,however, assumes that respondents are rating themselves honestly, as assumed in this study, then evidence points to a generalized increase in perceived compentency of professionals in the pilot schools as they progressed through the three year implementation period. It appears that the piloting method is an effective method of increasing the sense of empowerment professionals feel in implementing new educational policies.

As might be expected, special education teachers perceived themselves to be more competent than did regular classroom teachers or school administrators on competencies they felt important for implementation. On the other hand, regular classroom teachers perceived themselves to be less competent than the various professionals on those important competencies they deemed necessary for implementation.

These findings are in congruence with those found in the review of the literature. This suggests that pre and in-service education should be directed at all professionals, in particular the regular classroom teachers. The expertise special education teachers seem to possess should also be drawn upon when schools begin to implement the policy. These professionals should be given the opportunity to share their knowledge and skills with their colleagues.

In looking at the particular categories of competencies, it was found that all professionals perceived all eight competency categories to be important for implementation. Competencies surrounding the development of a positive classroom environment (category G) and personal characteristics of professionals involved with educating special needs students (category H) were felt to be the two most important competency categories. The various professionals also rated themselves as being quite competent on these two categories. Significant attention should therefore be given to the personal characteristics of future professionals selected to work with children with special needs. The high importance placed on the development of positive classroom environments underscores the necessity for teachers to understand the importance of

having these skills and the knowledge to develop those important atmospheres within their classrooms.

While all professionals felt professional knowledge of the characteristics of special needs children and adaptations necessary to effectively teach them (category A) were important, no group perceived themselves to be adequately competent in this area. It would seem, therefore, that pre and in-service methods must pay specific attention to the development of competency in this area for all educational professionals.

Regular classroom teachers, special educators and school administrators also felt that assessment (category C) competencies were important for implementation; however, only professionals in their third year of policy implementation and in particular, special education teachers, felt competent on this category. Again, it would seem that as schools progressed through the various stages of the piloting procedure, they became more competent in this area. However, pre and in-service training should address the area of assessment competencies at the initial stages of accepting children with special needs into the classroom, especially with regards to regular classroom teachers and school administrators. Research has emphasized how important it is to ensure professionals as well equipped with the skills before integration is attempted.

Regular classroom teachers and school administrators perceived themselves to be in need of additional competency in the area of communication with parents, colleagues and administrators (category E) and goal setting (category F). Particular emphasis should be given to these professionals with regards to these competencies during pre and in-service training.

Professionals at different levels of policy implementation had significant differences in the competency categories they felt to be important for successful implementation of the policy. It appears that as professionals reached their third year of policy implementation the importance placed on instructional strategies (category B) and personal characteristics (category H) significantly increased. Again, this increase in competency provides evidence that the piloting procedure seem to produce positive outcomes.

Based on the research findings one could conclude that, overall, the different professionals at various stages of policy implementation, generally felt competent in those areas which they deemed to be important for successful implementation. There are, however, some areas where inadequacies in competency exist and these areas are specified in Table 16-22. These tables pinpoint the specific important competencies for successful

implementation which educational professionals felt both competent and less than competent in delivering.

Being able to identify important competencies, in which implementors feel inadequate, helps to establish areas which need to be addressed both at the pre-service and in-service levels of training.

Similarly, identifying competencies in which implementors feel competent seems to indicate that their professional training and experience has equipped them with the majority of skills deemed to be important for successful implementation of the contemporary approaches to delivering educational services to children with special needs. It is not entirely clear, however, just how personal efforts at self development and teaching experience contributed to this sense of competency.

With the new Special Education policy comes responsibilities which various professionals feel are important for successfully implementing special needs students into the regular classroom. It would seem, from this study, that current training programs are addressing most of those areas of responsibilities adequately; however, some exceptions do exist.

Educators themselves feel less than adequate on certain competencies deemed highly important for successful implementation. It is, therefore, the responsibility of

training institutions and other agencies responsible for addressing professional development needs, to address those inadequacies so our educators can competently accept, develop and, in turn, work with students in need of specialized help.

Implications for Further Research

1. Although evidence exists that the piloting procedure has had success within the schools selected as pilot schools, further research needs to be conducted to determine the extent to which they served as catalysts for other schools within their districts for their implementation of the Special Education policy.
2. In-service efforts, whether through the pilot school method or not, should be based on continuous needs assessment of particular professionals, so in-servicing can be designed to address the present and emerging needs of those involved in meeting the needs of exceptional children.
3. It is not entirely clear from this study to what extent the high level of self assessed competency resulted from teachers' pre-service education or the in-servicing efforts of the piloting procedure. Further study needs to be carried out to determine the relative contribution of pre and in-service education

to the professional competence of educational personnel in the piloting schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamson, D., Matthews, P., & Schuller, J. (1990). "Five ways to bridge the resource room-to-regular classroom gap." Teaching Exceptional Children, Winter, 74-77.

Affleck, James Q., Lowenbraun, S., & Archer, Anita. (1980). Teaching the mildly handicapped in the regular classroom. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Affleck, J., Madge, S., Adams, A., & Lowenbraun, S. (1988). "Integrated classroom versus resource model: Academic viability and effectiveness." Exceptional Children, January, Vol. 54, No. 4, 339-348.

Alberto, P., Castricone, N., & Cohen, S. (1978). "Mainstreaming: Implications for training regular class teachers." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, February, 90-92.

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. (1983). "Learning disabilities as a subset of school failure: The oversophistication of a concept." Exceptional Children, 52, 242-246.

Algozzine, B., Morsink, C., & Algozzine, K. (1988). "What's happening in self-contained special education classrooms?" Exceptional Children, November, Vol. 55, No. 3, 259-265.

Anderegg, M., & Vergason, G. (1988). "An analysis of one of the cornerstones of the regular education initiative." Focus on Exceptional Children, April, Vol. 20, No. 8, 1-7.

Austin, L.M., Bagley, R., Goldstein, M., Rowe, J., & Singley, K. (1987). "Setting up for a special student." Instructor, August, 61-64.

Baker, J.M., & Zigmond, N. (1990). "Are regular education classes equipped to accommodate students with learning disabilities?" Exceptional Children, Apr., 515-526.

Bender, W. (1983). "The case against mainstreaming: Empirical support for the political backlash." Education, Vol. 105, No. 3, 279-287.

Bender, W. (1986-87). "Effective educational practices in the mainstream setting: Recommended model for evaluation of mainstream teacher classes." The Journal of Special Education, Vol. 20, No. 4, 475-487.

Besag, F., & Besag, P. (1985). Statistics for the helping professions. Sage Publications, London, England.

Bhattacharyya, G., & Johnson, R. (1977). Statistical concepts and methods. John Wiley & Sons, London.

Bishop, V.E. (1986). "Identifying the components of success in mainstreaming." Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, November, 939-946.

Brokenshire, G. (1971). Construction and validation of student questionnaires measuring attitudes to self, school, and teacher. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Brophy, K., & Hancock, S. (1988). "The role of the teacher in facilitating social integration." Early Child Development and Care, Vol. 3?, 109-122.

Bryan, T., Bay, M., & Donahue, M. (1988). "Implications of the learning disabilities definition for the regular education initiative." Journal of Learning Disabilities, January, Vol. 21, No. 1, 23-28.

Byrnes, M. (1990). "The regular education initiative debate: A view from the field." Exceptional Children, January, 345-351.

Calder, K.J. (1989). "Integration in special education: A kind of culture shock." Teaching Atypical Students in Alberta, Vol. 17, No. 1, 10-12.

Carnine, D.W., & Kameenui, E.J. (1990). "The general education initiative and children with special needs. A false dilemma in the face of true problems." Journal of Learning Disabilities, March, Vol. 23, No. 3, 141-144.

Chao, L. (1969). Statistics: Methods and analyses. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Toronto.

Childs, R. (1981). "Perceptions of mainstreaming by regular classroom teachers who teach mainstreamed educable mentally retarded students in the public schools." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, October, 225-227.

Chisholm, D.P. (1988). "Concerns respecting the regular education initiative." Journal of Learning Disabilities, October, Vol. 21, No. 8, 487-488.

Chow, P., & Winzer, M. (1989). "Newfoundland educators and their attitudes toward children with special needs and educational integration." Canadian Journal of Special Education, Vol. 5, No. 1, 77-83.

Clarke, C., & Schkade, L. (1974). Statistical analysis for administrative decisions. South-Western Publishing Co., England.

Conklin, R. (1985). "Teacher competency testing." Education Canada, Spring, 12-15.

Cosden, M.A. (1990). "Expanding the r le of special education." Teaching Exceptional hildren, Winter, 4-13.

Crisci, P. (1981). "Competencies for mainstreaming: Problems and issues." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, October, 175-182.

Crocker, R.K., & Riggs, F.T. (1979). Improving the quality of education: Challenge and opportunity final report task force on education. St. John's, NF: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Cuff, D. (1980). Preparation for mainstreaming: Self-perceived competence of the regular classroom teacher. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Newfoundland: Department of Educational Psychology.

Darvill, C. (1989). "Teacher attitudes to mainstreaming." Canadian Journal of Special Education, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1-13.

Davila, R.R. (1990). "Looking at the past and the future." Exceptional Parent, March, 20-22.

Day, C.F., Kirk, S.A., & Gallager, J. (1985). Educating Exceptional Children, 4th Ed. Toronto: Nelson Canada.

Deno, E. (1970). "Special education as developmental capital." Exceptional Children, 37, 229-37.

Dexter, B. (1977). Special education and the classroom teacher concepts, perspectives and strategies. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

D'Zamko, M.E., & Hedges, W. (1985). Helping exceptional students succeed in the regular classroom. New York: Parker Publishing Company Incorporated.

Edmond, D. (1984). "Educational integration, attitude change and the school." Education Canada, Summer, 40-44.

Epstein, C. (1984). Special children in regular classrooms. Virginia: Reston Publ. Comp. Inc.

Frank, A., Keith, T., & Steil, D. (1988). "Training needs of special education paraprofessionals." Exceptional Children, November, Vol. 55, No. 3, 253-258.

Frost, L., & Common, R.W. (1989). "A cross-provincial analysis of teacher attitudes toward integration of handicapped children." Canadian Journal of Special Education, Vol. 5, No. 1, 85-87.

Gallagher, J.J. (1989). "The impact of policies for handicapped children on future early education policy." PHI Delta Kappan, October, 121-124.

Galloway, D.M., & Goodwin, C. (1979). Educating slow-learning and maladjusted children: Integration or segregation. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Gans, K. (1987). "Willingness of regular and special educators to teach students with handicaps." Exceptional Children, September, Vol. 54, No. 1, 41-45.

Gear, G., & Gable, R. (1979). "Educating handicapped children in the regular classroom: Needs assessment in teacher preparation." Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 12, No. 4, 36-45.

Gearheart, B., & Weishahn, M. (1984). The exceptional student in the regular classroom. St. Louis: Times, Mirror/Mosby College Publishing.

Gearheart, B.R. (1984). Special education in the 80's. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Gerber, M. (1988). "Tolerance and technology of instruction implications for special education reform." Exceptional Children, January, 309-314.

Gersten, R., Darch, C., Davis, G., & George, N. (1991). "Apprenticeship and intensive training of consulting teachers: A naturalistic study." Exceptional Children, Dec.-Jan., 226-236.

Glavin, J. (1973). Major issues in special education. New York: MSS Information Corporation.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. (1986). Special Education Policy Manual. Newfoundland: Department of Education Special Services Division.

Graham, S., Hudson, F., Burdg, N., & Carpenter, D. (1980). "Educational personnel's perception of mainstreaming and resource room effectiveness." Psychology in the Schools, January, Vol. 17, No. 1, 128-133.

Grosenick, Judith K., & Reynolds, Maynard. (1978). Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Minneapolis, Minnesota: National Support Systems Project.

Gugan, K.M. (1979). "First steps in mainstreaming." Media and Methods, Apr., 46-48.

Haglund, Elaine, & Stevens, V.L. (1980). A resource guide for mainstreaming. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Hallahan, D.P., & Kauffman, J.M. (1978). Exceptional Children. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Hallahan, D.P., Keller, C.E., McKinney, J.D., Lloyd, J.W., & Bryan, T. (1988). "Examining the research base of the regular education initiative: Efficacy studies and the adaptive learning environments model." Journal of Learning Disabilities, January, Vol. 21, No. 1, 29-35.

Hamre-Nietupski, S., Nietupski, J., Ayres, B., Savage, M., Mitchell, B., & Bramman, H. (1989). "Enhancing integration of students with severe disabilities through curricular infusion: A general/special educator partnership." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, March, 78-88.

Hardy, M., McLeod,J., Minto, H., Perkins, S., & Quance, W. (1971). Standards for educators of exceptional children in Canada. Toronto, Ont: Leonard Crainford.

Haring, N. (1978). "Conclusion: Classroom two." Behavior of Exceptional Children (2nd Ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Hart, Verna. (1981). Mainstreaming children with special needs. New Jersey: Longman Inc.

Hartley, H.O. (1955). "Some recent developments in analysis of variance." Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 8, 47-72.

Hawkins, J.S., Doueck, H.J., & Lishner, D.M. (1988). "Changing teaching practices in mainstream classrooms to improve bonding and behavior of low achievers." American Educational Research Journal, Spring, Vol. 25, No. 1, 31-50.

Hawkins-Shepard, Charlotte. (1977). Making it work - Practical ideas for integrating exceptional children into regular classrooms. Council for Exceptional Children.

Hayes, J., & Higgins, S. (1978). "Issues regarding the IEP: Teachers on the front line." Exceptional Children, January, 267-272.

Heller, Harold, & Schilit, J. (1987). "The regular education initiative: A concerned response." Focus on Exceptional Children, November, 1-11.

Hill, J.L. (1988). "Integration in Canada: Implications for the certification of regular education teachers." Canadian Journal of Special Education, Vol. 4, No. 2, 123-131.

Hinkle, D., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. (1988). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.

Hoover, J.J., & Sakofs, M. (1985). "Relationship between sources of anxiety of elementary student teachers and attitudes toward mainstreaming." Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 19, No. 1, 49-55.

Hoover, J. (1986). "The preparation of regular class elementary teachers for education of exceptional children: An emphasis upon knowledge, attitudes, and skills." Educational Research Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 3, 2-7.

Hopkins, Kenneth, & Stanley, Julian. (1981). Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation. Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey.

Howard, G., Schmeck, R., & Bray, J.H. (Summer 1979). "Internal invalidity in studies employing self-report instruments: A suggested remedy." Journal of Educational Measurement, Vol. 16, No. 2, 129.

Idol-Maestas, Lorna. (1983). Special Educator's Consultation Handbook. London: Aspen Systems Corp.

Jenkins, J., Pious, Constance, & Jewell, M. (1990). "Special education and the regular education initiative: Basic assumptions." Exceptional Children, Apr., Vol. 56, No. 6, 479-491.

Kaplan, L. (1978). "Special education Public Law 94-142: What's happening?" Journal of Teacher Education, November-December, Vol. 29, No. 6, 74-75.

Karagianis, L.D., & Nesbit, W.C. (1979). Perhaps I'll be in your class: Approaching integration. Newfoundland: Council for Exceptional Children.

Kauffman, J.M., Gerber, M.M., & Semmel, M.I. (1988). "Arguable assumptions underlying the regular education initiative." Journal of Learning Disabilities, January, Vol. 21, No. 1, 6-11.

Keogh, B.K. (1988). "Improving services for problem learners: Rethinking and restructuring." Journal of Learning Disabilities, January, Vol. 21, No. 1, 19-22.

Kerble, M. (1988). "Incorporating special education teachers into teams: Why and How?" Middle School Journal, July, 18-19.

Knowlton, H., & Clark, G. (1987). "Transition issues for the 1990s." Exceptional Children, Apr., 562-563.

Lakin, K., & Reynolds, M. (1983). "Curricular Implications of Public Law 94-142 for teacher education." Journal of Teacher Education, March-April, Vol. 34, No. 2, 13-18.

Lawrence, P. (1988). "Basic strategies for mainstream integration." Academic Therapy, March, 349-355.

Lazure, D., & Roberts, C. (Eds.). (1970). The CELDIC report: One million children. Toronto: Crainford.

Leyser, Y. (1985). "Competencies needed for teaching individuals with special needs." The Clearing House, December, Vol. 59, 179-181.

Leyser, Y. (1986). "Competencies for teaching special needs students. The Clearing House, December, 54-55.

Lilly, M. (1974). "Classroom teacher competencies for mainstreaming." Duluth, Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

Lilly, M.S. (1988). "The regular education initiative: A force for change in general and special education." Education and Training in Mental Retardation, December, 253-259.

Lipsky, D., & Gartner, A. (1987). "Capable of achievement and worthy of respect: Education for handicapped students as if they were full-fledged human beings." Exceptional Children, September, 69-74.

Luchow, J. (1981). "Preparing the classroom teacher for mainstreamed students." Education Digest, November, 9-11.

Lynn, S. (1986). "Lessons from mainstreaming." Instructor, Sept., 64-68, 148.

Maddux, C.D., & Maddux, S. (1983). "Peer relations: Key to mainstreaming." Academic Therapy, Jan., 261-266.

Margolis, H., & McCabe, P. (1989). "Easing the adjustment to mainstreaming programs." The Education Digest, September, 58-61.

McClaughlin, M. (1988). "Special education teacher preparation: A synthesis of four research studies." Exceptional Children, November, Vol. 55, No. 3, 215-221.

McKinney, J.D., & Hocutt, A.M. (1988). "The need for policy analysis in evaluating the regular education initiative." Journal of Learning Disabilities, January, Vol. 21, No. 1, 12-18.

Messinger, J.F. (1985). "Commentary on 'A rationale for the merger of special and regular education' or is it now time for the lamb to lie down with the lion?" Exceptional Children, April, 510-512.

Miller, M. (1984). "The three faces of mainstreaming." Academic Therapy, May, 561-565.

Mitchell, P.B. (1988). "Tower of Babel or shared vision?" Teaching Exceptional Children, Fall, 49-50.

Mori, A. (1988). "The handicapped child in the mainstream - New Roles for the regular educator." Education, Vol. 99, No. 3, 243-249.

Morrison, M., & Brady, M. (1985). "Teacher in-service education in regular and special education: Evolving trends and practices." Contemporary Education, Summer, Vol. 56, No. 4, 226-231.

Morrison, R.J., Clancey, M., Giffen-Johnson, C., Macintosh, J., O'Connell, & Ritchie, D. (1989). "Mainstreaming in Nova Scotia - What are the issues?" AVISO, Winter/ Spring, 14-23.

Moses, D., Hegarty, S., & Jowett, S. (1987). "Meeting special educational needs: Support for the ordinary school." Educational Research, June, Vol. 29, No. 2, 108-115.

Munson, S. (1986-87). "Regular education teacher modifications for mainstreamed mildly handicapped students." The Journal of Special Education, Vol. 20, No. 4, 489-502.

Murray-Register, B. (1981). "Public policy on special education in Canada." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, February, 87-90.

Myers, D., & Sinco, M. (1980). Individual educational programming for all teachers of the special needs learner. Illinois: Charles Thomas Publisher.

Neiro, N., & Kucko, C. (1986). "Integration without mainstreaming." Teaching Exceptional Children, Fall, 64-65.

Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., & Brent, D. (1975). Statistical package for the social sciences. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Noll, Victor, Scannell, Dale, & Craig, Robert. (1979). Introduction to educational measurement. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Noonan, M., & Hemphill, N.J. (1984). "Comprehensive curricula for integrating severely disabled and nondisabled students." Focus on Exceptional Children, December, Vol. 17, No. 4, 1-11.

O'Reilly, R., & Duquette, C. (1988). "Experienced teachers look at mainstreaming." Education Canada, Fall, 9-13.

Osdol, B.M., & Perryman, P. (1974). Special education - A new look. New York: MSS Information Corp.

Pasanella, A.L., & Volkmor, C. (1977). Coming back or never leaving. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Paul, J.L., Turnbull, A., & Cruickshank, W. (1977). Mainstreaming - A Practical Guide. New York: Syracuse University Press.

Pernell, E., McIntyre, L., & Bader, L. (1983). "Mainstreaming: A continuing concern for teachers." Education, Vol. 106, No. 2, 131-13[illegible].

Phillips, V., & McCullough, L. (1990). "Consultation-based programming: Instituting the collaborative ethic in schools." Exceptional Children, January, 291-304.

Ramsey, R., & Algozzine, B. (February 1991). "Teacher competency testing: What are special education teachers expected to know?" Exceptional Children, Vol. 57, No. 4, 339-350.

Redden, M.R., & Blackhurst, A.E. (1978). "Mainstreaming competency specifications for elementary teachers." Exceptional Children, May, 615-617.

Reynolds, M.C., & Birch, J.W. (1977). Teaching exceptional children in all America's schools. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Riggar, William J. (1978). Mainstreaming the mildly handicapped: A teacher's manual. New Jersey: Kaleidoscope Press Inc.

Robichaud, O., & Enns, R. (1980). The integration issue: Principles, problems and solutions. In M. Csapo and L. Goguen (Eds.), Special education across Canada: Issues and concerns for the 80's (pp.201-213). Vancouver, BC: Center for Human Development and Research.

Robie, D., Pierce, M., & Burdett, C. (1979). "Implementing a special education mainstreaming competency-based teacher-training program." Educational Technology, February, 36-38.

Roffman, A.J. (1983). The Classroom Teachers Guide to Mainstreaming. Springfield, Illinois: Charles Thomas Pub.

Rusch, Frank, & Menchetti, B. (1988). "Transition in the 1990's: A reply to Knowlton and Clark." Exceptional Children, January, 363-365.

Safer, N., Morrissey, P., Kaufman, M., & Lewis, L. (1978) "Implementation of IEP's: New teacher roles and requisite support systems." Focus on Exceptional Children, March, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1 20.

Salend, S., & Salend, S. (1985). "Adapting teacher-made tests for mainstreamed students." Journal of Learning Disabilities, June/July, Vol. 18, No. 6, 373-375.

Salend, S., & Salend, S. (1986). "Competencies for mainstreaming secondary level learning disabled students." Journal of Learning Disabilities, February, Vol. 19, No. 2, 91-94.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1990). "Special education and the Holmes agenda for teacher education reform." Theory Into Practice, Winter, 55-60.

Saur, R., Layne, C., Hurley, E., & Opton, K. (1986). "Dimensions of mainstreaming." A.A.D., December, 325-330.

Savage, L., & Wienke, W. (1989). "Attitude of secondary teachers toward mainstreaming." The High School Journal, October/November, 70-72.

Schorn, F. (1989). "Special education where there is no special education: Getting support from a reluctant donor." International Journal of Special Education, Vol. 4, No. 2, 141-145.

Schumaker, J.B., & Deshler, D. (1988). "Implementing the regular education initiative in secondary schools: A different ball game." Journal of Learning Disabilities, January, Vol. 21, No. 1, 36-42.

Silon, E., & Harter, S. (1985). "Assessment of perceived competence, motivational orientation, and anxiety in segregated and mainstreamed educable mentally retarded children." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 77, No. 2, 217-230.

Sokolyk, D. (1981). Mainstreaming in Quebec: Teacher competencies in an integrated classroom. Quebec: Association for Children with Learning Disabilities.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1987). "Integration versus cooperation: A commentary on 'Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility'." Exceptional Children, September, 66-68.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1982). "Preparing regular class teachers for the integration of severely retarded students." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, December, 273-277.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1984). "A rationale for the merger of special and regular education." Exceptional Children, October, Vol. 51, No. 2, 102-111.

Steel, R., & Torrie, J. (1980). Principles and procedures of statistics: A biometrical approach. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Tanguay, S. (1985). Mainstreaming: Some issues for school boards. Toronto: Canadian Education Association.

Thruman, S.K., Langley, B., & Wood, T. (1976). "Children with retarded behavior and sensory impairment: A review. The Third Review of Special Education. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Turnbull, Ann, & Schulz, Jane. (1979). Mainstreaming handicapped students: A guide for the classroom teacher. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

United States Public Law 94-142. (1975). Education For All Handicapped Children Act. Washington: Government Document.

Vollbrecht, F. (1988). "Accepting the challenge: Addressing special needs." School Shop, September, 30.

Warnat, W. (1978). "In-service education: Key to PL 94-142's service to handicapped children and youth." Educational Leadership, March, 474-479.

Warnock, H.M. (1978). Special education needs: Report of the committee of inquiry into the education of handicapped children and youth. London, HMSO.

Weintraub, F., Abeson, A., Ballard, J., & LaVor, M. (1976). Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

West, J.F., & Cannon, G.S. (1988). "Essential collaborative consultation competencies for regular and special educators." Journal of Learning Disabilities, January, Vol. 21, No. 1, 56-63.

Will, M., Wang, M., Reynolds, M., & Walberg, H. (1987). "The regular education initiative." Journal of Learning Disabilities, May, Vol. 20, No. 5, 289-293.

Winzer, M. (1989). Closing the gap. Toronto: Clark Pitman Ltd.

Wolfensberger, W. (1972). The principle of normalization in human services. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

APPENDIX A

Letter of Request for School Board Permission to Administer Questionnaire to Policy Schools

May 12, 1989
P.O. Box 149
Whitbourne, NF
A0B 3K0

Dear

I am an Educational Psychology student at Memorial University and I am in the process of collecting data for my research. I shall be attempting to determine competencies necessary for regular classroom teachers, as well as special educators and administrators, in order to successfully implement the province's new Special Education Policy. In order to achieve this, I shall be surveying all the pilot schools in the province.

I therefore would like to respectfully request your permission to administer my questionnaire to the pilot school of Humber Elementary. A copy of this questionnaire is enclosed for your viewing.

Because of the lateness of the school year and thus the importance of making sure the questionnaires are distributed as soon as possible, I shall be contacting you by telephone, in the near future, for your reply.

Sincerely yours,

Mary E. Larner
Educational Psychology
Graduate Student
738-3837

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter for Questionnaire

Dear Colleague:

I realize how busy you are at this time of year, and being a pilot school, I can only imagine that the work is even piled higher on your desk.

Realizing this, I know I am asking a lot for you to assist me with my research by completing the enclosed questionnaire, when all I can offer you for your time and effort is a sincere Thank-You and a great deal of gratitude!

However, I must gather enough courage to ask if you could possibly take a few minutes from your hectic schedule and complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible.

I again thank you for your valuable time and wish you a very enjoyable summer vacation.

Sincerely yours,

Mary E. Larner
Educational Psychology
Graduate Student

APPENDIX C

Follow-Up Cover Letter

Dear Colleague:

Once again I am requesting your assistance in completing my data collection on the competencies teachers need in order to implement the province's New Special Education Policy.

Concerns have arisen about redundancies in the questionnaire and I appreciate the keen awareness readers have given to this fact. However, each questionnaire statement went through a screening and evaluation process of Department of Education - Special Services Division staff, and Memorial University Educational Psychology and Special Education Professors. From their expert advice, the present questionnaire was created. Some statements may appear similar; however, they occur in different competency areas and therefore, aid in the measurement of that area's objective.

I wish to thank you in advance for your valuable time and consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Mary E. Larner
Educational Psychologist

APPENDIX D

Research Questionnaire

SECTION 'A': GENERAL INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS

Please indicate your response by placing a check (✓) on the appropriate line to the right of the selected item.

1. **Sex:** Female ---------- ____
   Male ---------- ____

2. **Age:** 25 and under ---------- ____
   26 - 30 ---------- ____
   31 - 35 ---------- ____
   36 - 40 ---------- ____
   41 - 45 ---------- ____
   46 - 50 ---------- ____
   51 - 55 ---------- ____
   56 and over ---------- ____

3. **Professional Education (Please check one or more appropriate areas)**

   B.A. ---------- ____
   B.Sc. ---------- ____
   B.A.(Ed.) ---------- ____
   B.Ed. ---------- ____
   Diploma Sp.Ed. ---------- ____
   B.Sp.Ed. ---------- ____
   Master's Ed. Admin. ---------- ____
   Master's Curr. & Instr. ---------- ____
   Other (Please Specify) ---------- ____

4. **Teaching Experience**

No. of Years	Reg. Classroom	Sp.Ed.	Admin.	Other (Specify)
Less than 1 yr.				
1 year				
2 - 5 yrs.				
6 - 10 yrs.				
11 - 15 yrs.				
16 or more yrs.				

5. **Current Professional Title**

   ____ Regular Classroom Teacher
   ____ Special Education Teacher
   ____ Vice-Principal
   ____ Principal

6. **Grade Level of Students You Teach**

   ____ Primary
   ____ Elementary
   ____ Jr. High
   ____ Sr. High
   ____ K - 12
   ____ Developmental Unit (Specify Level) _____
   ____ Other (Please specify) _____

7. Number of Years Your School has been a Pilot School:

First year _____
Second Year _____
Third year _____

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE INTENDED FOR SPECIFIC PERSONNEL.

Please answer the question which pertains to you.

As Principal (Vice-Principal), how many students are receiving specialized instruction in your school. _____

As a Regular Class Teacher, how many students are receiving specialized instruction in your classroom. _____

As a Special Educator, provide an estimate of the number of students to whom you provide special education services. _____

SECTION B: QUESTIONAIRE COMPETENCY CATEGORY DEFINITIONS

1. **Professional Knowledge Competencies:**

   These refer to your knowledge and understanding, as a professional educator, of characteristics of special needs children, and the adaptations necessary to effectively teach them.

2. **Instructional Strategies:**

   Reflects the ability to demonstrate maximum flexibility regarding modification and adaptation of teaching strategies, so you accomodate different learning styles and abilities within the various instructional settings.

3. **Assessment:**

   The use and interpretation of various educational assessment devices and procedures appropriate for determining student strengths, weaknesses, and levels of achievement in various domains of development and learning.

4. **Evaluation of Student Progress:**

   Determining, through various and appropriate evaluation criteria, the level of student mastery of individualized program plan objectives; and the ability to use this data to initiate modifications in instructional or programmatic objectives.

5. **Communication with Parents, Colleagues, and Administrators:**

   Engaging in collaborative consultation to disseminate and gather information concerning special need students. This consultation exhibits a willingness and deep committment on behalf of all involved to work together for the benifit of the child.

6. **Goal Setting:**

   Developing measurable and observeable objectives for instruction, based upon results of assessment.

7. **Developing a Positive Classroom Environment for Special Need Students:**

   The ability to develop a positive, accepting classroom and school atmosphere, which fosters constructive interaction between all students.

8. **Personal Characteristics:**

Individual, personal characteristics, thought to be important traits for any teacher to possess, but specifically for those with special need children in their class.

SECTION 'C': QUESTIONAIRE DIRECTIONS

The following questionaire attempts to determine the competencies necessary for professionals implementing the provinces new Special Education Policy. You will find two rating scales, one on either side of each competency statement.

Scale One - located on the left of each statement, asks you to rate the statement in terms of its level of importance for professionals **in your role** (i.e., either as a regular classroom teacher, special educator, or an administrator) to possess, in order to implement the policy successfully. Indicate your answer by selecting one of the following:

Very low importance
Low importance
Average importance
High importance
Very high importance

Scale Two - located on the right of the statement, measures the extent to which you feel you possess the competency given. I appreciate that this scale requires you to be frank in your self-assessment, but I can assure you that your candid reply will be greatly appreciated and kept anonymous. You are to indicate your level of competency by selecting one of the following answers:

Highly Competent
Competent
Somewhat Competent
In need of a little more competency
In need of a lot more competency

VERY LOW IMPORTANCE	LOW IMPORTANCE	AVERAGE IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE	VERY HIGH IMPORTANCE		HIGHLY COMPETENT	COMPETENT	SOMEWHAT COMPETENT	IN NEED OF A LITTLE MORE COMPETENCY	IN NEED OF A LOT MORE COMPETENCY
CATEGORY A : PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE COMPETENCIES										
---	---	---	---	---	1. knowledgable about the skills necessary to select appropriate behaviorial management techniques for use with individual and/or group behavior.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	2. have a knowledge of the underlying philosophy and salient events that have lead to our contemporary striving towards integration of exceptional students.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	3. have an understanding of a range of different instructional programs appropriate for use with special needs children.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	4. have knowledge of the emotional, intellectual, and behavioral characteristics of exceptional children.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	5. have an understanding of the motivational conditions which enhance optimum performance in children.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	6. am knowledgeable about the procedures used in case conferencing.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	7. have an understanding of the concept of the 'least restrictive environment'.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	8. have an understanding of the rationale for the new Special Education Policy.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	9. have knowledge of the responsibility associated with the supervision of students with physical, behavioral and developmental disabilities, during lunch duty, play-ground time, recess, etc.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	10. have an understanding of how to deal effectively with parents of exceptional children, from knowledge of typical experiences and stages they progress through in dealing with the reality of their situation.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	11. am knowledgeable about the principles and dynamics involved in bringing about attitudinal change within the school.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	12. have knowledge about the range of psychometric devices and procedures available for psychoeducational assessment.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	13. have knowledge of various stages/phases of the consultation process.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	14. have knowledge of learning characteristics of gifted children and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	15. have knowledge of learning characteristics of children with visual impairments and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	16. have knowledge of the learning characteristics of hearing impaired children and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	17. have knowledge of characteristics of children with communication disorders (eg. articulation, stuttering, cleft palate, language disorders) and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---

VERY LOW IMPORTANCE	LOW IMPORTANCE	AVERAGE IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE	VERY HIGH IMPORTANCE		HIGHLY COMPETENT	COMPETENT	SOMEWHAT COMPENENT	IN NEED OF A LITTLE MORE COMPETENCY	IN NEED OF A LOT MORE COMPETENCY
---	---	---	---	---	18. have knowledge of characteristics of children with behavior problems and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	19. have knowledge of characteristics of children with specific learning disabilities and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	20. have knowledge of characteristics of children with physical disabilities and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	21. have knowledge of the characteristics of children with developmental disabilities and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	22 have knowledge of the characteristics of children with severe and multiple handicapps and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	23. have knowledge of characteristics of children with augmentative devices and instructional adaptations to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---

CATEGORY B : INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

---	---	---	---	---	1. can identify and differentiate between a variety of behavior management techniques.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	2. can identify and reinforce appropriate student behaviors in order to stimulate continued effort.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	3. have a repertoire of response styles and instructional approches to match individual students' learning styles.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	4. can use convergent/divergent inquiry strategies when teaching.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	5. can provide a wide variety of learning activities which accomplish similar goals, yet allow for individual differences in learning style.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	6. can develop techniques for individual remedial instruction to meet the specific learning needs of each student.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	7. can maintain flexible scheduling in the classrooms to allow for periods of extended instructional practice, or other physical or social needs of the student.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	8. can implement modified learning strategies before a student is referred.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	9. can make instructional decisions related to students entry skills in the educational setting.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	10. can provide learning experiences which will enable students to transfer learning from one situation to another.	---	---	---	---	---

VERY LOW IMPORTANCE	LOW IMPORTANCE	AVERAGE IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE	VERY HIGH IMPORTANCE			HIGHLY COMPETENT	COMPETENT	SOMEWHAT COMPENENT	IN NEED OF A LITTLE MORE COMPETENCY	IN NEED OF A LOT MORE COMPETENCY
---	---	---	---	---	11.	can specify and prepare a variety of activities that will involve the entire class in grouping patterns that are varied and flexible.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	12.	can provide an optimal classroom climate through appropriate arrangement and adaptation of the physical properties of the classroom.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	13.	can acquire, adapt, and develop curriculum materials necessary to achieve learning goals.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	14.	can provide ample instruction and practice for each child to develop and refine adequate coping strategies.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	15.	am able to appropriately use alternative or augmentative methods of communication when necessary.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	16.	can systematically analyze instructional objectives (task analysis) and specify alternative program strategies to achieve them.	---	---	---	---	---

CATEGORY C : ASSESSMENT

---	---	---	---	---	1.	can administer and interpret formal/informal assessment devices to ascertain student strengths and weaknesses and generate possible remediation ideas from these devices.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	2.	can determine a child's present level of functioning, in all domains, through criterion referenced tests.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	3.	can assess attainment of program plan goals and initiate revisions to the plan when necessary.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	4.	can determine a child's ability to successfully cope with the regular curriculum.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	5.	can conduct assessments of teacher effectiveness in educating children with special needs	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	6.	can monitor, from year to year, student growth in all educational areas.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	7.	can conduct systematic observation of special students as a means of assessing their performance in all domains.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	8.	can identify characteristics of behavioral disorders in children.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	9.	can recognize predominant signs of possible learning disabilities in children.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	10.	can compile student's early development history through various methods including extracting information from parents concerning the child's behavior at home, etc.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	11.	can develop a student profile highlighting strengths and needs of exceptional children.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	12.	can develop a variety of data collection techniques for problem identification and clarification of student needs.	---	---	---	---	---

VERY LOW IMPORTANCE	LOW IMPORTANCE	AVERAGE IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE	VERY HIGH IMPORTANCE			HIGHLY COMPETENT	COMPETENT	SOMEWHAT COMPETENT	IN NEED OF A LITTLE MORE COMPETENCY	IN NEED OF A LOT MORE COMPETENCY
---	---	---	---	---	13.	can evaluate alternatives and anticipate possible consequences of program decisions.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	14.	can determine, through consultation, assessment and observation, whether a student is a canidate for placement in the regular classroom.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	15.	can match the needs/abilities of each child to the appropriate educational setting based on evaluation of both the learner and the setting.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	16.	can understand and critically interpret assessment reports from other professionals.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	17.	can apply the principles of the least restrictive environment in all decisions regarding exceptional students.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	18.	can record observations made in a clear, accurate and concise format.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	19.	can coordinate program planning team decisions and integrate recommendations into a cohesive program plan.	---	---	---	---	---

CATEGORY D : EVALUATION OF STUDENT PROGRESS

---	---	---	---	---	1.	can develop appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures, and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether short term instructional objectives are being achieved.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	2.	can develop various means of classroom evaluation, which take into account, the individual differences of the students in my class.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	3.	can establish review dates to evaluate student progress and program plan effectiveness.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	4.	can conduct ongoing and outcome evaluations of student progress.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	5.	can establish new program goals once mastery of specified objectives has been reached.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	6.	can organize a system to collect and record data by which to evaluate student progress toward goal attainment.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	7.	can prepare verbal or written reports to the principal about the effects of teaching strategy modifications.	---	---	---	---	---

CATEGORY E : COMMUNICATION WITH PARENTS, COLLEAGUES AND ADMINISTRATORS

---	---	---	---	---	1.	can act as a consultant to other teachers, etc., on teaching strategies for exceptional students	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	2.	can establish and maintain rapport with all program team members, in both formal and informal school interactactions.	---	---	---	---	---

VERY LOW IMPORTANCE	LOW IMPORTANCE	AVERAGE IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE	VERY HIGH IMPORTANCE		HIGHLY COMPETENT	COMPETENT	SOMEWHAT COMPETENT	IN NEED OF A LITTLE MORE COMPETENCY	IN NEED OF A LOT MORE COMPETENCY
---	---	---	---	---	3. can communicate clearly and effectively, in oral and written form, information about the exceptional child to relevant individuals.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	4. can encourage parents to assume an active role during individualized program plan conferences.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	5. can collaborate and plan with the individualized program planning committee the objectives and goals for students with special needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	6. can demonstrate skills in informing parents of evaluation results and program plan involvement using, in addition to the written notice, the strategies of parent-teacher conferences, phone calls, and home visits.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	7. can elicit special concerns from parents related to their child and ensure that these concerns are carefully considered by the individualized program planning committee.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	8. can schedule planning time that accomodates the needs of both regular and special educators to discuss a student's progress, needs, etc.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	9. can consult regularly with special education resource personnel to discuss effective teaching strategies and resources for their use with special needs children.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	10. can schedule monthly meetings for case conferencing to share knowledge about a student, collaborate on academic tasks, and behavior management programs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	11. can coordinate team decisions and recommendations into a cohesive program plan.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	12. can act as a liason between members of the program planning team.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	13. can ensure follow-up and implementation of program plans.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	14. can ensure appropriate resource personnel form a part of the program planning team.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	15. can share ideas and approaches that pertain to the students for whom the program planning committee have mutual responsibilty.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	16. can support and foster a shared view of your school's philosophy about special needs children and how best to meet their needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	17. can contact parents when a student begins experiencing difficulty dealing with curriculum demands, or classroom environment and explain to them behaviors exhibited or skills lacking, that need to be addressed.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	18. can act as a source of information to classroom teachers in discriminating unique problems from normal fluctuations in development.	---	---	---	---	---

VERY LOW IMPORTANCE	LOW IMPORTANCE	AVERAGE IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE	VERY HIGH IMPORTANCE			HIGHLY COMPETENT	COMPETENT	SOMEWHAT COMPETENT	IN NEED OF A LITTLE MORE COMPETENCY	IN NEED OF A LOT OF COMPETENCY
---	---	---	---	---	19.	can ensure that persons involved in planning and implementing the program planning process are also involved in its evaluation.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	20.	can develop a plan to use the talents of parents, in supporting at home, learning activities helpful for their child.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	21.	can conduct inservice training for all school personnel, with regards to procedures for implementing the new special education policy.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	22.	can give clear instructions and inservice to support personnel (teacher-aides) as to the functions they will perform.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	23.	can ensure that school personnel are aware of their specific role in the observation, referral and identification of children with special needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	24.	can interpret student psychoeducational assessments to others, in a meaningful way, and discuss recommendations and appropriate interventions.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	25.	can utilize active, ongoing listening and responding skills to facilitate the consultation process.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	26.	can interview effectively to elicit information, share information, explore problems, set goals and objectives.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	27.	can manage conflict and confrontation skillfully, throughout the consultation process to maintain collaborative relationships.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	28.	can provide information to other professionals and parents, on the child's capabilities in a variety of environments and situations.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	29.	can keep a record of contacts made with parents or resource personnel as well as anecdotal data.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	30.	can establish guidelines to assist teachers in informal data collection about student strengths and weaknesses.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	31.	inform special education teacher of the need for modification of the program plan.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	32.	can develop a feedback system that will furnish continuous data to student, teacher, and parents, on goal attainment.	---	---	---	---	---

CATEGORY F : GOAL SETTING

---	---	---	---	---	1.	can determine for each student in the class individual goals that are appropriate, realistic, and measurable.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	2.	can set short and long term goals for exceptional students.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	3.	can establish projected dates for initiation and duration of services to students with special needs.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	4.	can state objectives for student educational plans in clear, identifiable and measurable terms.	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	5.	can specify evaluative criteria for particular goals and objectives.	---	---	---	---	---

VERY LOW IMPORTANCE	LOW IMPORTANCE	AVERAGE IMPORTANCE	HIGH IMPORTANCE	VERY HIGH IMPORTANCE		HIGHLY COMPETENT	COMPETENT	SOMEWHAT COMPETENT	IN NEED OF A LITTLE MORE COMPETENCY	IN NEED OF A LOT MORE COMPETENCY
...	...	...	...	...	6. can accept responsibility to teach to the specified educational plan objectives.	---	---	---	---	---

CATEGORY G : DEVELOPING ACCEPTANCE AND PUPIL SELF-CONFIDENCE

...	...	...	...	...	1. can conduct class activities in a way to encourage interaction between and among all students.	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	2. can encourage acceptance, integration and understanding of an exceptional child in the regular classroom.	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	3. can maintain an environment in which all students are actively involved and working on task.	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	4. can help build a positive self-concept in all students.	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	5. can facilitate social interaction of special needs children with regular class students.	---	---	---	---	---

CATEGORY H : PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

...	...	...	...	...	1. have a willingness to seek out consultative relationships with specialists or school staff concerning a student.	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	2. can exhibit the ability to be caring, respectful, empathic, and open in consultation interactions.	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	3. can facilitate progress in consultation situations by managing personal stress, maintaining calm in times of crisis, taking risks and remaining flexible and resilient.	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	4. can respect divergent points of view, acknowledge the right to hold different views and to act in accordance with convictions.	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	5. am willing and safe enough to say " I don't know, let's find out."	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	6. can recognize that successful and lasting solutions require commonality of goals and collaboration throughout all phases of the problem-solving process.	---	---	---	---	---
...	...	...	...	...	7. can develop the role as a change agent (eg. implementing strategies for gaining support, overcoming resistance, etc.)	---	---	---	---	---
..	...	...	...	...	8. can engage in self-evaluation of strengths and weaknesses to modify personal and teaching behaviors influencing the consultation process.	---	---	---	---	---
..	...	...	...	...	9. can accept that the responsibility for educating exceptional students is a shared responsibility.	---	---	---	---	---
..	...	...	...	...	10. can demonstrate an ability to work with individuals as well as groups.	---	---	---	---	---