

2017

Responsibilities of General and Special Education Teachers Serving Students With Learning Disabilities

Antonia Lynn Kittrell
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Antonia Lynn Kittrell

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Kathleen Claggett, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty

Dr. Jennifer Seymour, Committee Member, Education Faculty

Dr. Mary Dereshiwsky, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University

2018

Abstract

Responsibilities of General and Special Education Teachers Serving Students With
Learning Disabilities

by

Antonia Kittrell

MA, Walden University, 2009

BS, Greensboro College, 1989

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Walden University

December 2017

Abstract

Third-grade students in a small rural school district in North Carolina are not meeting reading benchmarks on End-of-Grade Tests. Parents and educators have concerns regarding the service delivery plan for students with disabilities who have deficits in reading. The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the roles and responsibilities of special education and general education teachers in relation to Common Core Reading Standards instruction for students with disabilities. Vygotsky's theory of social constructivism and concept of the zone of proximal development formed the conceptual framework for the exploration of how students' academic needs are met with appropriate support in the learning environment. The study's research questions addressed the perceptions of 4 special education teachers and 5 general education teachers as they considered placement, monitored students' reading progress, and implemented instructional strategies. Purposeful sampling was used to select the 9 participants to participate in the interview. Data were analyzed inductively using categories and themes. Eight themes emerged from the special education teachers and 6 themes developed from the general education teachers. The common themes that developed from both teachers were: progress monitoring, time/scheduling, and communication. The most important finding is the need for professional development to improve collaboration. This case study may promote social change by documenting the process that coteachers engage in to support disabled students' reading progress. This is significant because it offers evidence that general and special education teachers can use reading instruction strategies in inclusion settings to address students' reading deficit.

Responsibilities of General and Special Education Teachers Serving Students With
Learning Disabilities

by

Antonia Kittrell

MA, Walden University, 2009

BS, Greensboro College, 1989

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Walden University

December 2017

Dedication

This dissertation is first dedicated to my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. Without him, I would not have been able to take on such a task; however, I am reminded that through him, and of him, all things consist. I am reminded that eyes have not seen, or ears heard, all the things that he has in store for me. To God be all of the Glory!

I dedicate this work to my parents, Mr. & Mrs. Bobby Kittrell, who encouraged me to pursue my doctorate and sealed their blessing upon my purpose in life. They allowed me to work at their home as I used their computer and printer and asked for advice. I am grateful to have been raised by these two wonderful people.

I also dedicate this work to my biological father, Clarence Jenkins (deceased). I am so glad that I was able to share with him that Walden had approved me to begin research on his birthday, December 28, 2015. He transitioned on January 5, 2016. He was so proud of his baby girl, Lynn.

I also dedicate this work to my deceased grandmother, Tezzie Mae Atkinson Barnes. She had the desire to become a teacher but could not afford to go to college after graduating from high school. She and Granddaddy Buck (Johnnie Frank Barnes) were sharecroppers and demonstrated love, sacrifice, determination, and strong work ethics that impact my life today. Granddaddy Buck would say, "You can make it if you try."

I also dedicate this work to my deceased grandparents, Mr. & Mrs. Charlie Kittrell, who inspired me to love God, serve him, and attend church, which was a great foundation for me as I continue on my journey in life.

Acknowledgments

With a grateful heart, and much humility, I acknowledge and recognize all who assisted and trusted me to reach this milestone. I wish to thank my chair, Dr. Katherine Claggett. The phone calls, texts, emails, and messages from you were always on time. Your character of caring is so heartfelt, which pushed me to work harder despite my personal and work obligations. The times you suggested that I reflect, read, and write were needful. You are a gift to education because of your willingness to support others. Your level of patience caused me to believe that I could achieve my goal. “Thank you for everything, Dr. Claggett.” Your countless hours of helping me from the initial stages of the prospectus to this dissertation will never be forgotten. I also recognize Dr. Jennifer Seymour and Dr. Mary Dershiwsky, who also assisted me.

I acknowledge my best friend since kindergarten, Ms. Pattie King. She has been my cheerleader since Day 1. I thank you for all the prayers and encouragement, and for reminding me to stay focused. We got our degree!!! I also thank Valerie Whitley, Queenie Kittrell, Tori Kittrell, Curtis Gooding, Carrie Wootson, Meeka Shaw, Annetter Wooten, Patrick Kabasele, Michelle Foster, Anedra Johnson-Mobley, Jorie Edwards, Dr. Ruby Jones, Judy Wiggins, Sandra Kittrell-Dunn, and Mr. & Mrs. Vermont Hinton, Rhonda Jones, and Lisa Little, for providing me with technical support, encouragement, and prayer. I would also like to say thanks to the participants who sacrificed their time to be part of the project study. I want to extend heartfelt thanks to my pastors, Apostle B. L. Kittrell and Prophetess Jean Kittrell, and my church family, Perfecting Family & Friends Worship & Ministries, for all of your prayers and support. I also thank Apostle Wiggins

and Redemptive Blood Church, Pastor James Perry, Bishop Sarah Perry, and Shiloh Deliverance Ministries Church for allowing me to worship with you as you encouraged me through the Word of God, prayer, and praise. I also thank all of my siblings—Michelle, Wonza, Bobbie, Fabrienne, Vashti, Rolanda, Bobby Jr., LeTroy, and Jennifer—for your support and prayers. Each of you has helped me to grow through this time in my life. Last but not least, I thank my children, Eunesia and Trey, and their father, Warren, along with my grandchildren, Tre'Shaun, Daniel, Amir, and Genesis for being on this educational journey with me. You pushed me more than you know as I persevered. I thank God for all of you and pray that I will continue on my journey as I continue to serve children.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vi
Section 1: Introduction.....	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Rationale	5
Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level.....	5
Evidence of the Problem From the Professional Literature.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	11
Significance of the Study	12
Research Questions.....	14
Review of the Literature	15
Conceptual Framework.....	15
Review of the Broad Research.....	16
Common Core Standards	17
Teaching Diverse Learners	19
Strategies to Assist With Reading Difficulties	21
Monitoring Student Learning.....	25
Service Delivery Plan	29
Least Restrictive Environment.....	30
Special Education Models Within the Schools.....	34

Inclusion Setting	38
Attitudes and Roles of General Education Teachers	40
Coteaching Models	43
Collaboration Among Colleagues.....	45
Implications.....	48
Summary.....	49
Section 2: The Methodology.....	51
Introduction.....	51
Research Design and Approach	51
Participants.....	55
Method of Establishing Researcher-Participant Working Relationship	62
Ethical Considerations	62
Data Collection	63
Interviews.....	65
Tracking Data.....	66
Special Education Teachers’ and General Education Teachers’ Interviews	66
Document Artifacts Results	67
Role of Researcher	68
Data Analysis and Results	69
Case-by-Case Studies.....	75
Discrepant Cases.....	76
Research Findings.....	76

Discussion of the Findings.....	77
Data Analysis Results: Thematic Findings	77
Progress Monitoring.....	78
Collaboration.....	83
Time/Planning/Scheduling.....	84
Providing Reading Instruction	92
Structuring of Groups	98
Improving Reading Intervention.....	100
Staffing/Training.....	107
Improving the Proficiency of Students With a Reading Deficit	109
Differentiation.....	114
Pull-Out Model	116
Push-In Model.....	123
Communication.....	128
Conclusion	133
Section 3: The Project.....	135
Introduction.....	135
Project Goals.....	135
Rationale	137
Review of the Literature	139
Project Genre	139
The Need for Professional Development.....	140

Progress Monitoring.....	143
Time	145
Planning	146
Collaboration/Communication.....	148
Project Description.....	152
Existing Supports	153
Potential Barriers	153
Proposal for Implementation and Timetable.....	153
Roles and Responsibilities of Researcher and Others.....	154
Project Evaluation Plan.....	154
Project Implications	156
Local Community	156
Far-Reaching Implications.....	157
Conclusion	157
Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions.....	159
Introduction.....	159
Project Strengths and Limitations.....	159
Project Limitations.....	161
Recommendations for Alternative Approaches	161
Scholarship.....	162
Project Development and Evaluation.....	163
Leadership and Change.....	164

Analysis of Self as a Scholar	166
Analysis of Self as Practitioner.....	166
Analysis of Self as a Project Developer.....	167
Implications, Applications, and Directions for Social Change.....	168
Conclusion	169
References.....	171
Appendix A: The Project	196
Appendix B: Teacher Sample Interview Guide	231

List of Tables

Table 1. Attributes of Participants.....	59
------------------------------------------	----

Section 1: Introduction

Background of the Problem

The implementation of Common Core Standards has placed increased demand on teachers to ensure that all students are proficient in reading at the elementary level. Third-grade students receive extra attention in North Carolina because of the Read to Achieve program, which is part of the Excellent Public Schools Act that was enacted in July 2012. This legislative initiative applied to all schools at the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year. With emphasis being placed on third grade students, including students with reading deficits, special education teachers, general education teachers, and parents have expressed concerns regarding how students with disabilities receive instruction in reading. Many third grade students who have reading deficits receive pull-out services rather than inclusion services. This raises concerns for general education teachers and special education teachers. Students with disabilities are missing core instruction due to receiving pull-out services with special education teachers. This situation poses a problem involving the roles and responsibilities of general education teachers and special education teachers within the school district.

The roles and responsibilities of both general education teachers and special education teachers are evolving. North Carolina began the implementation of the Common Core Standards in all public schools during the 2012-2013 school years. In order to obtain more information of Common Core Standards, general education teachers, special education teachers, parents, administration, and students can view the website at [http:// www.commoncorestandards.com](http://www.commoncorestandards.com). With the adoption of Common Core Standards

in many states, general and special educators' roles and responsibilities need to be identified in the general education classroom and pull-out model to ensure that all students become proficient in relation to reading standards for literature, informational text, and foundational skills. Roles differ between general education teachers and special education teachers. For example, the general education teacher's role includes monitoring grade-level reading and comprehension, while the special education teacher may use the pull-out model to fulfill the roles of progress monitoring and developing phonemic awareness.

End-of-Grade Test results from a small rural area in the southern part of the school district that was the focus of this study indicated that some of the students had not been demonstrating proficiency in relation to the current curriculum, especially in reading. With the introduction of the Common Core Standards, such results presented a concern for third-grade teachers and parents. The local school system did not meet annual measurable objectives for the 2012-2013 school year. Each individual school within the local system had to present its disaggregated proficiency and growth data on the End-of-Grade Test. Data for the subgroup of students with learning disabilities included results from all of the elementary schools in the southern area. According to the report of the Disaggregated State School System (Local Education Agency [LEA]) and School Performance Data for the 2012-2013 school year (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction [NCDPI], 2012-2013), some third grade students with disabilities were not proficient in reading at six elementary schools in the southern area of the local school district. Proficiency rates at these six schools ranged from less than 5% of students being

proficient to 30%. These data indicate that general education teachers and special education teachers must seek ways to improve reading proficiency levels for students with deficits in reading.

Third-grade teachers and parents in the study district have many concerns related to students' proficiency levels in reading, report cards, retention, and promotion. To meet Common Core Standards, students' progress should be monitored regularly, and students who are not meeting goals should receive interventions. Even though all students benefit from explicit and designed instruction in the area of reading, students with disabilities require specific interventions and additional support to meet their needs in this area (Hudson, Torgensen, Lane, & Turner, 2012). The Common Core Standards in reading provide consistent learning goals as students prepare for college, career, and life.

Through these standards, teachers are aware of what each student is expected to learn. In addition to being knowledgeable about the Common Core Standards in reading, teachers must address the reading deficits of students with disabilities as outlined by their Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals (Haager & Vaughn, 2013).

Teachers are challenged to meet the mandates of Common Core Standards and IEPs. As they attempt to do so, they may experience negative attitudes due to increased demands for preparation and collaboration with colleagues. As a result, general education teachers and special education teachers have difficulty in meeting the reading needs of students with disabilities as indicated in their service delivery plans on their IEPs. The problem in the district that was the focus of this qualitative study is that students with disabilities currently receive services in both the general education classroom and through pull-out

services. When these students leave the general education classroom for special education services, they can have difficulty in relation to the general-classroom instruction that they missed, along with completing related assignments. Special education teachers and director of special education have expressed concerns over instructional roles and responsibilities concerning students with disabilities. With the implementation of Common Core Standards and the use of IEPs, understanding these roles and responsibilities is of paramount importance.

The school system in this case study is the second largest district in North Carolina and the 16th largest district in the nation. It has 104 elementary schools, 33 middle schools, 27 high schools, and two leadership academies, for a total of 171 schools. The schools are divided into seven regions; in each region, an area superintendent is assigned to provide school district leaders with strategic direction to fulfill the district mission. An elementary school report for the district indicated that in 2012-2013, 359 students in the district participated in the free and reduced-price lunch programs based upon the information on the district homepage. In addition, on the district homepage during: the 2013-2014 school year, 33.3% of elementary students applied and qualified for free or reduced-price lunches. The local school system has a special program called the Exceptional Children's Program, which serves 20,282 special education students, or 13.2% of the total student population. The district has a high number of students with disabilities, and educators must seek ways to help them improve their reading performance.

Statement of the Problem

Delineating the roles and responsibilities of each professional interacting with learning disabled children in third-grade reading instruction is needful. Despite efforts to improve the success of all students through professional learning team meetings, staff development meetings, and IEP meetings, many factors have been associated with this problem. These include proficiency level, progress monitoring, interventions, reading strategies, and the continuum of services. One persistent challenge is simply knowing what the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers and general education teachers are in relation to students with disabilities. Through this case study, I sought the perceptions and opinions of both general education and special education teachers regarding the appropriate environment for providing reading interventions for students with disabilities.

Rationale

Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level

In the schools that were represented in this case study, students with learning disabilities had not met proficiency standards in reading. Teachers across the district had stated that students were missing literacy instruction in the general education classroom due to pull-out services. The focus of instruction for a special education teacher who serves students with the pull-out model is based on IEP goals, whereas the focus for the general education teacher is making sure that he or she is teaching the Common Core Standards. This presents a problem when students with learning disabilities are not making adequate progress with the Common Core Standards. Both general educators and

special educators had articulated this problem during grade-level meetings, staff meetings, and district meetings with central office. This concern was also addressed during an IEP meeting as a parent and general education teacher discussed the service delivery plan in the area of reading.

Studies have been conducted to determine whether the push-in model or pull-out model is more effective for students with learning disabilities. Obiakor, Harris, Mutuak, Rotatori, and Algozzine (2012) conducted two small case studies regarding students taught with these models. One student received pull-out services and never reached his goals in reading; in fact, his behavior worsened while he was being taught by the special education teacher. He was more engaged and focused in the general education setting. Another student received services using the push-in model; this student made great improvement and met all of his goals. It is necessary to consider appropriate placements for students carefully to ensure that their academic needs are met.

Scores from recent End-of-Grade Tests have indicated that students have not been meeting reading proficiency goals. With the introduction of the Common Core Standards, students' lack of proficiency is a concern for teachers. On the End-of-Grade Test for the 2012-2013 school years, students had to score a Level three or four to be proficient in reading and be promoted to the next grade. In the local public school system, there are 18 elementary schools in the southern part of the county. Aggregated results of the End-of-Grade reading tests for five out of the 17 schools indicated that no students with disabilities scored a Level three or four, as indicated in the results from the Accountability Services Division at the NCDPI (2012-2013). I focused on these schools

because of the reading level results of the students with disabilities. Low proficiency scores impact the instruction of students as well as students' promotion and retention.

In the local school system, it is necessary to examine the roles and responsibilities of both special education teachers and general education teachers in the instruction of Common Core Standards for students with disabilities in consideration of their IEP goals. It is also necessary to understand the advantages and disadvantages of each learning environment as teachers work with students assigned to their individual classrooms. Such understanding will allow both special education teachers and general education teachers the opportunity to monitor the reading progress of students with disabilities and provide appropriate instructional strategies. In choosing the optimal learning environment for students with learning disabilities, an IEP team must also consider the least restrictive environment based upon the student's individual needs, such as those related to the student's present level of performance, strengths, and behaviors, as well as communication, vision, social, and physical needs. Appropriate classroom accommodations and testing modifications must be implemented so that students can be successful with all assignments and tests.

Scores on the Beginning-of-Grade 3 English Language Arts/Reading Test (BOG3) and End-of-Grade Test highlight students' reading strengths and weaknesses. These results allow general education teachers and special education teachers to plan instruction and provide appropriate materials to students with learning disabilities. During the fourth grading period, third-grade students take the North Carolina End-of-Grade test. If they do not pass the End-of-Grade reading test, there are other factors

called *good cause exemptions* that may allow them to be promoted to the fourth grade. Students need to meet at least one of the good cause exemptions mentioned on the district homepage. An example of the good cause exemption would be for students who have received intensive reading intervention and previously retained in kindergarten, first, second, and third grades. Another example is if students demonstrated proficiency on Read to Achieve Test. If students do not meet one of the requirements, they are encouraged to attend a free reading camp sponsored by the school district. The need for this project study was identified based on anecdotal evidence that general education and special education teachers in the schools where this study was held were unclear in their understanding of roles and responsibilities for making certain that students identified as learning disabled are making adequate progress with the Common Core Standards.

Due to the recent implementation of the Read to Achieve program, the state has mandated that every student read at or above grade level by the end of third grade. This directive needs to be addressed because it is raising questions during professional learning team meetings regarding the accountability of general education teachers and special education teachers as they make decisions on scheduling, grading, promotion, and retention with the input of administration and service providers at the school level.

Evidence of the Problem From the Professional Literature

The general education classroom is the first placement option considered for a student with a disability unless the student's IEP specifies otherwise. In addition, third-grade students with disabilities as well as third grade students in the general education classroom must be proficient in reading to be promoted to the next grade. As children

with disabilities enter the classroom environment, some general education teachers can feel inadequate to meet their needs. On June 2, 2010, North Carolina adopted the Common Core Standards in K-12 English Language Arts released by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Offices. These standards articulate rigorous grade-level expectations in reading placing emphasis on increasing the amount and complexity of text as well as on deep analysis of text as students are expected to reach benchmarks. These expectations have raised concerns about how general and special education teachers can best support students with disabilities (Haager & Vaughn, 2013). Students with disabilities who are eligible under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) must be challenged to excel within the general curriculum and be prepared for life after graduation, including college and careers. Not only has the implementation of the Common Core Standards placed emphasis on literacy, but under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2006), all students, including students with disabilities, are expected to reach proficiency in reading. These expectations increase challenges for students with disabilities and their teachers.

In the 1990s, the National Reading Panel received a directive to review the effectiveness of learning approaches. In a report, the panel identified five areas of instruction significant to an effective reading program: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development [NICHD], 2000). Inclusion teachers face the challenges of accommodating many learning needs as they implement strategies to increase student fluency, vocabulary knowledge, and comprehension (Yearta, Jones, & Griffin, 2014). Schools are asked to

align to Common Core Standards so that students can have the opportunity to engage with fictional and nonfictional texts (Yearta, Jones, & Griffin, 2014). The Common Core Standards include a foundation for Grades K-5 that calls for students to “read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension” (National Governors Association [NGA] & Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2010, Fluency section, para. 1). Because these strategies are aligned with the Common Core Standards, these standards can be used in the classroom to foster deeper interaction with text.

For students with disabilities to meet high academic standards and demonstrate conceptual and procedural knowledge and skills, their instruction must incorporate appropriate modifications and accommodations to meet their unique needs (IDEA 34CFR 300.34, 2004). Therefore, there must be careful consideration of scheduling, classroom environment, time, structure, curriculum, and instructional methods for students with disabilities. These considerations are applicable when the inclusion model or self-contained models are being considered for students with learning disabilities. Research has indicated that students with learning disabilities have shown improvements in reading as a result of being in an inclusive environment (Katz & Mirenda, 2002; Teigland, 2009).

Coteaching is one service delivery option for students with disabilities (Friend & Bursuck, 2009). This model requires collaboration between the general education teacher and special education teacher as students receive reading support in the classroom environment. Inclusion implies that every child, regardless of disability, be fully involved in a school’s community (Hodkinson & Deverokonda, 2011).

There is controversy over who is responsible for teaching students the Common Core Standards as well as where students should be taught. The purpose of this study was to explore the roles and responsibilities of general education teachers and special education teachers in providing interventions and reading instruction to students with reading deficits. In addition to these matters, it is necessary to address the strengths and weakness of learning environments that include the push-in model and pull-out model.

Definition of Terms

Collaboration: In the field of special education, collaboration is generally a key part of creating and implementing an effective IEP. Parents, teachers, and school administrators must work together to ensure the education and well being of the student (Cook, Shepherd, Cook, & Cook, 2012).

Common Core Standards: A set of high-quality academic expectations in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics that define the knowledge and skills that all students should master by the end of each grade level to be on track for success in college, career, and life. (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010 a).

Coteaching: An approach to teaching that involves general and special educators wherein “two or more professionals [are] delivering substantive instruction to a diverse, or blended, group of students in a single physical space” (Hallahan, 2012, p. 37).

Least restrictive environment: To the maximum extent appropriate, school districts must educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Typically, this involves educating students in the regular classroom with appropriate aids and supports, referred to as “supplementary aids and services, along with the

nondisabled, peers in the school they would attend if not disabled, unless a student's individualized education program (IEP) requires one arrangement" (Rozalski, Miller, & Stewart, 2010).

Progress monitoring: A scientifically based practice used to assess a student's academic progress and evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. Progress monitoring tells the teacher what the student has learned and what still needs to be taught (Fuchs & Stecker, 2003).

Significance of the Study

The Common Core Standards for reading have represented a major instructional shift in the elementary schools in the local school system where this qualitative case study took place. These K-12 standards were created to ensure that all students are prepared for college and careers in terms of their literacy skills. Thus, they have caused general and special education teachers to change their educational practices across the curriculum for all students, including students with learning disabilities.

This study provides an in-depth understanding of the roles and responsibilities of both general education teachers and special education teachers in the instruction of Common Core Standards. In addition, it provides an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of these groups of teachers in relation to implementing reading goals on IEPs for learning disabled students. According to the research of Boyd and Symnter-Gworek (2012), teachers should be aware of the learning standards for curriculum instruction for all students. Therefore, the study documented teachers' knowledge of

standards for third-grade reading so that parents, general education teachers, special education teachers, and reading teachers know what they need to teach.

This study provides information to the local school district that can be used to ensure that general education teachers and special education teachers know their roles and responsibilities as they serve students with disabilities. With better defined roles and responsibilities, teachers may experience increases in student reading proficiency and thus greater job satisfaction. The findings provide the literacy department of the local school system with information to assist in creating and supporting appropriate reading programs that encourage growth in reading. The study provides general education teachers and special education teachers the opportunity to clearly see the documented skills and knowledge needed to teach all students as they look at data and plan lessons to include diverse learners. This study may promote positive social change in offering information that may be used by both general education teachers and special education teachers to teach students with a reading deficit in an inclusive classroom regardless of learning style, ability level, or performance on any assessment.

As general education teachers and special education teachers have incorporated the Common Core Standards within the classroom, students have seen how relevant they are to the real world. The Common Core Standards reflect knowledge and skills that students need for success in college and careers. In meeting these standards, students become fully prepared to compete in a global world.

Research Questions

Multiple research studies (Ballard, 2013; Brown, 2013; Hardy & Woodcock, 2015; Selvaraj, 2015) have indicated that there are many perceptions and opinions regarding the roles of general education teachers and special education teachers toward the service delivery plan for students with disabilities. This study investigated the roles and responsibilities of general education teachers and special education teachers when implementing the Common Core Standards, specifically in the area of reading. This study also explored the perceptions of special education teachers and general education teachers concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the pull-out model for students with disabilities. Through this case study, I sought to understand how the use of progress monitoring, reading interventions, and proficiency assessments impacts the roles of special education teachers and general education teachers as they serve students with disabilities who have reading deficits.

The following research questions guided the project study:

Research Question 1: What are the perceived roles and responsibilities of general education and special education teachers in monitoring reading progress for Common Core Reading Standards with students with disabilities?

Research Question 2: How do general education and special education teachers address Common Core Standards in reading instruction?

Research Question 3: Who has the responsibility of providing reading intervention strategies for students who are identified with a learning

disability who are not meeting benchmarks with the Common Core Reading Standards?

Research Question 4: What do elementary special education teachers and general education teachers perceive as the strengths and weaknesses of the pull-out model for students with disabilities?

Review of the Literature

This literature review provides a thorough understanding of the academic research regarding the responsibilities of both special education teachers and general education teachers in the instruction of Common Core Standards, particularly in the area of reading for students with disabilities. The review also explores the advantages and disadvantages of each learning environment. The theoretical concept of the zone of proximal development guided the study.

Conceptual Framework

Two conceptual frameworks guided this study. One of these frameworks pertains to students' learning and teachers' attempts to help students learn, and the other relates to how teachers, as adults, learn. These elements of the conceptual framework for this study were important because both students' learning of reading and teachers' learning of reading instruction are intertwined within the study of reading instruction.

The conceptual framework for this study was Vygotsky's theory of social constructivism. Vygotsky's theory is based upon the concept of the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). Within the zone of proximal development, children learn a certain task and gain knowledge with assistance rather than independently. A teacher

leveraging the zone of proximal development must serve as the facilitator to guide children as they face different learning challenges within the classroom environment.

To successfully apply the zone of proximal development concept, it is important to be aware of students' current performance level as well as to assist students with mastering more advanced concepts and skills (McLeod, 2010). Vygotsky contended that when a student is in the zone of proximal development for a particular skill and receives the appropriate assistance, the student will have enough courage to achieve the task. Vygotsky's theory suggests that educators provide support to children within each child's individual zone of proximal zone of development for the best learning outcomes. One investigator has shown how Vygotsky's framework embeds Common Core Standards into content-area instruction and provides templates, tasks, and strategies for a wide range of educators, including general education teachers, special education teachers, educational consultants, and math instructional coaches, as they design units that engage students in thoughtful investigations of their discipline (Harris, 2013). Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1993) agreed that curriculum has the maximum effect on student achievement when it is a proximal variable in the educational process—in other words, when the content goals are within the learner's zone of proximal development. Therefore, this study addressed the roles of general and special education teachers as they attempt to provide the optimum learning environment for students with learning disabilities.

Review of the Broad Research

Research for this literature review began with a search of journals, books, dissertations, and electronic articles. The databases searched included ERIC (peer-

reviewed articles), Google Scholar, SAGE, and the Walden Library ERIC, along with special education journals. I used key words such as *roles of teachers*, *progress monitoring*, *inclusion*, *service delivery plan*, *learning styles*, *multiple intelligences*, and *collaboration* as I searched for peer-reviewed articles. This literature review was focused on the study's conceptual framework and on literature relevant to special education teachers and general education teachers who serve students with reading deficits. This literature review consists of 11 sections addressing the following: (a) Common Core Standards; (b) teaching diverse learners; (c) strategies to assist students with reading difficulty; (d) service delivery plans; (e) the least restrictive environment; (f) inclusion settings; (g) the inclusion model, push-in model, and pull-out model; (h) attitudes and roles of general education teachers; (i) attitudes and roles of special education teachers; and (j) collaboration among colleagues.

Common Core Standards

With the implementation of Common Core Standards, general education teachers are expected to teach nondisabled and disabled peers. Ediger and Rao (2011) argued that all students, including disabled students, need to have support from their teachers and peers to achieve objectives with the Common Core curriculum. General education teachers and special education teachers are expected to provide the appropriate constructivist strategies and methods for students to reach benchmarks. This is necessary because the Common Core Standards are intended to shape constructivist instruction, rather than to dictate targets for direct instruction for declarative fact knowledge (Ediger & Rao, 2011). Common Core Standards instead target conceptual and procedural

knowledge. In this study, the Common Core Standards specifically targeted third-grade reading skills. Within the Common Core curriculum, general education teachers and special education teachers put forth goals that allow students to ask questions, develop the ability to make inferences, and understand structure, similarities, and contrast (Coburn, Hill, & Spillman, 2016).

Gewertz (2012) stated that the Common Core Standards place a premium on students' ability to read and reread text until they understand its meaning as well as use evidence in the text to build an argument. Due to students having practice with complete text and its academic language, there is emphasis on nonfiction across the content area. Students are expected to refine their vocabulary, apply inferencing skills, and convey information from sources in written form. Students are required to read so that they will be prepared for quarterly reading assessments and state testing. General education teachers and special education teachers are expected to provide appropriate strategies and methods for students to reach benchmarks. Students with disabilities need to meet these Common Core Standards that target conceptual knowledge, procedural knowledge, and specific English language skills rather than only simple recall of facts.

In order for this to happen, general education teachers and special education teachers must provide appropriate instruction and accommodations to allow students with disabilities to access the general curriculum (IDEA 34 CFR 300.34, 2004). Teachers in both groups must implement modifications, classroom accommodations, and testing accommodations so that students with learning disabilities have the opportunity to access the curriculum with their peers. The result of this effort is a collaborative environment in

which students with disabilities can feel confidence, trust, and empathy in relation to their nondisabled peers.

Teaching Diverse Learners

Teacher efficacy is a teacher's confidence in his or her ability to facilitate student learning (Isbell & Szabo, 2015). Teaching diverse learners presents a challenge to educators, and some feel unprepared to help students succeed. Many students with learning disabilities are educated in self-contained classrooms or in the resource setting with a special education teacher (Gothshall & Stefanou, 2011). Increasingly, learning disabled students are being served in inclusive classrooms along with students with emotional disabilities (Gable, Tonelson, Sheth, Wilson, & Park, 2012). Thus, students with learning disabilities are spending more time in the general education classroom with their nondisabled peers (Gothshall & Stefanou, 2011). This is a concern; Peterson and Smith (2011) found that many special education teachers lack necessary preparation to implement evidence-based classroom practices for inclusion classrooms.

Many teachers find it difficult to teach adaptively or modify teaching approaches to meet diverse learners' needs in the general education classroom (Kuyini, 2013). Kuyini and Abosi (2011) conducted a study in Ghana and found that students dropped out of school because their teachers' style was not adapted to meet their learning needs. As a result, the researchers indicated that adaptive strategies should be implemented to enhance learning outcomes for students. General education teachers and special education teachers must have a shared vision to address the unique needs of the various

learners within the classroom environment as they implement appropriate strategies and accommodations during the literacy block.

The implementation of the Common Core Standards at the national level and the establishment of rigorous standards with the expectation that all students will graduate from high school and subsequently compete in the workforce and/or the postsecondary educational environment have implications for students with learning disabilities (Haager & Vaughn, 2013). Data suggests that students with emotional disabilities who have behavioral problems that are not addressed in a timely fashion have poor learning outcomes which effect their postsecondary adjustment. Consequently, they have high rates of unemployment and underemployment, as well as lower wages compared to their learning-disabled and nondisabled peers (Simpson, Peterson, & Smith, 2011). Collins, Karl, Riggs, Galloway, and Haager (2010) stated that because the Common Core Standards promote career readiness, it is important that educators see a bigger picture regarding students with disabilities at the elementary level as they transition to middle school, especially students with moderate/severe disabilities.

One of the purposes of the No Child Left Behind Act was to improve teacher quality (Isbell & Szabo, 2015). Teachers must have the knowledge and the skills needed to teach various learners and impact their academic performance. According to Kurz et al., 2014, students benefit from a conceptual model called Opportunity to Learn, which focuses on schools' inputs and processes for producing student achievement of intended outcomes. Under this model, educators provide instructional time to teach a curriculum emphasizing higher order thinking skills with the implementation of evidence-based

instructional practices (Kurz, Elliot, Wehby, & Smithson, 2010). Both general and special education teachers have the chance to report on the progress of the Opportunity to Learn model at the class and student level. By doing so, teachers exemplify their shared responsibility for instruction to impact student learning in reading.

Three key components must be executed for Opportunity to Learn to be effective (Hiebert, Wilson, & Trainin, 2010). Those components are time, content, and quality, which exist simultaneously during instruction. First, teachers must invest instructional time in addressing students' knowledge and skills. Second, teachers must define the curriculum in order to provide students with the opportunity to learn. Teachers must be aware of the content that needs to be covered based upon the Common Core Standards. In many elementary schools' classroom environments, teachers read text aloud to students. Hiebert et al. (2010) emphasized that during that time, teachers set the pace and content of students' reading of text; however, this does not occur during an assessment. Third, as teachers know how much time to spend and what content is covered, time produces quality work as teachers use instructional practices such as direct instruction, guided feedback, and student-think-aloud. Due to the range of abilities in the classroom environment, it is necessary that general and special education teachers provide needful methods, materials, and strategies for students with reading deficits.

Strategies to Assist With Reading Difficulties

The Common Core Standards provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn as they prepare for success in college or the workforce. In this section of the literature review, evidence-based strategies have been designed to help

students meet the standards are reviewed. These strategies include a foundational component for students to read fluently and engage with text. One research-based strategy to increase student fluency is repeated reading (Mraz et al., 2013). One form of repeated reading is Reader's Theatre. It gives students the opportunity to read scripts and have a dramatic interpretation while engaging in reading (Jones, Burr, Kauffman, & Beck, 2013). Students select their roles and practice reading their scripts. They are able to reread the script multiple times, which enhances their fluency skills (Yearta, Jones, & Griffin, 2014). Ates (2013) explored the effectiveness of repeated reading with a student with a reading difficulty. He found that when he used repeated reading with the student accompanied with performance-based feedback, the student made improvement from his frustration reading level to an instructional level. There was also a decrease in the student's reading miscues. Therefore, the study indicated that repeated reading and feedback had a positive impact on the student's reading fluency. It is evident that fluency is an important component of reading and impacts comprehension when reading texts in different genres. Authors have agreed that there is a strong correlation between students' reading fluency and comprehension levels (Stanovich, 1980; Therrien, 2004; Torgesen, Rashotte, & Alexander, 2001).

Comprehension is another Common Core component of reading. It is defined as a student's ability to understand the text. Comprehension becomes important to students at the elementary level because it provides the foundation for further learning at the secondary level. Students' academic progress is shaped by their reading ability (Sweet & Snow, 2003). Thus, students must be knowledgeable of the skills needed to be successful

in reading. One of the Common Core standards emphasizes character development, in that students must be able to analyze why characters and events develop or interact during the text (NGA & CCSSO, 2010, Key Ideas and Details section, para. 3). An activity called BioPoem can be helpful with students who have difficulty with comprehension. Students create a poem about the main character of a text after reading the text. In doing so, students think about the character and analyze their character's interactions, thoughts, and traits. Students have the opportunity to write lines that include their feelings, fears, and accomplishments. Students may then read their writing pieces to their teacher and peers (Yearta, Jones, & Griffin, 2014).

Reading strategies are needed to enhance fluency and comprehension. Thus, educators must know the crucial role that the Common Core component vocabulary plays in comprehension. Therefore, the special education teacher must have a strategy to meet the needs of students who have difficulty with vocabulary (Yearta et al., 2014). For example, as students read fiction and nonfiction text, it is vital that teachers help them with determining or clarifying meanings of unknown words as well as navigating multiple meanings of words and phrases by using context clues (NGA & CCSSO, 2010).

There are many vocabulary strategies and materials such as Word Walls, the Frayer model, and Wordle. Teachers can use word walls to support vocabulary. Word Walls are commonly used in inclusive classrooms in a variety of ways and for a variety of purposes. Upon deciding on how to use a Word Wall, teachers or students may select words to study (Yearta, 2012). Gore (2004) mentioned that a study led by Monroe and Pendergrass in which fourth graders were randomly assigned to participate in the Frayer

model. The fourth-grade students were able to define the meaning of math terms after an oral review as a result of using the Frayer model. Thus, the researchers concluded that it was an effective model (Gore, 2004). It appears that visual supports such as Word Walls and graphic organizers can enhance student learning.

Graphic organizers can be used as a reading strategy in teaching and learning vocabulary in content areas (Manoli & Papadopoulou, 2012). As evidence, the Frayer model (Yearta, 2012) can be used as a graphic organizer as students provide the meaning of a word, provide an example of the word, provide a definition of the word, write a sentence with the word, and make an illustration of the word. Teachers should implement the words throughout the day. In this way, students may be encouraged to use the new vocabulary.

A study conducted by Malone and Yoon (2014) was used to determine if there was a difference in science vocabulary test scores when using the Wordle program versus the Frayer model. Wordle is a computer program invented by Fienberg (2011) that allows students to see words in a cloud. Students can change the shape of the cloud as well as color and font size using the program. There were only two participants in the Malone and Yoon (2014) study, both of whom were high school graduates. One of the participants was using the Wordle program online. The second participant used Wordle in a face-to-face setting. Participant 1 increased her science score by 5 points with the Frayer model but only 3 points with Wordle. Participant 2 increased his science score by 5 points with the Frayer model and only 1 point with Wordle. Results from the study indicated that the Frayer model improved visual learners' retention of science terms

compared to another program (Malone & Yoon, 2014). Thus, this could be a recommended strategy for students who demonstrate difficulty with vocabulary. As general education teachers and special education teachers develop and use activities such as those reviewed in this section, all students may make progress in the area of reading.

Monitoring Student Learning

Monitoring student learning is an essential component of high quality education. To ensure that all students learn, both special education teachers and general education teachers must use data to adapt their teaching to meet student's needs as they implement the appropriate interventions and strategies as they monitor the progress of students. In the general education classroom, the general education teacher has the responsibility of teaching students with a range level of abilities and academic needs. According to Gilson, Little, Ruegg, & Bruce-Davis (2014), matching instruction with students' readiness to learn is necessary to differentiate instruction. Thus, educators must assess the students in order to understand where students are academically. By doing so, a baseline can begin by looking at performance with Case 21 assessments, M-class data, and grade level standards in reading (Otaiba et al., 2014). As a result, general education teachers and special education teachers can monitor and analyze student abilities for those who are not proficient with reading common core standards. In return, instruction can be tailored to meet student academic needs. Thus, differentiated instruction is implemented (Jones, Yessel, & Grant, 2012). Due to the federal legislation known as the No Child Left Behind Act, school systems have adapted instruction for all children that are not meeting grade level expectations. Thus, teachers are accountable for ensuring that all students meet the

benchmark. In reality, some students fall behind the grade level benchmark due to deficits in reading (Gothshall & Stefanou, 2011). Nevertheless, it causes teachers to monitor the academic progress of students with the intent of implementing accommodations and strategies as soon as students show signs of struggling academically. A system called Response to Intervention (RTI) is in place to monitor progress of children that are experiencing difficulty in the area of reading before special education services are considered. “Responsiveness to Intervention (RTI) is a multi-tiered framework which provides school improvement through engaging, high quality instruction (North Carolina Department of Public Education, p.9, 2012). Response to Intervention (RTI) employs a team approach to guide educational practices, using a problem solving model based on data to address student needs and maximize growth for all (North Carolina Department of Public Education, p.9, 2012). Responsiveness to Intervention is used in elementary schools in North Carolina as a way to deliver research-based practices to all students and to monitor their progress (Ryan & Kaffenberger, 2011).

Implementation of Response to Intervention (RTI) has increased in schools as a result of changes in the Individual with Disabilities Improvement Act of 2004. Response to Intervention is part of the process for identifying students with disabilities. However, the process must be implemented with fidelity (Keller-Margulis, 2012). In a study related to teacher’s knowledge, associated with the Response to Intervention, Spear-Swerling and Cheesman (2011) found that teachers lacked knowledge in administering assessments and Response to Intervention (RTI) when compared to their knowledge about reading

components such as phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. In the state of North Carolina, Response to Intervention (RTI) has been replaced in some school districts with Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). MTSS has been an increasing interest with researchers and practitioners who wanted to bring research-based programs to schools. With the implementation of this practice educators must be aware of the critical factors of MTSS. These factors include the complexity of the process, use of data, importance of leadership, and ongoing technical support (Forman & Crystal, 2015). As a result, MTSS connects all efforts of it to ensure all students are successful.

MTSS is a multi-tiered framework which promotes school improvement through engaging, research-based academic and behavioral practices. North Carolina Multi-Tiered System of Support (NCMTSS) employs a systems approach using data-driven problem solving to maximize growth for all students (NC Department of Public Instruction, 2014). All school districts will be implementing this model in the upcoming years. The local school system currently has 28 schools that began using this model beginning in the 2015-2016 school years. MTSS has three tiers of instruction and support. Tier 1 includes all children receiving instruction and support. Tier 2 serves students needing more individualized instruction and support in a small group learning environment (Jimerson, Burns, & VanDerHeyden, 2007). Tier 3 is for students that require intensive support in order to be successful often in a smaller group or one-on-one (Baker, Fien, & Baker, 2010; Vaughn, Wanzek, Woodruff, & Linan-Thompson, 2007).

In the context of RTI, progress monitoring is used to assess student progress and performance in reading. In the local school system, the general education teacher and special education teacher use a formative diagnostic reading assessment called M-class to monitor the progress of the students in reading. As soon as the results are known, strategies are put in place to help the students with their reading needs such as reading level, fluency, word recognition, and retell. Each of these deficits is assessed by teachers in North Carolina during the beginning, middle, and ending of the school year. To meet Common Core Standards, student's progress must be monitored quarterly. All students will receive explicit and designed instruction in the area of reading; however, students with disabilities will require specific interventions and support to meet their academic need (Hudson, Torgesen, Lane, & Turner, 2012).

Although teachers progress monitor reading for students, students can monitor their reading progress too. A study was conducted by Rafferty (2012) during a summer invention program for students that had difficulty with oral fluency. These students learned how to utilize a tactile device to increase their on-task and oral reading fluency behavior during whole-group reading instruction (Rafferty, 2012). This tactile device is called a MotivAider and cues students to self-monitor their behaviors when there was a pulse from the device. When students felt a vibrating prompt, students were supposed to ask themselves if they were on task. Students independently implemented the process during reading instruction. The results showed the participants in the study increased their on-task behavior during reading after being taught how to use the self-monitoring strategy (Rafferty, 2012). With effective monitoring, general education teachers and

special education teachers know whether a strategy he or she uses is effective. By looking and listening to students, both educators will know if learning is occurring. Therefore, providing feedback allows students to take ownership of their learning. When students realize their learning matters, they will stay engaged with all tasks. The key is to make sure this occurs in the learning environment as written on the service delivery plan in the student's Individual Education Plan.

Service Delivery Plan

No student should be denied access to an appropriate education due to having a learning disability. Federal provisions have made it possible for students with disabilities to be involved in a more thorough academic education in the general education classroom (Murawski, 2009). Alberta (2009) as well as McLeskey, Rosenberg, and Wrestling (2013) have written that it is essential to understand the needs of learners, particularly, students with learning disabilities. McLeskey and Waldron (2011) reported that the IEP team must consider the continuum of services for students with learning disabilities as they look at the needs of the students. Similar findings were reported by Ruijs and Peetsman (2009).

The continuum of services for students with learning disabilities plays an important part when considering where instruction is delivered. The continuum of services refers to places where students with disabilities receive special education services. The placement can vary from the least to most restrictive environment. Therefore, students can receive special education services in a general education classroom, special class all day or part of the day, special school, home, or hospital. A

teacher's ability to support students is a crucial element for a quality learning environment (Bru, Stornes, Munthen, & Thuen 2012). Bru et al. (2012) agreed when students are in the least restrictive environment, they have a positive motivational orientation to school work.

Least Restrictive Environment

For students with learning disabilities to experience success, it is important that they receive instruction in the appropriate learning environment (Bru, et al. 2012). Takala, Pirttman, & Tormanen (2009) stated that students sense an atmosphere that is conducive to learning when they are in a relaxed and supportive environment. In a small group setting, students may feel that he or she is receiving special attention. On the other hand, some students fail academically because they are separated from the general education classroom and miss instructional time (Takala, Pirttman, & Tormanen, 2009). Consequently, there is a dilemma regarding the appropriate setting for students with learning disabilities to receive instruction. Fore et al., 2008; and McLeskey (2011) both stated that without the appropriate supports in place for students with disabilities, the general setting may not be beneficial. The composition of a classroom, along with class size has always been a topic of debate among educators (Di Benedetto, Dickinson, & Harris, 2013). Public education has undergone major reforms, especially with the rise of high-stakes testing, accountability, and the current shift toward Common Core Standards, thus class size is plays an important regarding student achievement (Fredikson, Ockart, & Ooster ,2013).

According to the American Federation of Teachers (2013), class size impacts student achievement and distractions. According to Ontario Institute for Students in Education and the Canadian Education Association (2010), smaller classrooms may have the greatest impact on students with the greatest needs. Thus, class size should be considered as teachers work with students with learning disabilities. This is a great concern for parents of children with a disability. In Hong Kong, parents are concerned about larger class sizes of students with disabilities because it played a role in the lack of instructional support for their children. Parents felt the teacher's workload impacted the teacher's effort and attention on their child's academic needs (Malak, 2013). Bascia (2010) concluded the benefits of a smaller class size provides an environment in which teachers can teach differently, interact with students more frequently, use a variety of strategies, create opportunities for students, and spend time on creative planning rather than spend time out of the classroom on work time. As the general education teacher and special education teachers provide instruction, each have a responsibility to help students grow academically and socially within the learning environment as they prepare students for standardized testing. Zynger (2014) stated when high quality teachers have a significant and positive impact on test scores due to smaller class sizes students obtains high achievement. Therefore, as students continue to be proficient in reading, they will be prepared for college, career, and life.

The goal of education is to prepare students to be contributing citizens of society. Although some schools may not have inclusive classrooms in the areas of reading, math, and writing, students with a learning deficit need to be in a learning environment where

they can practice skills in settings as they develop a sense of belonging. Students with disabilities who are in the general education classroom have opportunities to grow academically and socially through peer relationships. In return, nondisabled peers and students with a learning deficit can experience a variety of learning experiences as they build relationships with each other. Therefore, it is pertinent that the IEP team make the appropriate decision when considering the placement of students.

According to Public Law 142, the Individual Disabilities Education Act (2004) mandates that students with disabilities receive a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment (Sydney, 1999). Singh (2007) stated that lawmakers believe many children are eligible for special education services and are capable of being active participants within the general education classroom. The revision of Individual Disabilities Education Act (2004), requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment, and provides them with the opportunity to be educated in the general education classroom. Therefore, the members of the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) team should share ideas about the student's strengths, needs, and goals for students with disabilities. It is important that each of the members of the team communicate properly, ask questions, welcome questions, respect the views of others, share views, be open to different views, and look to the future rather than the past (Diliberto & Brewer, 2014).

The report of the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education indicated that it was necessary for the general education teacher and special education teacher to work together so that students with learning disabilities profit from

meaningful instruction in a co-taught environment (President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002). In order to have this type of environment, Villa, Thousand, and Nevin (2008) mentioned that co-planning must happen between the specialist and teachers. Another factor to consider is the development of communication strategies that allows for shared decision making. These factors will impact the planning and implementation of instruction, strategies, and instructional materials (Villa, et al., 2008).

Gurur and Uzuner (2010) have stated that the attitudes of both the general education teacher and special education teacher play a vital role in the classroom environment. Sileo (2011) said that the success of the co-taught classroom depends on attitudes and beliefs regarding the shared responsibilities of the general education teacher and special education teacher. Researchers (Hoy & Spero, 2005) have explored the attitudes of both elementary and secondary teachers have often argued that the belief system of a teacher is developed through the teacher education program (Gao & Mager, 2011). Findings indicated that 168 participants in the study which were divided into six cohorts showed a positive sense of efficacy regarding their attitudes toward the inclusion setting. However, the 18 participants in cohort six demonstrated negative attitudes about teaching children with behavioral disabilities (Gao & Mager, 2011). Allowing the participants to part of the study indicated a need to place a higher emphasis on providing resources and time to better prepare teachers in this regard. For that reason, special education teachers and general education teachers must collaborate to create a learning environment that works for all students.

Special Education Models Within the Schools

New state and federal mandates are holding students and teachers to a higher standard. Consequently, instructional practices are changing in the state of North Carolina. Thus there are concerns of how teachers should implement instruction for all students to be proficient in reading. Furthermore, the general education teacher and special education teacher must focus on how to provide instruction for students with disabilities. There are many factors to consider when serving students with learning disabilities. In the current school system, students are expected to meet proficiency in the area of reading, which means the general education teacher must be prepared to meet the needs of all students within the general education classroom. A general education teacher's preparedness to work with students with disabilities can be critical within an inclusive environment, which ultimately affects End of Grade scores (Wiebe Berry, 2006). In return, teachers are feeling ineffective which solidifies the need for pre-service training (Kangas, 2014).

General education teachers need some support when working with students with learning disabilities. Findings of a study conducted by Carrington and Brownlee (2001) indicated that general education teachers needed training to serve students with disabilities (Carrington & Brownlee, 2001). The general education teacher is held accountable to teach the Common Core Standards, however, it is difficult for them to teach students with learning disabilities when they are missing valuable instructional time due to the pullout-model (Cosier, Causton-Theoharis, & Theoharis, 2013). At the school for this study, it creates teacher frustration and friction among other Therefore, general

education teachers and special education teachers must collaborate on their teaching so that they are able to provide learning opportunities for students, particularly, students with a learning deficit. General education teachers, special education teachers, administration, and related service providers must consider academic and social concerns for parents and students for within the learning environment-.

However, there are concerns of where students with learning disabilities should be served in order to have academic success in order to be proficient in reading. According to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), a student's classroom environment is determined by the decision made by the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) team based on the least restrictive environment (Public Law 101-476.). Classroom placements for the participant school district in the study are in the resource setting (pull-out model) and inclusion model (push-in model). The resource setting is a classroom which allows students with disabilities to be in an individualized or small group learning environment with the primary focus being on the Common Core Standards (Jones & Hensley, 2012). The inclusion setting is a classroom for students with disabilities that fully participate in the curriculum and receive special education services as needed with peers without a disability (Jones & Hensley, 2012). Findings of a study conducted by Lalvani (2013) explored the beliefs of teachers regarding inclusion. Findings indicated that inclusion was grouped into three themes: privilege, compromise, and social justice. (Blum, Wilson, & Patish, 2015). Teachers that viewed inclusion as a privilege believed inclusion is beneficial for some students with disabilities, and other students academic needs could not be met in the general education classroom. Teachers that viewed

inclusion as a compromise, felt students have social and emotional benefits and have capability of learning content with individualized instruction. Teachers that viewed inclusion as social justice believed the majority of students benefit from inclusion (Blum, et al. 2015). Regardless of the learning environment, the general education teacher and special education must consider the needs of students as he or she collaborate and consult with each other.

While placement is very significant in serving students with disabilities, the general education teachers and special education teachers must consider two important factors: collaboration and consultation. According to Friend and Cook (1992), during collaboration educators consider joint planning, decision-making, and problem solving that may occur with a group for the purpose of accomplishing a goal for student needs. In contrast, consulting is when one seeks the opinion of someone, or talks over a situation or subject with someone (Dettmer, Thurston, & Dyck, 2004). The inclusion setting for students with disabilities is most effective when teachers both collaborate and consult with each other (Evans & Weiss, 2014). The collaboration among both educators will facilitate the success of inclusion for them (Obiakor, Harris, Mutua, Rotatori, & Algozzine, 2012).

Gaskins (1998) stated that the United States is moving closer to inclusion which means the general and education teacher must collaborate to address teaching for students with delayed reading. Currently, many school districts have been provided with a great deal of flexibility in developing policies and programs for the inclusion model. Although there may not be a consensus, inclusion is a topic to be more considered (Akiba, 2011).

Controversy surrounds the inclusion of special education services for students with learning disabilities. There is also controversy about how to successfully include them within a classroom so that they can learn the curriculum with non-disabled peers (Lalvani, 2013). Although the inclusion model may be in some schools, there are more students being pulled from the general education classroom to receive academic support in the resource setting. These classrooms offer small group learning with the focus being on the core academic curriculum. In contrast the inclusion model allows the students to have greater access to the general school environment through both physical location and social opportunities (Jones & Hensley, 2012). Different members of the IEP team within the school district may feel students with disabilities should receive push-in services or pull-out services. In the push-in model, students with disabilities receive services within the general education classroom with the support of a special education teacher. In the pull-out model, students with disabilities are removed from the general education classroom to be served in a resource setting with disabled peers. Pull-out services allow the special education teacher to address the student's deficits in the areas of reading, math, and writing. There are self-contained classrooms for students identified as intellectually disabled, however, this learning environment will no longer exist in the upcoming years, therefore, a decision will have to be made regarding placement.

Some schools in the local school district do not have an inclusion model in all schools. The pull-out model is commonly used in all schools which indicate the importance of collaboration among the special education teacher and general education teacher as they discuss the IEP goals and curriculum for students with a learning deficit.

McGill and Allington (2005) stated when using the pull-out model, some of the students became confused. The confusion existed because the special education teacher created a literacy curriculum that was different from the general education classroom. Students with disabilities were being exposed to different methods of instruction in the pull-out model, which was difficult for students to transfer the information when they returned to the general education setting. Students with disabilities were also missing valuable instruction from the general education teacher (McGill & McGill, 2001). These students benefited from explicit and systematic instruction in the general education classroom (Zigmond, Kloo, & Volonino, 2009). Research has shown this type of instruction is more explicit and intensive in the general education classroom (Zigmond, et al. 2009).

Although there are discussions about implementing pull-out, inclusion, and separate services for students with a reading deficit, there is still a need for the special education teachers and general education teachers to collaborate regarding the reading needs for students with disabilities. Emphasis is on increasing academic achievement and closing the achievement gap. Therefore, the IEP team must consider the appropriate setting for students with disabilities.

Inclusion Setting

As IEP teams decide the appropriate placement for students with learning disabilities, it is the goal that students have access to the curriculum just as their nondisabled peers (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010). In a study involving both undergraduate elementary and undergraduate secondary majors who enrolled in a course on integrating students with a deficit in general education

classrooms, participants were found to have different attitudes and beliefs about the inclusion model (McCray & McHatton, 2011). Most of the participants wanted to know more about specific disabilities, and wanted to know how to individualize instruction. McCray & McHatton (2011) mentioned these areas are critical and often challenging for a beginning teacher. Some of the participants indicated that they would need to be in an inclusive classroom in order to gain experience and knowledge. The participants felt inclusion provided social benefits for students with disabilities (McCray & McHatton, 2011). Since the study did not include the perceptions of inclusion by the special education teachers, the data was limited. Muhanna (2010) stated in order for inclusion to be successful the attitudes and problems should be investigated by special education teachers. The attitudes of both the general education teacher and special education teacher towards inclusion are very important because it will impact what occurs in the classrooms.

According to Armstrong, Armstrong, and Spandagou (2010), many educators want to see the inclusion model around the world. The same concerns and challenges are expressed internationally, which includes making sure teachers are knowledgeable about inclusion, promote collaboration among colleagues, and maintain positive attitudes towards students with learning disabilities that are being educated in an inclusive classroom (Armstrong et al. 2010). These factors seem appropriate to address because the inclusion model is the global trend in education that requires participation and cooperation among colleagues (Hwang & Evans, 2011).

Attitudes and Roles of General Education Teachers

Teachers have the responsibility of ensuring that all students have a fair and equal education as they prepare them for the ever-changing global society. Thus, teachers must have the appropriate attitude towards students with learning disabilities, especially when students are taught in an inclusive classroom. Hwang and Evans (2011) agreed that attitudes held by a general education teacher regarding inclusion are very important. Therefore, it is imperative that general education teachers be aware of the diverse learners within the classroom environment. Teaching diverse learners presents a challenge to educators who may feel unprepared and perhaps feel inadequate to help students with learning disabilities succeed (Gothshall & Stefanou, 2011). Although, many schools do have the pullout model to serve students with a reading deficit, some may not have inclusion classroom because teachers are unwilling to use inclusion. This was evident in a case study that involved a new principal at an urban school that decided to increase the amount of time for students with disabilities within the general education classroom. The special education teachers stated that general education teachers did not feel it was their place to teach students with learning disabilities (DeMatthews, 2014). They also proposed to the principal that the students would benefit from a co-teaching model. In a study completed by Villa, Meyers, & Nevin (1996), general education teachers showed positive attitudes towards inclusion. The teachers felt the support and collaboration of administration played an important part in their attitudes toward inclusion. Scruggs and Mastroperi (2001) had a study that was consistent with (Villa et al. 1996).

General education teachers have a responsibility to educate all students; however, there is a need for them to have knowledge regarding students with a reading deficit (Nguyen, 2012). Additionally, knowledge about specific disabilities and conditions are needed being that general education teachers are providing Common Core instruction within the general education classroom. With these factors being considered, it could possibly impact the attitudes of general education teachers. Recent studies have shown there has been a move toward having a more positive attitude for students with disabilities (Akiba, 2011). Educators that are willing to be part of an inclusive classroom play an influential role in building a learning atmosphere within the classroom. For that reason, educators must have a willingness to interact with diverse learners, particularly in an inclusive classroom. Based upon a study by Melekoglu (2013), Service Learning allowed teacher candidates to participate in a project entitled, Interaction Project with Students with Special Needs which allowed them to work with students with special needs in an inclusive environment. As a result of having the opportunity to be part of the project, it caused the teacher candidates to have a different perception about the students with special needs (Melekoglu, 2013). The participants indicated they had an increased positive attitude and awareness of students with disabilities. As a result of their participation, it was thought that educators will take a more active role for inclusion students. In return, inclusion will improve (Melekoglu, 2013). Thus, it appears evident that administrators may need to break down the barriers between the general education teacher and special education teacher.

A survey was given to a group of pre-service teachers that had concerns about the inclusive classroom (Forlin & Cook, 2011). These teachers were concerned about their lack of knowledge and skills. They found that it was difficult to give the appropriate attention to all students within this classroom environment. The pre-service teachers were more concerned about the inadequate resources and the lack of personnel to support inclusion (Forlin & Cook, 2011). Mousouli (2009) reported that teachers had a limited understanding regarding disabilities and special education and thought special education was linked to mental retardation. Therefore, it is necessary that general education teachers and special education teachers consider their knowledge, actions, and attitudes within and outside of the learning environment (Cassady, 2011). Not only do general education teachers have a responsibility to be knowledgeable and nurturing when it comes to working with students with learning disabilities, but it is required of special education teachers too. Both must consider their attitudes and actions within their learning environment (Cassidy, 2011). In order to do so, special education teachers must help students develop the appropriate tools that will allow them to become learners as they develop their potential. According to Takala, Pirttima, and Tormanen (2009), students with learning disabilities will have a quality education when special education teachers exhibit motivation, professional skills, and cooperation. While ensuring special education teachers and general education teachers have a positive attitude, it is pertinent that it is maintained with staff and students during the school day regardless of the learning environment.

Coteaching Models

Maintaining a positive attitude towards students with a deficit, educators are encouraged to take courses to improve their attitudes, By doing so, it will cause general education teachers and special education teachers to take a more active role with the co-teaching models as they work together in the inclusive setting (Melekoglu, 2013).

Special education teachers must be able to adapt the content, methodology, delivery and provide appropriate instruction and materials when working with students within the learning environment. According to Idol (2006), who is recognized for seminal thinking in collaboration and consultation, the special education teachers can provide services for students by using three models within the school environment.

One model is the consulting teacher, in which the special education teacher serves as a consultant to the general education teacher (Friend, 2008). The consultant indirectly works with targeted students while working along with the general education teacher. He or she talks with the general education teacher regarding accommodations, modifications, and strategies regarding students with a reading deficit. Another model is the cooperative teacher model, in which the special education teacher and general education teacher work together using a various coteaching approaches (Friend, 2008). For that reason, the general education teachers and special education teachers should consider six approaches as they address the goals in the individualized educational plan for students with a reading deficit and at the same time meet the academic needs of the non-disabled students in the general education classroom (Friend, Cook, Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010). One approach is called: One Teach, One Observe. With this approach, one teacher leads

the large group, while the other teacher gathers data. The next approach is Station Teaching which consists of three parts. Each teacher leads a group while a third group is working independently, meaning as a whole group, individually, or working with a partner. Another approach is parallel teaching, in which both teachers lead half of the class in this approach teaching the same content or addressing specific objectives.

Alternative teaching is an approach in which one of the teachers work with most of the group of the students and the other teacher work with the smaller group due to needing more remediation, re-teaching, or attention. Teaming is an approach in which the general education teacher and special education teacher lead the entire class and interchangeably contribute to the instruction. The final approach is One Teach, One Assist. During this approach, the general education teacher instruction and the special education teacher focus on the students that need more assistance. With this approach, either the general education teacher or special education teacher could lead instruction while the other teacher circulates among the students and offer individual assistance (Friend et al. 2010). The final model is the supportive resource programs, in which the special education teacher and general education teacher collaborate as they design the content for the student based upon the individualized plan for the students (Friend, 2008). The purpose of this plan is to ensure that the resource setting truly supports the general education classroom. By identifying the appropriate role, the special education teacher will ensure that the students have the appropriate strategies, tools, and materials (Nguyen, 2012). In return, the students will have good results which will cause them to attain a high quality education.

Collaboration Among Colleagues

As general education and special education teachers work with diverse learners, it is significant that they work collaboratively (DuFour, Dufour, & Eaker, 2005). Teacher collaboration involves teachers working together, engaging in dialogue, and having a common goal of improving and increasing student learning (Woodland, Lee, & Randall, 2013). City, Elmore, Fiarman, & Teitel (2009) stated these components impact change in their instructional practice that incites student achievement. Due to the expectation of proficiency for the students, general education and special education teachers can differentiate instruction for students by embracing their learning-style instruction and taking the time to identify student's individual style strengths and (Lauria, 2010). Additionally, a skilled and trained teacher should deliver high quality instruction (Brownell et al., 2009; Fletcher & Vaughn, 2009).

Hence, there must be an effective collaborative effort to coordinate planning and instruction with the data from assessments among educators. In return, strategies can be provided to make content more accessible to students that struggle in reading. As a result, co-teaching is utilized. Coteaching is a specific form of collaboration that has been described as a promising approach for combining the expertise of school-based stakeholders (Fenty, McDuffie, Landrum, & Fisher, 2012). Therefore, there must be a high level of functioning teams among educators when it comes to collaborating about student learning, effective instruction, learning challenges, and support for all students (Woodland, Lee, & Randall, 2013).

Collaboration involves commitment by the general education teacher and special education teacher in order for students with disabilities to be successful. It involves time, support, planning, development, and evaluation (Sharpe & Hawes, 2003). In order to facilitate effective collaboration, there are several recommended strategies some of which are described below. They include Applied Collaboration, The Five Step Process, and Question-Answer-Response.

Applied Collaboration is a program that uses the strategy of collaboration with general education teachers and special education teachers (Angle, 1996). By having staff development together, both teachers will have the training to identify goals and use negotiation skills to address the needs of students with disabilities. Gurur and Uzunur (2010) had similar beliefs in that special education teachers and general education teachers must receive training on issues such as inclusion, special education support services, and cooperative skills. Teachers involved in this teaching model must have time to allocate for co-playing and reflection meetings.

Another strategy used to facilitate effective collaboration is The Five Step Process (Angle, 1996). This strategy brings the general and special education teacher together to address the academic and social needs of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. The five steps to the program allow the general education teacher and special education teacher to have a shared responsibility as they follow the plan which are as follows (a) communicate about the standard that would be taught; (b) discuss the specific needs and concerns regarding the placement of students; (c) create and explore changes that will cause students to participate in class; (d) provide an

opportunity for the collaborative to determine who will be responsible for monitoring; (e) provide the collaborative team an opportunity to discuss how students are evaluated. With a positive attitude and willingness to include students with a disability in their classroom teachers may promote academic success for all students.

Collaboration among general education teachers and special education teachers, principals, and assistant principals is vital as each perform their role in the education of all students. A study was conducted with 12 participants from various experiences with working with students with disabilities (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). Each participant believed that student success was achieved through collaboration. Participants believed each of them had a shared responsibility as a professional. They felt general educators, special educators, and administrators must be prepared and ready to present information at meetings regarding students with disabilities. Each participant felt that each teacher must uphold each teacher's unique responsibility as they provided information regarding all students (Hamilton- Jones & Vail, 2013). Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger (2010) indicated that "co-teaching demonstrates the potential as well as the complexities of collaboration that joins the fields of general and special education teachers" (p.74). There are benefits to co- teaching especially when strategies are used which allows both teachers to be actively involved through each component of instruction.

Co-teaching allows the general and special education teacher to implement a strategy called Question Answer Response (QAR). It is a literacy strategy that provides a framework to guide their processing of comprehension questions after reading a text. It

also allows students to demonstrate their ability to determine importance, infer, and monitor their comprehension (Fenty et al. 2012). When the general education teachers and special education teachers plan instruction together they are more likely to equally share instructional duties as they work with diverse learners (Fenty et al. 2012).

Implications

This subsection discusses the implications for possible project directions based on findings of the data collection and analysis. By attempting to understand the responsibilities of both general education teachers and special education teachers, I sought to know the role of both educators regarding their responsibility of the implementation of the Common Core Standards with students with a reading deficit within their learning environment. In addition, I sought the level of communication that took place among them as they provided reading instruction to students with a reading deficit.

In this case study, I proposed to focus on four schools in the southern part of the local school district. The data collected provided a description of the general and special education teacher's perception of the pull-out model for students with disabilities at the elementary school level. The data showed how both groups of teachers monitor the progress of students with the Common Core Standards. The data collected showed what specific strategies were being used for students with disabilities who are not proficient with the Common Core Standards. Data was collected regarding the lesson planning of reading. The data analysis provided an avenue for discussion regarding placement and best practice for these schools. I believe the information obtained from the data clarified

the role of the general education teacher and special education teachers. As a result of this research, a proposed project was designed to host a three day workshop for third grade general education teachers, reading coach, intervention specialist, Title1 teachers, and special education teachers to show how defined or undefined some responsibilities are. Secondly, the proposed project could emphasize the importance of research on collaboration. Therefore, if implemented, there would be of activities that would allow the special education teachers and general teachers to better define their roles and responsibilities of educators when providing reading instruction for all students.

Summary

In Section 1, I focused on the literature related to the Common Core Standards in reading and how it impacts students with disabilities, particularly students that are in the third-third grade. Many of these students receive reading support with the pull-out model. The inclusion setting is not implemented in some of the third-grade classes which raise concerns for the regular education teachers and special education teachers. Due to a decision made by legislation, Read to Achieve is part of the North Carolina's Excellence Public Schools Act, which became law in 2012 and took effect starting in fall of 2013 according to information from the local school district webpage. The goal is that every child read at or above grade level by the end of third-third grade in order to be promoted to the fourth grade. However, this presents parental concerns regarding instruction, placement, academic performance, promotion, and retention at this grade level which causes the local district to address the needs of the students with a reading deficit that do not meet proficiency on the North Carolina End of Grade test.

Due to the service delivery plan of students with disabilities they are missing Common Core instruction in the general education classroom. Thus, it raises the question what is the role and responsibility of the general education and special education teacher when teaching the reading Common Core Standards for students with a reading deficit. In addition, there is a concern regarding the appropriate learning environment for the students which plays a vital part with student proficiency. The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore perceptions and opinions of the general education teachers and special education teachers regarding the push-in and pull-out model when providing reading instruction and reading interventions for student with disabilities.

There are four sections of the doctoral study. Section 2 includes the Methodology for conducting the qualitative case study and the results of the case study. Section 3 includes a description of the project. Section 4 includes my reflections and conclusions about the doctoral process.

Section 2: The Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the roles and responsibilities of both special education teachers and general education teachers in the instruction of Common Core Standards and implementation of IEP goals for students with disabilities. Special education teachers and general education teachers also expressed their personal and professional understanding of learning environments as they monitored Common Core reading progress and provided reading strategies for students with disabilities. The findings of the study indicate the potential for enhancing reading instruction and for general education teachers and special education teachers to collaborate on interventions in the least restrictive environment.

Research Design and Approach

This study was qualitative in nature. I selected a qualitative research design as the best means of collecting data through document analysis, interviews, and observation (Lodico, Spaulding, & Vogetle, 2010). The findings are typically summarized through narrative. Creswell (2013) defined qualitative research as “a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (p. 40). Qualitative researchers desire to understand and interpret social interactions, whereas quantitative researchers test and look at potential causes and make predictions (Creswell, 2012). To understand interactions and determine the feasibility of research, qualitative researchers study a whole phenomenon, not variables. Quantitative results provide statements about a variable; they do not give specific details concerning how and

why a phenomenon takes place. Within such a paradigm, I sought to discover the roles and responsibilities of both general education teachers and special education teachers from this school district, guided by each student's service delivery plan on his or her IEP.

Explaining or predicting relationships between variables is a characteristic of quantitative research (Creswell, 2012). In a quantitative study, the researcher inquires about the relationship between an independent variable and at least one dependent variable within a population. Researchers using the quantitative method also test hypotheses while emphasizing statistical data analyses after collecting data from participants (Steffes, 2012). Researchers form hypotheses about the relationships among variables. Testing of the variables involves statistical procedures that allow researchers to draw inferences about the population from a sample used in a study (Creswell, 2012). In quantitative research, researchers may administer a survey to a sufficient number of people to identify trends in attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of a larger population (Creswell, 2012). Unlike quantitative data, qualitative data allowed me to represent the knowledge, perspectives, and experiences of the general education teachers and special education teachers in the study (Stake, 2010; Tellis, 1997). Therefore, as I sought to investigate the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers and general education teachers, qualitative research seemed more appropriate for my study.

There are several designs to consider when conducting qualitative research. Those considered for this study included grounded study, ethnography, narrative, and case study. Grounded theory explains a process or interaction among people (Creswell, 2012). I decided not to use this design because I did not seek to explore a process or interaction

among people, in that such an exploration might have included many individuals involved in the field of education. Instead, my primary focus was special education teachers and general education teachers. Ethnographic design involves qualitative procedures in which individuals participate in an environment where they live and work and the researcher works to establish a complete picture of how these individuals interact (Creswell, 2012). Ethnographic design would not have been appropriate for this study because I would have needed to become a participant in the environment. At Walden University, the role of the graduate student researcher is to collect data, be part of a study, in order to uphold ethical standards for research. Narrative research design is a type of qualitative research in which the researcher describes the life experiences of participants and looks at how the participants create meaning in their lives (Creswell, 2012). I did not select narrative research design because I sought to investigate the perceived roles and responsibilities of general education teachers and special education teachers while providing reading support to students within the learning environment. I also considered grounded theory for this study. Grounded theory is used by researchers to develop a theory (Lodico et al. 2010), and my goal in this project was not to provide a theory or explanation. Ethnography theory allows researchers to engage heavily in the lives of people, cultures, and situations. Such engagement was not the purpose of my study; rather, I sought to develop a deep analysis of the phenomenon of interest (Creswell, Hancock, & Algozzine, 2011).

A qualitative case study is descriptive, with an end product that is a rich description of the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 2009). Such studies are heuristic,

as they help readers to understand more deeply the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 2009). The purpose of a qualitative case study is to investigate a specific situation; in this study, the situation of interest was general education teachers' and special education teachers' perceptions of their roles and responsibilities in implementing Common Core Standards for reading. Qualitative case studies can be particularistic and focus on a particular situation (Merriam, 2009). I selected qualitative case study design because it allowed the participants to share their experiences in a specific setting, which was my goal for making sense of their understanding of their instructional roles and responsibilities.

Case Study Design

The intent of this study was twofold. First, I wanted to explore general education teachers' and special education teachers' perceptions of the pull-out model and push-in model for students with disabilities who have deficits in reading. Furthermore, I explored how both the general education teachers and special education teachers monitored students' reading progress while implementing specific intervention strategies. Creswell (2007) defined case study as a strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals (p. 13). The participants in the study were able to share information regarding their concerns related to reading progress monitoring, reading instruction, reading intervention, reading proficiency, and student placement in the pull-out model and push-in model.

This case study was conducted in four different elementary schools in the local school district. Merriam (2009) suggested that a case study should be written with a

detailed description so that the reader can experience the setting of the study. Such a description enhances transferability as it gives attention to selection of the study sample (Merriam, 2009). Thus, the data collected from the face-to-face recorded interviews were transcribed so that I could capture the exact data. According to Bogdan and Biklen (2007), the written word is significant in the qualitative approach when a researcher is recording data and disseminating information.

Participants

I used purposeful sampling in this project study to maximize efficiency and increase validity as well as to ensure that the research questions were informed and the phenomenon was understood (Merriam, 2014). Participants were selected who could address the research questions in the project study. They were also selected based upon their years of teaching experience and experience with working with students with reading deficits. The interviews were held in a quiet, neutral location decided by the participants; I met them in this place. Eight of the nine interviews were conducted at the school site, and one was conducted at a public library. Participants represented four schools, thus providing perspectives from different schools and contributing to the triangulation of the data.

Criteria for selection of participants. I reviewed the requests of the invited participants who had consented to participate in the study and chose them based upon the design criteria. The criteria were as follows:

1. Certified teacher.

2. General education teacher who had taught students with disabilities in the general education classroom.
3. Special education teacher who had taught students with disabilities in the pull-out model or push-in model.
4. General education teachers and special education teachers who had taught third-grade students with disabilities in reading.

Justification for number of participants. Qualitative research does not require the sample to be a specific size, unlike quantitative research, which requires a sample large enough to provide statistical significance to determine statistically significant discriminatory variables (Merriam, 2009; Ritchie et al., 2013). When selecting participants, I wanted to make sure that the participants could answer the research questions in order to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon and meet the goal of data saturation, which I did attain in this study (Creswell, 2012). I thought that finding participants in the local school district would be easy, but it was challenging to obtain participants for various reasons. The participants who decided to be part of the study met the criteria. As a result, nine participants gave consent to participate in the study on a voluntary basis. These participants included five general educators and four special educators.

Procedures for gaining access to participants. As the researcher, I wrote a letter requesting permission from the superintendent of schools to conduct research at four elementary schools in the southern part of the county. In return, the superintendent presented my letter to the department of accountability. In the local school district, board

policy governs external research; however, the research review committee approves applications for researchers requesting to conduct research in the school system. The director of the department of accountability contacted the principals of the selected schools to seek their participation in the study. When the request for cooperation was granted by the research review committee, I forwarded it to the Institutional Review Board (IRB). After approval from the IRB, I contacted the principals of the schools via email to thank them for allowing their general education teachers and special education teachers to be part of the project. I also assured them that I would follow the ethical practices of the local school district and Walden University. I assured each principal that information collected on each participant would remain confidential and would be used solely for this research study.

These elementary schools were selected based upon low scores on End-of-Grade Tests. Because all students have to be proficient in reading, general education teachers and special education teachers expressed concern about the proficiency level of students with a reading deficit. Questions and responses arose in staff meetings and district meetings. Because the research review committee sought permission from the principals to conduct interviews with the general education teachers and special education teachers, I emailed the principals to inform them that the participants would sign consent forms that clearly stated the purpose of the study. The letter of consent explained that their participation was voluntary.

I requested that all teachers identify whether they were general education teachers or special education teachers on the letter of invitation when they provided consent to

participate in the study. According to Creswell (2012), “researchers intentionally select individuals and sites to learn or understand the central phenomenon” (p. 206). Similar to Creswell (2012), Bogdan and Biklen (2007) stated that a qualitative researcher goes to the setting where a study will take place, due to concern about context. It is felt that action can best be understood when it is observed in its natural setting (p. 4). Once I knew the names of the participants whom I would interview, I made sure that the participants were in a comfortable environment, such as their classroom or a library.

I indicated on the IRB application that I would protect the confidentiality of all participants; however, the research review committee provided the names of teachers who would be in the study. I emailed the IRB to state that I would explain that no names would be mentioned during the interview process and that I would not provide names of the participants in the research study to the research review committee. I emailed the IRB to state that I had received approval from the research review board. I asked IRB if the research review committee needed to sign a letter of cooperation. I contacted the general education teachers and special education teachers via my personal email to discuss the study, invitation, and consent forms. Individuals replied by email to indicate one of the following: “I consent to participate in the study” or “I do not consent to participate in the study.” Based upon the proposed names on the approval letter from the research review committee, only two participants gave consent.

The director of the accountability department reached out to other schools and gave me permission to ask other teachers at the selected schools to participate in the project. After receiving assistance from the director of the accountability department, I

was able to contact other participants. At the first school, one special education teacher and one general education teacher consented to participate in the study. At the second school, one special education teacher consented to participate in the study. At the third and fourth schools, two general education teachers and one special education teacher consented to participate in the study.

There were nine participants in the study: four special education teachers and five general education teachers. All of the participants seemed passionate about teaching and expressed love for their students. Two out of the nine participants had previous careers in the business and legal field. The attributes of the participants are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Attributes of Participants

Participant	Total years of teaching experience	Highest degree	Grade level
1A	5	Bachelor's	K/5
1B	14	Master's	3
2A	18	Bachelor's	K/5
3A	10	Master's	K/3
3B	27	Bachelor's	3
3C	11*	Bachelor's	3
4A	4*	Master's	2-3/4/5
4B	19	Master's	3
4C	17	Bachelor's	3

Note. Of the nine participants, Participants 3C and 4A had experience in business/legal employment. The letters A, B, and C indicate the roles of the teachers. Letter A

represents special education teachers. Letters B and C represent general education teachers.

The participants in the study were special education teachers and general education teachers. There were five general education teachers and four special education teachers. Teacher 1A had been a teacher for five years after serving as a teacher assistant for two years. At the time of the study, she served third and fourth grade students and had worked with students with disabilities in second, third, fourth, and fifth grades in the areas of reading, math, and writing in the push-in and pull-out models. Teacher 1B had been a teacher for 14 years. She taught third grade and had worked with students who were part of a Head Start program. In addition, Teacher 1B had taught kindergarten and second grade in all content areas. The educator has been teaching for 18 years. She had worked with students with disabilities in Grades K-5 in the areas of reading, math, writing, behavior, and social skills. Teacher 2A had worked with students in the push-in model in the past. At the time of the study, she worked with students in the pull-out model.

Teacher 3A had been teaching for 10 years. Teacher 3A reported teaching students with a reading deficit in Grades K-5 using the pull-out model for students in the areas of reading, math, writing, and behavior. Teacher 3A had also taught students in Grades 2nd-5th in the area of ELA using the push-in model. Teacher 3B had been teaching for 29 years. Teacher 3B reported experience that included working with students in first, second, and third grades in the pull-out model. This teacher had no experience working with students using the push-in model.

Teacher 3C had been teaching for 11 years. Teacher 3C mentioned having taught students with disabilities in the second and third grades. Teacher 3C mentioned that a special education teacher may come into the general education classroom to address behavior or a specific plan but indicated no knowledge of the school having ever implemented the push-in model.

Teacher 4A has been teaching for four years as a special education teacher and has worked with students in Grades K-5 in the areas of reading, math, and writing in the push-in model and pull-out model. She currently works with students in the second, third, and fifth grades. Teacher 4B reported that this was their nineteenth year of teaching. It was reported that teacher 4B, a general education teacher, had taught in the general education classroom and intervention for 10 years. This was the first year teacher 4B was fully situated in the general education setting. Teacher 4B stated that their experience included working with second and third grade students. During the time of being an intervention teacher, teacher 4B was mentioned that they worked with students using the push-in model. The students with a disability did not receive intervention however, they did receive extra help. Teacher 4B also worked with students in the pull-out model in the second and third grade.

Teacher 4C has been teaching for 17 years. The general education teacher has experience working with students in a pre-school setting. Currently teacher 4C teaches third-grade in the areas of math, science, and social studies. It was mentioned that the Social Studies curriculum for the local school system ties in with reading closely and is primarily writing-based. The teacher shared that they have prior experience working with

students with a reading deficit in the push- in model for students in third and fifth grades. In addition, they have worked with students in the pull-out model for students in the third- grade. Therefore, there were a total of nine teacher participants in the project study. All participants worked at a Title 1 school in the local school district.

Method of Establishing Researcher-Participant Working Relationship

It is important for a researcher to develop a good relationship with participants in order to allow them to be comfortable during the interview. Prior to the interview, I introduced myself and shared my role as the researcher via email. When each potential participant responded to my email, I assured each of them that the interview was voluntary and that each could withdraw their consent to participate in the study at anytime. I also informed participants that each would have access to the initial summary analysis of the interview before it would be used for research data. Participants were assured that they could contact me with any questions or concerns via my personal email address and cell phone. The participants were informed that the interviews could take as long as an hour or less. During the interview, general education teachers and special education teachers demonstrated empathy regarding the students with a reading deficit, and recognized their role and responsibilities for all children within the learning environment.

Ethical Considerations

Researchers have many ethical responsibilities to the participants. Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, (2010) described three ethical issues that should be considered in qualitative research. One consideration is informed consent (McLeod, 2007). Informed

consent forms were given to the participants to sign before they participated in the case study. This form acknowledged that participants' rights would be protected during data collection. The second consideration is protection from harm (McLeod, 2007). I must ensure that I do not offend, hurt, or embarrass them (McLeod, 2007). Therefore, I did not ask questions that pertained to their personal lives. I used the interview guide to keep the focus on my questions. Confidentiality was the final consideration. Names and data given during the study were kept anonymous. Pseudonyms were assigned to participants. I gave all the teachers at the same school the first number with a different letter. The data that was audio taped will be kept in my home in a secure cabinet with a secure lock. The notes will be in a file and shredded after five years. Electronic documents will be stored on a thumb drive in the same secure cabinet.

Before collecting data, I sought Walden's Institutional Review Board approval for this study. No research or data was taken until the approval was granted. In complying with the IRB of Walden University, for the protection of human study, I secured a letter of cooperation from the committee review board of the local school district to conduct the research project study. I secured approval of my proposal and IRB application, Approval # 12-28-15-0130851 prior to any participant contact.

Data Collection

Data collection was interviews held with general education teachers and special education teachers who teach third grade students with reading disabilities. In addition, lesson plans were part of the data collection. Participants were chosen who could provide insight regarding their roles and responsibilities. I audio -recorded and jotted down

pertinent notes at the interview. The research questions were presented in the initial part of the interview. The second segment of the interview was open-ended questions; however, the participants were able to discuss more on the initial questions if they chose too. Interviews were described on a data sheet. This data sheet included the following: interviewee's name, date of interview, location of school and, recording format.

Documents and artifacts are also utilized as collection tools in a case study design. (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtler, 2010). These documents and artifacts could be documents that existed before the start of the study or created after the study has begun. Therefore, I requested that the general education teachers and special education teachers bring items like grade books, work samples, and instructional materials to the interview. I requested their reading lesson plans to see if they displayed differentiation with instruction, materials, and assessment for students with disabilities. I requested that the names of the students not be revealed to protect the student's privacy. I took a picture of those documents with the school iPad and transferred it to my personal thumb drive. The thumb drive will be kept in a locked file cabinet. After interviewing each participant, I emailed each participant a copy of the summary of the interview to review and make corrections or additions to ensure accuracy of their responses which is considered member checking. Member checking allows the participants to confirm that the summaries are or not accurate (Merriam, 2009). It is important to allow participants the opportunity to review their responses so that they can see that the interview recording and transcription were authentic rendering their personal perspectives (Stake, 2010; Toma, 2011). In my study, all participants returned the summaries and only one participant

added more information regarding one of the reading interventions that was used in her classroom. That was the only revision needed.

Interviews

The interview is an important part of data collection (Yin, 2009). Ritchie et al. (2013), describes interviewing in a case study is a rigorous and telling verbal exchange with a purpose. Interviewing provided me a deep understanding of how general education teachers and special education teachers reflect on their roles and responsibilities as they provide reading instruction and interventions for students with a reading deficit as well as their perceptions of the push-in and pull-out model. To ensure that I captured their responses, I wanted to make sure that I asked the appropriate questions. Merriam (2014) emphasized that a researcher must refine the questions to avoid irrelevant verbiage and refrain from asking several questions before the participant can answer. An interview guide with research questions and probing questions allowed me to gather information to provide rich descriptions of the schools and the settings. The interview guide is located in Appendix B. Merriam (2009) mentioned that the interview guide is a list of questions that the researcher would ask in an interview. By having the interview guide, the structure allowed me to feel more confident, a benefit noted by Merriam (2009). Each interview took 45-60 minutes and consisted of questions developed from the literature review. The semi-structured format allowed me to probe beyond the protocol. Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle (2010) stated that probing is one of the procedures that should be followed when conducting an interview. A probe is a follow upon question that is asked to get clarification about a response” (p. 125). Therefore, I made sure that I gave the

participants in the study an opportunity to give clarification. I made sure I audio taped the information given by the participants during the interview and jotted down some key responses to assist in analysis and establish credibility. After transcribing the answers from the interview by listening closely to each of the participants, I started to jot down themes. Hancock and Algozzine (2011) stated that semi- structured interviews have a predetermined list of questions that are flexibly worded with follow-up questions to probe more deeply into the interviewees' perspectives. The general and special education teachers were interviewed individually. The teachers were interviewed based upon the agreed time. Patton (2002) stated that interviews should be enjoyable and feel like an everyday conversations. In lieu of the software, I listened to the audiotape repeatedly and wrote the responses in a notebook so that I could analyze data based upon the responses and artifacts.

Tracking Data

After each interview, I would collect and categorized themes to save time. As I captured the responses from the interviews based upon the experiences of the participants in the project study, I organized the information and carefully reviewed them along with my notes. To help with me with organizing and retrieving data, I created a table in Word with participant's responses to the interview questions along with my notes taken at the interview.

Special Education Teachers' and General Education Teachers' Interviews

Four special education teachers and five special education teachers were interviewed face-to face. To protect their identity, both teachers are referred to by the

pseudonym of their elementary school as listed in Table 1. The participants were from elementary schools identified as Title 1 status and low performing. The general education teachers and special education teachers shared their perceptions regarding the reading instruction and reading interventions for students with a reading deficit, strengths and weakness of the push-in model and pull-out model, collaboration, and communication among the general education and special education teachers. The individual interviews followed the Teacher Sample Interview Guide located in Appendix B. Each participant was asked the following questions from the Teacher Sample Interview Guide. Once I collected the demographic information asked the research questions to each participant in the case study, I audio-recorded each interview with permission and later transcribed them.

Document Artifacts Results

When the general education teachers and special education teachers gave their consent to participate in the project study, I requested that they bring their lesson plans, grade book, and instructional materials for examination. To analyze the artifacts, I first read through the lesson plans looking for differentiation within the lesson plans. I sought to see if they utilized instruction based upon the learning styles, ability levels, and academic performance on assessments. Research supports that if teachers successfully teach the components of reading, differentiation impacts the performance of students (Antoniou, Kyriakides, & Creemors, 2011).

Role of Researcher

The researcher has been a special educator for 25 years and is currently enrolled in the doctoral program at Walden University. As part of the program, I conducted interviews with the selected participants in the proposed case study. I am a special education teacher in the district in which the study was conducted; however, I am not a teacher at the schools that are part of the case study. Outside of district-wide participation in the literacy meetings and trainings regarding Exceptional Children's Program updates, there is limited contact between the general education teachers and special education teachers in the study and myself.

As I interviewed the participants for the case study, I made sure that I did not display bias. Not only was it important that I did not display bias, but that I distanced myself from any bias that I may have had during the interviews. I refrained from adding my opinions and thoughts during the interview. It was my role to remain objective while I listened and recorded information during the interview. I made sure that I recorded only what was stated and heard. That way, data was accurate when sorted into categories and analyzed.

As a special education teacher in the district, I listened to the concerns of both special education teachers and general education teachers regarding the implementation of Common Core Standards with students with disabilities in the pull-out and push-in model. This experience provided insight and understanding that should allow me to develop categories, and themes related to the problem.

Data Analysis and Results

I made sure that I addressed my role as a researcher as I gathered information for the case study. It was useful that I audio taped the responses of the participants and jotted down notes during the process .By doing so, I could obtain accurate data for analyzing my research.

Qualitative data analysis is an inductive process that allows the researcher to take data apart to determine the responses of the participants in the study and then put it together to summarize the data collected (Creswell, 2009). To address the research questions, it was necessary that I took the appropriate steps to analyze the data (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2010). Researchers suggested that the researcher prepare and organize the data, review and explore the data, code data into categories, and construct descriptions of people, places, and actions (p. 301). For these reasons, I began to transcribe the interviews in order to get answers to the research questions and arrive at conclusions based on the findings.

In preparation for the data analysis, I listened to the tapes with written notes from the interview. Data was organized by the participants' responses to the research questions and teacher roles as a general education teacher and special education teacher. As I reviewed and explored the data, I read and looked at the responses given by the special education teachers and general education teachers and jotted down words or phrases that captured my attention as I prepared to sort the data into categories.

Coding allows the researcher to manage the data collected from the study. Merriam (2009) defines codes as “nothing more than assigning some sort of shorthand

designation to various aspects of your data so that you can easily retrieve specific pieces of data” (p. 173). After the initial sorting by research questions, I reviewed the data and attempted to group comments and notes that went together. This is called axial coding or analytical coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2007). In qualitative research, the researcher must read, reread and examine the data collected to ensure that he or she has not coded the participants inappropriately based upon their experiences (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtler, 2010). In qualitative research, I needed to ensure that my findings and interpretations were accurate. Therefore, I used a strategy called triangulation.

Triangulation is the “process of corroborating from different individuals, types of data, and method of data collection in qualitative research.” (Creswell, 2012). As the researcher, I examined each of the information sources such as responses from interviews, feedback from participants, lesson plans, and student work samples. . The special education teachers used a researched- based reading program with the students who need reading support. When asked to show the reading lesson plans, the special education teachers provided their responses. Teacher 1A lesson plans addressed the skills that were going to be taught during each reading session. Students were grouped based upon reading skills which were addressed in their IEP (Individual Educational Plan). She mentioned the teacher assistant also had a group that she worked with too. Teacher 2A lesson plans were addressed the same way, however, she used the data from the researched-based reading program to show the progression of skills on a form entitled, IEP Goals Data Collection sheet. Teacher 3A provided data based upon a log to show mastery. Based upon the data she placed a check or x by the student name to indicate

their performance of the skill. This served like a grade book since special education teachers don't provide report cards, but rather progress reports at the end of each grading period. Teacher 4A used the data tool with the researched-based program to show reading progress.

Based upon my observation, the general education teachers used data to help students become proficient with the reading Common Core Standards. Each of the general education teachers mentioned that the data in M-Class is used to monitor instruction for all students. When asked to show the reading lesson plans, each stated that they follow CMAPP which is a guide recommended by the school district for general education teachers to use to address the reading Common Core Standards at the third-grade level. The first general education teacher was the only one of the general education teachers that presented a copy of a CMAPP and personal lesson plan. Her personal lesson plan included the lessons that were to be taught, homework, and Daily 5 groups. There was no sign of differentiation. She mentioned during the interview that she should start addressing the IEP goals within her lesson plan book, even though; she differentiates instruction and materials for students that have a reading deficit. None of the general education teachers had a grade book to show the grades of the students, however, they are responsible for providing a reading grade on their report card. Researched- based programs were used by each of the special education teachers. Some of the programs included, Letter land, Recipe for Reading, Making Connections, and Corrective Reading. The special education teachers had instructional materials posted on the wall such as anchor charts, word wall, posters, and reading vocabulary terms posted on the wall.

These instructional materials provided support for students to help them in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics knowledge, reading strategies, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Each of the special education teachers presented leveled books to show the varying levels and abilities of the students. Students had packets or a station that he or she could go to when task was completed or assigned by the special education teacher. During the interview, each of the special education teachers mentioned the importance of using educational websites to help students with reading. Some of the reading websites that were mentioned were a-z reading.com, starfall.com, and peeblesgo.com. Other websites were Achieve 2000, Study Island, and Accelerated Reader.

All the special education teachers used the performance data to determine the appropriate reading programs, instructional materials, and websites to support the reading needs of students identified with a learning disability. In contrast, the general education teachers mentioned they shared instructional materials to assist students with a reading deficit. Each of the general education teachers had anchor charts posted on the wall to support the reading Common Core Standards. Four out of five general education teachers implemented Daily 5 within their classroom. Daily 5 is an intervention that allows students to read to self, read to partner, writes, and do word work. These activities help build phonemic awareness, fluency, accuracy, retell, reading and writing comprehension which are the reading components. One of the general education teachers did not participate in Daily 5 because she taught Science, Math, and Social Studies. She shared that her students do rotations as she works with a high or lower leveled group in the areas

of math. Her classroom was filled with math vocabulary terms. There were posters that showed students how to solve problems in the areas of place value, addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, and geometry. There were pictorial representations to show the math vocabulary term along with word meaning. The general education teacher stated that she uses the Social Students book to correlate reading and writing with the Common Standards. She expressed the need to modify assignments for students that had a hard time taking notes. Therefore, she prints them for the students because it was difficult for them to listen to her and take notes.

All the general education teachers mentioned each of them progress monitor their students in reading. As a result, they share reading data among their grade level and/or with the special education teachers, particularly as it related to the Case 21 assessment and M-Class data. As a result, general education teachers provided strategies and other tools to help students become proficient. Some of the strategies included the RUNNERS strategy, QAR (Question Answer Response), and Ladder Words. Two out of the five general education teachers had the QAR strategy posted in their classroom. Other tools included a Reflective Reading Log, Daily 5 checklist, Student Record Report, Reading Progress Chart, Book Bingo and leveled books. Another tool was Question Stems, which was used by two other general education teachers.

All students must be proficient in reading, however, it can be challenging when students are below grade level and not meeting benchmark based upon assessments mandated by the local school district. Moreover, one must consider the impact it has on the students that are not performing on grade level. General education teachers must

determine what reading instruction and interventions are needed to help students become proficient or make growth in reading. To assist with that, general education teachers have suggested a few reading programs that may help students become proficient or made growth. One program is called Open Court which focuses on identifying letter sounds, and vowel teams. Other programs include RAZ Kids and Curriculum which focuses on comprehension as students apply test taking strategies to answer comprehension questions. Based upon the information requested from the participants allowed me to provide a report that was credible and accurate. I was able to validate my report via email by allowing the participants to read the summary regarding their interview. This is called member checking, which means to ask the participants in the study if the findings in the study are accurate (Creswell, 2012).

From the recordings, I was able to transcribe the interviews on a summary sheet and all the data were sorted into categories. Information from the special education teachers' interviews and general education teachers' interviews allowed me to look for patterns, relationships, and themes in the data. Hatch (2002) suggested that data from interviews should provide evidence if the study has been well designed and implemented. Data was obtained from the interview responses and documents from the special education teachers and general education teachers. As a result it allowed me to seek answers regarding the research questions in the study. After the data analysis was complete, I wrote a detailed description of the study findings. According to Merriam (2009), a case study needs to be rich in description and analyze a specific phenomenon.

Case-by-Case Studies

This study is a qualitative case study, as the data collection pulls from the qualitative paradigm in order to address the research questions in the study. Merriam (1998) explains that case studies are conducted to answer “why” and “how” questions researchers have and are often used when the connection between context and phenomenon are not clear. Case studies are an depth look at a classroom, program, and school. A case study can include single sites or multiple sites, which can be lengthy, or short, and use document analysis, interviews, and observations as the main sources of data collection. For this particular study, a case study design was the most appropriate way to answer the research questions. The study design investigated five general education teachers and four special education teachers who reported their perceptions and opinions regarding their roles when providing Common Core instruction. The design is broken down into phases of data phases. During phase one, the researcher inquired about their experience while working with third grade students with a reading deficit in the pull-out or push-in model. During phase two, the researcher used a case study design, interviews, lesson plans, and artifacts to gather in-depth data from the special education teachers and general education teachers. During this phase, the participants were presented with initial findings and asked to ensure accuracy of the interview. Both phases allowed the researcher to obtain a significant amount of data to address the research questions. Results from the participants’ interviews were then combined to represent each general education teacher and special education teacher responses.

Also, interview results were compared to the each school's lesson plans and artifacts to check for differentiation.

Discrepant Cases

In qualitative case studies, some discrepancies or findings may occur in the data (Merriam, 2009). Merriam suggested the researcher explains all known cases of the phenomenon (p.206). When the data begins to repeat itself and there is not any new data arising, then that is an indication that enough time has been spent with data collection (Merriam, 2009). Although participants may have different viewpoints, I attempted to include each participant's perspectives. I included all the results and would have mentioned any contradictory results along with any discrepant case data to avoid conflicting points of view (Creswell, 2012; Glesne, 2011). However, there were no discrepant cases in the study, nor any circumstances indicated where a response provided by the participants differed from the norm.

Research Findings

The findings for this case study were from the data analysis of the personal interviews conducted with special education teachers and general education teachers; artifacts from each school were also analyzed. The interviews were used to examine the roles and responsibilities of both special education teachers and general education teachers in the in the instruction of Common Core Standards and implementation of IEP goals for students with a reading deficit. Data was collected from each special education teacher and general education teacher so that each could express their personal and professional understanding of each learning environment as they monitor the reading

progress and provide reading strategies for students with disabilities that are not meeting proficiency as outlined by the Common Core Standards.

Discussion of the Findings

Each interview was transcribed verbatim. From the transcribed interview, each participant was emailed a summary of their interview transcript. They all reviewed this to ensure that I had captured their responses and emailed me stating everything was accurate. One of the participants emailed me to add more information to one of the research questions regarding the improving the proficiency of students with a reading deficit. After analyzing the data for themes and coding the responses, there were themes that emerged from this research study.

Data Analysis Results: Thematic Findings

The themes that developed from the special education teachers were: (a) Progress Monitoring, (b) Collaboration, (c) Time/Planning, (d) Structuring of groups, (e) Staff training, (f) Scheduling, (g) Determining Pull-out Services/Push-In Services, (h) Communication.

The themes that emerged from the general education teachers were (a) Progress Monitoring, (b) Improving Reading Instruction, (c) Determining Push -In Services/Pull-Out Services, (d) Differentiation (e) Improving the Proficiency of Students with a Reading Deficit, (f) Scheduling. The common themes among both the general education teachers and special education teachers were (a) Progress Monitoring, (b) Scheduling/Time, and (c) Communication.

Progress Monitoring

The first theme to emerge was regarding monitoring the progress of students for Common Core Standards. The special education teachers and general education teachers were asked about their responsibility and roles as they monitored the progress of students. Both were also asked if they consulted or collaborated with each other, as well as if there was something to do to improve the situation. The responses from the participants varied.

Special education teachers. Each of the special education teachers provided a different response regarding the monitoring of students with a reading deficit. Teacher 1A reported it was her responsibility to monitor the progress of students for Common Core standards in the area of reading due to receiving pullout services. Teacher 2A reported that the general education teacher is responsible for any grade level Common Core Standards. The general education teachers said that they will progress monitor students with a reading deficit if they are minimally below grade level. If students with a learning deficit have IEPs (Individual Educational Plans), the special education teachers are responsible for off grade-level progress monitoring. Teacher 2A also mentioned that she would prefer not to have to progress monitor so much, however, it was understood that the general education teacher has them most of the time and if the student's IEP addresses that skill, the special education teacher is responsible for that part of progress monitoring. In addition, each special education teacher has to administer the Core assessment twice a year to monitor progress.

Teacher 3A reported that the general education teacher and special education teacher shared the role of progress monitoring. When progress monitoring with M-Class,

the students are broken into groups based upon the results. In addition, as the special education teacher, she progress monitors all the students that have an IEP (Individualized Education Plan). All the special education teachers expressed some concerns regarding time discuss the progress monitoring.

Teacher 4A mentioned that progress monitoring is provided based upon the teacher that she is working with per grade level, however, the third-grade teachers share the responsibility. Teacher 4A stated the relationship varies among grade levels due to the attitudes of the teachers. It was mentioned that some of the teachers have more experience than she has, therefore, the sharing of progress monitoring may not take place.

General education teachers. Five out of the five general education teachers all used the same assessment, M-Class, to monitor the reading progress of students. Although each of the general education teachers used the same assessment, there were separate parts in the monitoring process. One out of the five participants stated she was responsible for the monitoring of the Common Core Standards in reading. Teacher 1B explained that during the previous year, progress monitoring was shared among the general education teacher and special education teacher. The participant stated during this current school year, reading coaches to the DORF part of the M-Class assessment and the general education teachers do the TRC (Text Reading Comprehension). This part of the assessment allows the students to write and orally tell about the text. She explained that the general education teachers could progress monitor their own students during quarter one and two of the grading period; however, later they were informed the general education teachers could not progress monitor their own students. The participant

clarified there were separate parts due to having the reading coaches to assess the fluency part of the M-Class assessment, which was a concern for her. The researcher asked the participant to explain her concern and state how the situation could be improved.

The participant stated,

I say there is confusion because if I progress monitor every two weeks, students are going from yellow, red, and green and it is taking away teaching time. I feel coaching jobs is important but if they would take a lot more of the responsibility of progress monitoring for the students, it can be done with fidelity.

In general, this participant stated that if the coaches did the progress monitoring, the general education teachers could focus on teaching. The participant stated this situation could be improved if there were more intervention teachers to progress monitor more of the third-grade students. Teacher 1B emphasized this because third-grade students are tested heavily and as general education teachers, they lose a lot of instruction and teaching time. The participant stated there is a lot of instruction to do to prepare students for the End of Grade test.

In contrast to the above participant's response regarding the role and responsibility of reading, four out of five general education teachers stated the general education teacher and special education teacher are both responsible for progress monitoring the students. Two of the general education teachers from the same school both agreed it was their responsibility to provide Common Core instruction for students with a reading deficit. In addition, they both agreed that the special education teacher was responsible for addressing the specific reading goals on the student's IEP.

One participant stated that the general education teacher and special education teacher shared the progress monitoring of the students with a reading deficit. She stated that the data regarding fluency, reading accuracy, comprehension and retell is shared in order to meet the reading needs of the students. A different participant stated that the special education teachers look at the student data, and focus on the skills based upon student needs. Another participant stated the general education teacher definitely share information during professional learning team meetings. In comparison to the previous participant, data is also discussed, however, is shared during Kid Talk.

Summary of general and special education teachers regarding progress monitoring. The responses from the participants varied. Only one out of four special education teachers felt it was the responsibility of the special education teacher to provide progressing monitoring for reading. Teacher 2A felt it was the responsibility of the general education teacher to monitor the progress of reading. In agreement, with Teacher 3A and Teacher 4A, both stated it was a shared responsibility with progress monitoring with the third-grade teachers. Teacher 4A did note that outside of third grade the responsibility varied.

As previously mentioned, four out of five general education teachers stated the general education teacher and special education teacher share responsibility for monitoring the progress of students. Interestingly, two of the general education teachers were unsure of how the special education teacher monitored the reading progress of the students. For example, Teacher 3B stated as the general education teacher, she has the responsibility to monitor the progress of the students using the M-class assessment during

the beginning, middle, and ending of the year; however, she was not sure of what assessments the special education teacher used for progress monitoring. Teacher 4B felt that this situation needs to be improved by making the general education teachers aware of the assessments being used by the special education teachers.

For students to be successful in reading, it is necessary that the general education teachers and special education teachers have knowledge about progress monitoring. From these results it appears that general education teachers are uninformed regarding the progress monitoring that the special education teachers are doing. Werts, Carpenter, and Fewell, (2014) mentioned the lack of knowledge and training of progress monitoring impacts the use of proper interventions, progress monitoring, and assessment instruction. Progress monitoring is a practice that helps educators use student performance data to continually evaluate the reading progress of students. Thus, general education teachers and special education teachers must have an understanding of what and how to monitor reading instruction in order for third grade students to be proficient with phonics, word recognition, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary.

As general education teachers use assessment data, it will allow them to make instructional decisions. As they track data, it will show student growth and ensure that appropriate interventions are delivered with fidelity (White, Polly, & Audette, 2012). For students to continue to make reading growth, general education teachers and special education teachers need to improve on collaborating to ensure that students reading needs are monitored in order to be successful with the Common Core Reading Standards and IEP goals.

Collaboration

Special education teachers. With the implementation of Common Core Standards, both the general education teachers and special education teachers were very concerned about the collaboration among them. Two out of four special education teachers reported that there is collaboration which primarily took place at the PLT meetings or briefly in passing. Teacher 1A mentioned that she has to collaborate with the general education teacher due to serving students that are being pulled from the general education classroom. In addition to collaborating with the general education teacher, she collaborates with colleagues that work with students that are identified as LEP (Limited English Proficiency) and ESL (English as a Second Language). Teacher 2A mentioned that collaboration takes place via email to avoid interruption during teaching time.

Each of the special education teachers understood their responsibility to the students that were on their caseload. Therefore, they mentioned it was their responsibility to ensure the implementation of accommodations for students were utilized and IEP goals were addressed. Teacher 4A shared an experience below which indicates the importance of collaboration. The participant stated,

As the special education teacher, I was working on an IEP, and saw that the student did not have any reading goals. Therefore, as the general education teacher and I sat down and reviewed the data together, we found that his fluency was great, but his comprehension level was low, and he scored a level 1 on his mid-year ELA benchmark which is known as Case 21. It was determined that the student needed some support from

the intervention teacher. And based upon the progress monitoring results, the student did not make growth. As a result, the IEP team met to decide if reading goals were needed.

General education teachers. Collaboration was not a theme that emerged with the general education teachers, however, Teacher 3B shared that she and the special education teacher used the same reading programs entitled A-Z and RAZ Kids. In addition to using these programs, she mentioned that they both used a program entitled, Accelerator Reader. She explained these programs are text based on the student's reading level and that the special education teacher sends notes to inform her of the number of words students read in a minute. This indicated the impact of progress monitoring between them. Although the special education teachers and special education teachers see the importance of collaboration, the factors of time and planning impedes their interaction with each other.

Time/Planning/Scheduling

Special education teachers. Due to the time and planning constraints for the special education teachers and general education teachers, there is limited discussion among them which impacts their role and implementation of the IEP goals and Common Core Reading Standards for students with a reading deficit. Each of the special education teacher felt timing was an area that caused some challenges. Time was a common theme between the general education teachers and special education teachers in the study. Although time and planning was a theme that emerged from the special education teachers and general education teachers, scheduling was a theme that developed as both

teachers provided their responses regarding who has the authority to designate pull-out activities and times when working with students identified with a learning disability.

Teacher 3A stated that special education teachers do not have a common planning time. In return, she uses the Face Time app to discuss their pull-out and inclusion plans. When asked how this situation could be improved, Teacher 3A's response was, "Have a common planning time with a grade level with the general education being present." Teacher 3A mentioned having more than one grade level present would be overwhelming.

Teacher 4A mentioned that she attends PLT as time permits. She does attend grade-level meetings half of the time depending upon the schedule. This participant mentioned the importance of looking at data to determine the steps for students that are not making progress toward M-Class standards. The special education teacher stated that she and the general education teachers look at the data together to determine if the IEPs need to be tweaked for the students that she serves to address their areas of need.

Teacher 2A stated that scheduling is a concern as they consider providing reading interventions for meeting the Common Core Standards. She mentioned that her school is a year-round school; however, they are not track specific. Students on differing tracks impact how teachers provide interventions for students with a reading deficit. The participant stated there are many students on Track four, and one of the special education teachers are always gone; therefore, as special education teachers, they have to spread out so they can be equally divided among other tracks. It was stated that scheduling is a nightmare; however, they do the best they can.

Three out of four participants stated that each of them have the authority to designate pull-out activities and times when working with students identified with a learning disability. Teacher 1A stated special education teachers are responsible for the activities and times when working with students identified with a learning disability. Teacher 1A stated that she is responsible based upon her expectations, data, observations, and the general education teacher's expectations. She stated that when time needs to be increased for the pull-out sessions, that collaboration takes place with the general education teachers.

Teacher 3A stated that in her situation organizing scheduling is not a shared responsibility, but rather she had full control over the activities and time. She stated the general education teachers provide their class schedule to her, because there is not a master schedule except for lunch and specials. Teacher 3A also stated some of the general education teachers have the same schedule which makes scheduling difficult. She stated this situation could be improved if there was more alignment with CMAPP. The participant stated if that were to occur, the general education teacher and special education could be teaching the same skill in both learning environments.

Teacher 4A stated that in her situation, the general education teachers and special education teachers are both responsible for designating times and activities for students identified with a learning disability. Teacher 4A stated that the activities are usually recommended by the local school district; however, some do not work with the students. She also stated that as the special education teacher she tries to coordinate pull-out times

with the general education teacher. The participant stated they are not allowed to pull students during the 30 minute reading block.

Teachers 1A, 3A, and 4A mentioned designating pull-out services and times were not a shared responsibility at their school. Unlike these participants, Teacher2A stated that it is a shared responsibility to designate pull-out services and times for students with a reading deficit. The participant stated during the interview, administration was in the process of discussing the schedule for the 2017-2018 school years. She stated that the general education teachers were providing input regarding when they desired to teach reading, science, social studies, math, as well as times for students to participate in recess, lunch, and specials. Based upon the proposed schedule, pull-out times would be determined with leadership and special education teachers.

General education teachers. Teacher 1B stated, “Data is involved in this process and the intervention teacher decides on services and times.” She stated that currently she did not have any students that received special education services; however, she explained how the process took place during the previous year. The participant, stated,

Ok, this is how it worked last year. They were pulled out based on where they were. There were only four classes and were pulled based upon IEP. Students in the grade level met at this time, students meeting benchmark (meaning ability level) met at this time, and students with an IEP met another time. It is all third-grade. If you have the same goal, you go at the same time. The students that are in third-grade with an IEP go at the same time.

The participant stated currently it was being done that way because there were only two general education classrooms that had students that are identified with a reading deficit. She mentioned that there may be a total of five or six students that received reading support in the morning and afternoon using the pull-out or push-in model.

When asked if the general education teachers consult/collaborate with the special education teacher, teacher 1B stated,

We do collaborate; I don't do it a lot because I don't have students currently identified yet. I do know her and the other general education teachers meet regularly. We discuss where we are and what we are covering in the classroom. Last year, every teacher had a student with an IEP. During grade level planning, the special education teacher would come in for about five minutes to discuss the students. Then, she would leave to pull groups. It didn't work because, she (special education teacher) may be working on three digit addition and I (general education teacher) maybe working on fractions. In reading, she did word work. It was the same. I worked on comprehension and other reading strategies.

When asked what she could do to improve the situation, she stated,

Put the students in a strategy group; find out what strategy that fit in, which is not hard to do. If they have a deficit with comprehension or context clues, they can sit with anybody to learn the strategies despite ability level, because you are working on that particular strategy.

Providing pull-out services for students with a deficit is an advantage for them because they receive designed explicit instruction in a smaller learning environment.

Although their learning needs are being addressed with the special education teacher, general education teachers tend to exhibit flexibility when scheduling activities and times for students with a learning deficit. Teacher 3B stated,

We try to share to designate times for activities as best we can. Personally, I have always been flexible for the pullout services. I know it is really, really hard. As a grade level, we give the special education teachers our math time, because we don't want the students to be pulled out during our math block. It overlaps sometimes, a little bit. The special education teacher gets pull-out in math so, it's ok.

The participant stated that the special education teacher is able to make her own schedule because the assistant principal makes the master schedule for the entire school, however, there must be a consideration for specials and lunch times. When asked how this situation could be improved, the participant mentioned that there should be math and literacy blocks. She shared that none of her students were being pulled during the literacy block. However, she was not sure if her colleague's students with a reading deficit were being pulled out and therefore missing instruction. The participant mentioned if students miss instruction it is hard to incorporate Science and Social Studies during the literacy block, because then the student being pulled out would miss not only literacy but also science or social studies as well. She mentioned that it would be ideal to teach content areas with ELA, but the teacher would have to consider the reading level on that topic. She expressed this as an area that the third-grade team was trying to get materials, resources, and books; however, it was hard because there is not any money for books.

Teacher 3C mentioned that the special education teacher provided a schedule to her. She mentioned the schedule is accepted when given. General education teachers had to teach math for 15 minutes with students with a learning disability. There was a question about adjustment during that time; however, she was informed she had to provide some math instruction within the general education classroom. She realized that scheduling was a nightmare and that the special education teachers were trying to make the schedule work for everybody. Students with a learning disability receive math in the afternoon in the resource setting. Then, they return to the general education setting and go to recess and science. The participant stated that the students with a learning deficit have to wait before she can assist them because she is teaching or showing students what needs to be done while being in the lab. Then she stated that math begins, and the class must move on. She expressed how fractions were currently being taught and students with a reading deficit needed to be prepared because it was going to be on the End of Grade test in the spring. The participant was concerned that the general education teacher and special education teacher were not teaching same skill. She mentioned students would know fractions if they were in the general classroom setting. The participant also mentioned that she was not aware of what students knew regarding fractions which was indicated in her concern regarding scheduling at the school.

Teacher 4B stated mentioned that the special education teacher is responsible for designating pull-out times and activities. She expressed that the special education teacher knew what the general education teacher is teaching and tries to teach the same skill. The participant emphasized it was the special education teacher's responsibility for

designating pull-out times and activities. She mentioned that the local school system has their own programs; therefore, the special education teacher will be responsible for implementing those programs.

Teacher 4C is a colleague of the previous participant mentioned above and she shared administration and the special education teachers are responsible for designating the activities and times. She mentioned the schedule was made and the general education teachers were told by the special teacher the times the special education students would be pulled. She was informed that her students would be pulled for math during her Science and Social Studies block. The participant mentioned that was a separate part when the general education teachers had to make an intervention plan because students were missing Reach to Achieve instruction. She mentioned that was a collaborative effort. The participant shared at her former school, there was a scheduling committee which included grade level representation and a special education teacher. When asked how to improve this situation, the participant stated there should have a scheduling committee with grade level representation along with the special education teachers.

Summary of special education teachers and general educations data regarding timing and planning. The special education teachers and general education teachers provided insight on the roles and responsibilities when designating pull-out times and events. Two out of four special education teachers indicated they are responsible for designating pull-out services for students with a reading deficit. Two out of four special education teachers indicated it is a shared responsibility The general education teachers seem to be flexible, however, there were concerns regarding

scheduling. Teacher 1B felt the special education teacher should be teaching the same skill taught in the general education classroom in the resource classroom. One out of five general education teachers were unhappy about students being pulled when missing instruction. Four out of five general education teachers mentioned being flexible with pull-out due to the role of the special education teachers providing instruction for the students based on their IEP goals. Each of the schools represented in this study provided special education services with the pull-out model. Two out of four schools provided push-in services, however, one out of four schools only provided push-in services for second grade. Based upon the responses from the interviews, it seems like there is a need for the general education teachers and special education teachers to work together to determine when and for how long they provide Common Core reading instruction and intervention.

Providing Reading Instruction

Special education teachers. Reading instruction is significant in the classroom environment because it impact all content areas. Therefore, it must be taught with fidelity in order for students to be proficient readers per Common Core Reading Standards for all students. Third graders are expected to ask and answer questions with fiction and nonfiction text in order to use evidence from the text to support their responses Of course, by engaging in this way, special education teachers and general education teachers must have a method to provide reading instruction. Three out of four special education teachers stated that they share the responsibility of providing Common Core Reading instruction.

One out of four special education teachers stated the general education teacher is responsible for providing Common Core Standards.

Teacher 1A stated,

For the reading instruction, I pull-out and co-teach. We collaborate on how we do instruction because students learn at a different pace and level. It is whole group instruction. The general education teacher may teach it one way and as the special education teacher, I will repeat the instruction in a different way. After whole group instruction, I work with students in a smaller group. Not only do I work with the special education students but the students that are performing below grade level.

Teacher 2A mentioned that reading instruction is shared if the students are below grade level, which is most of the students that receive instruction in the resource setting. This special education also mentioned that the general education teacher's role should be teaching students with a reading deficit at their level. The special education teacher's role is to break it down and do more intensive instruction. She mentioned that there were a couple of students that had high hours of literacy instruction. Therefore, all the reading and math instruction is served by this special education teacher. For the most part, these students do not receive any reading instruction from the general education teacher in the general education classroom. They are only in the classroom for recess, lunch, and attend all specials, such as music, art, library, physical education, and computer with their non-disabled peers. Teacher 2A explained students with maximum resource hours are the third-graders that are still learning letter sounds, decoding CVC (consonant vowel

consonant) sounds. Therefore, these are the students with a reading deficit that are significantly below grade level. In summary, most of the responsibility is shared among the general education teacher and special education teacher; however, the students with intensive needs receive reading instruction by the special education teachers.

The responsibility of providing reading instruction is shared between the general education teacher and the special education teacher according to Teacher 3A. She stated that the general education teacher knows which standard will be taught. Teacher 3A also stated as the special education teacher, she does not look at the curriculum, however, she and the general education teacher brainstorm on the activities that will be implemented within the inclusive setting.

In contrast to the above responses, Teacher 4A stated that the Common Core Reading Standards is the responsibility of the general education teachers. Her role as the special education teacher would be to help them with the standards and to address the Common Core IEP goal that is not aligned with grade level standards. This was also expressed by Teacher 2A, particularly for students that did not receive maximum resource support; otherwise it was the general education teacher's responsibility to provide Common Core reading instruction. Therefore, two out of four special education teachers felt Common Core reading instruction was the responsibility of the general education teachers.

General education teachers. General education teachers have a responsibility to make sure they teach Common Core Standards to all children, including students with a reading deficit. When asked who has the responsibility for providing Common Core

Standards reading instruction, four out of five of the general education teachers stated that reading instruction is a shared responsibility based upon student need. Teacher 1B stated that the special education teacher and the general education teacher shared the responsibility of administering the TRC and DORF levels and implementation of Daily 5. As the researcher, I asked Teacher 1B to explain Daily 5 and reading services because she stated there were separate activities. The participant explained that Daily 5 could be used as a guided strategy group. Instruction is based upon the results from the two reading areas previously mentioned along with combining the skills for CMAPP, which has to be taught for 20 minutes for all students. She explained that students with a reading deficit are taught in a group based on their score on the quarterly assessment.

Four out of five general education teachers agreed that the special education teacher is also responsible for teaching Common Core Standards based upon the reading goals on their IEP. They agreed that their role is to teach Common Core reading instruction on third-grade level. Similarly, both general education teachers and special education teachers are trying to meet the reading needs of the students.

Teacher 4C is a general education teacher that is not responsible for reading instruction, but rather a specific English Language Arts teacher. Teacher 4C is responsible for teaching writing as well as teaches math, science, and social studies for the third-grade students. The participant explained that the ELA teacher is responsible for the RF, (Reading Fluency) RI, (Reading Informational text), and RL (Reading Literature).

Teacher 3B stated there are so many standards that are to be taught by all general education teachers. In addition, there are three grades that must be given on each reading standard when the assessments are administered. In her opinion, this requirement was too much for students with a reading disability. She felt students were not ready to tackle all of those standards. Therefore, she and another general education teacher from the same school used a new reading program created by Curriculum Associates. This program narrowed the standards and the passages. Additionally, it provided modeled instruction, guided instruction, and independent practice which were used with all students. Teacher 3C mentioned that she and the special education teacher never talked about the progress of the students that each of them served. In contrast, Teacher 3B works at the same school did collaborate about the progress of the students. This participant stated that there were some things that needed to be changed. She stated that there were some things that the general education teachers, special education teachers, and administration are doing that are not working. I asked the participant, "How could this situation be improved?"

She replied,

It has begun because I am on the leadership team and we discussed how we need to make improvement for all students as we looked at the School Improvement Plan. We discussed vertical alignment. If it was my way, I wouldn't look at the push-in or pull-out model. My students are missing 90 minutes of instruction a day from my classroom. I have to fit them in once they come back from the special education teacher.

There is an expectation for students to come to school every day and learn Common Core Reading Standards as they are given opportunities to think, read, write, speak, and listen. However, students must have skills modeled by teachers to improve in reading. As a result, students must have the opportunity to practice these skills. Therefore, it is necessary that both special education teachers and general education teachers collaborate regarding the implementation of reading instruction practices.

Summary of special education teacher and general education teacher regarding reading instruction practices. It seemed obvious that knowing the roles and responsibilities of implementing reading instruction falls on both the general education teachers and special education teachers. Similarly, Teacher 1A, 1B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 4B share reading instruction, however, the special education teachers were responsible for goals written on the student's individual educational plan. Teacher 2A mentioned that they share the responsibility of providing reading instruction if students are significantly below grade level in reading. Teacher 4A and Teacher 4C stated the general education was responsible for teaching providing reading instruction based upon 3rd grade Common Core Standards. Teacher 3C felt that timing needed to be improved so that she could meet with the special education teacher to address student performance and needs. This participant stated that nothing could be done about timing due to the special education teacher other responsibilities. Teacher 4C felt the situation could be improved if there was more collaboration across grade level for students with disabilities.

Structuring of Groups

Special education teachers. Due to the varying needs and abilities of the students with a reading deficit, students should be placed in a classroom environment that will meet their reading needs with the appropriate reading instruction. Teacher 1A stated that general education teachers and special education teachers look at the data at the end of the year to determine instructional levels in the beginning of the next school year. Assessments are also completed throughout the year to adjust instructional groups. Some of the students are on grade level, and some are below grade level, therefore, students need to be taught similar skills, such as comprehension, therefore, students are placed in a group with either the general education teacher or special education teacher to work on the skill.

Teacher 3A stated that the general education teacher and special education teacher plan lessons and activities such as word work to improve word recognition. Students are placed in a group based upon their needs. This activity is based on grade level; however the word work list may be different.

Teacher 4A stated that her role is supplemental. She mentioned that the groups may consist of students that are on and below grade level on certain skills. For example, all students may be taught the skill of retelling during whole group instruction with the general education teacher. The students that have a reading deficit or are having difficulty with the skill will be taught by the special education teacher within a small group. Teacher 4A mentioned both special education teachers and general education teachers have a responsibility to provide reading support to make sure that students receive a

learning opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and retain the rigor and high expectations of the Common Core Standards.

Reading is the access to all learning. Without the development of foundational reading skills, students are placed at risk for not being proficient readers. As a result, students fall behind in reading which indicates they are not meeting grade level expectations. Therefore, help is needed to help the struggling readers so they can experience academic success in school. When asked a probing question about the responsibility of providing Common Core Standards Reading interventions, each of the participants indicated that the general education teachers play a role in providing Common Core Reading Standards.

Teacher 1A stated,

The special education teacher consults with the general education teacher. The special education teacher assists the general education with the skills taught in the resource setting which shows collaboration. I want the general education teacher to use what is taught in the resource setting with the students with disabilities.

Teacher 2A stated the general education teachers may do a decoding progress monitoring for five minutes, however, the special education teacher provides a more intensive program for the students with a deficit. The special education teacher did a corrective reading program five times a week for 30 minutes for students that are significantly below grade level.

Teacher 3A stated that she and the general education teacher wrote Tier 2 plans together. The students in her groups are 3 or 4 years behind in their reading level.

Therefore, students with a reading deficit need plans in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and decoding. The special education teacher stated that she may see an area of need for a student that the general education teacher may not see within the classroom. In the event of such a situation, the appropriate interventions are put in place for the students.

Teacher 4A has a similar situation and stated that she works with a second grader that is in an intervention group because they were not meeting benchmark. The participant stated that she works in an inclusive classroom with a student with a reading deficit for 10 minutes. Teacher 4A also has the responsibility of working with non-disabled students that need help with reading words, speed, and sight words. This participant stated when the activity ends, the second-grade students return to their classroom. Then, she works with the third-grade students with a reading deficit for the next 20 minutes. In addition to the responsibilities of a special education teacher, she expressed a desire for additional and improve communication with the general education teachers.

General education teachers. There were five general education teachers in this study. There were no findings regarding the structuring of the groups.

Improving Reading Intervention

Special education teachers. There were four special education teachers in this study. Each one expressed their concerns for improving the situation for providing Common Core Standards reading interventions for students with a reading deficit. Teacher 1A stated there could be improvement for the general education teacher and

special education teacher by making sure they focus on what the students need. The concerns were consistency, meaning, use the strategy that was agreed upon by both the general education teacher and special education teacher to help students with the reading deficit.

Teacher 3A stated that this situation could be improved if the general education teachers and special education teachers could add time to plan and teach reading. She also stated she would love to see the grade levels on the same page. For example, if each grade level could teach the same reading skill at the same time. This participant felt if this occurred it would make pull-out and co-teaching more feasible in order for students to flourish academically and socially. Teacher 3A mentioned planning for reading was different and it was evident which students were on the grade levels that planned math together, when receiving received math support in the resource setting. She also stated it is very hard teaching reading when different reading skills are being taught in the general education classroom versus the resource classroom. With this in mind, having the views of the general education teachers would help improve the reading intervention needs of students, staffing , and training which impacts student learning.

General education teachers. In as much as there are a concerns of special education teachers for making sure students are meeting benchmark in reading, the same is true for the general education teachers when implementing reading interventions which allows special education and general education teachers to see the improvement in students.

When asked who has the responsibility for providing reading interventions, four out of five general education teachers shared that the role of providing Common Core Standards reading interventions with students with a reading deficit. One out of five general education teachers shared that there are separate roles when providing Common Core Standards reading interventions for students with a reading deficit. Teacher 1B explained that this year she did not have any students with a reading IEP within her classroom. She explained during the previous school year, students worked on word work with the special education teacher in the resource setting, whereas the general education teacher would be working on reading strategies, fluency, writing skills, and comprehension. The participant stated this made it difficult to differentiate instruction. The participant stated the general education teacher provided intervention in the area of fluency, however, reading coaches, and intervention teachers focused on the students identified as Tippy Points students. These were the students that were pulled for reading support that scored a two or two plus on the Case 21 assessment and were below grade level based on the TRC. The participant stated that these students were pulled three times a day during the co-teaching session.

Teacher 1B explained the previous year that she worked with students that received math instruction. She shared that she could be teaching fractions, however, the special education teacher would be teaching with a math deficit on adding three digits. She shared it was difficult for her because students were not receiving the same instruction in the pull-out model. Teacher 1B shared this was the same concern in the area of reading. She stated students were working in word work with the special

education teacher, where as the general education were teaching reading strategies, writing skills, comprehension, and fluency. In return, she shared it was difficult to differentiate instruction. The participant stated that she only had a student identified as ELL (English Language Learner) this year. Teacher1B also stated there were two students in another general education classroom that had a reading deficit. She also explained there were mainly two special education teachers that taught students with the pullout model and push-model.

Teacher B shared the special education teacher and her share the role when providing Common Core Standards reading interventions. Both of them use a reading program called Reading A-Z on the computer which is a leveled reading program that checks for fluency and comprehension. The participant explained that this program allows students to read, listen, and answer questions. She also shared that she allows the students with a reading deficit to use the computer programs entitled RAZKIDS and Accelerator Reader. As the researcher, I asked the participant, if she and the special education teacher discussed the progress of the interventions. She replied, “Not enough, we do what we can. It’s a problem. I share a little with her and she share a little with me”. As a result of her response, I asked if Teacher 2B if the special education teacher attend PLT. The participant stated that she attended the meetings at the beginning of the year but later stopped attending, thinking it may be due to her schedule. The participant stated this situation could be improved if there was a shared common planning time or have the special education teacher comes to a PLT at least once a month. She stated that if this occurred, the general education teachers could assist with the reading strengths of the

students in the general education classroom. She also stated that it would be a time where the general education teachers could ask what they could do to support the special education teacher. The participant stated she recognize that it is difficult because the responsibility of the general education teacher is to focus on grade level reading standards, and the responsibility of the special education teacher is to focus off grade level standards.

The next participant worked at the same school as the previous participant; however, she did not share the same response regarding the responsibility of providing Common Core reading interventions for students with a reading deficit. Her response was there was no collaboration shared with the special education teacher. She explained it was needed because she was unaware of what was happening with the students that both serve in the area of reading. The participant mentioned that she does her best with implementing Daily 5 which is an intervention that allows the students read to self, read to someone, write or do word work. She stated that she hoped students were receiving reading interventions while being in the resource setting with the special education teacher. As she explained what intervention time looked like in her classroom, she stated that in order to improve the implementation of reading interventions, there was a need for collaboration between her and the special education teacher. She suggested a monthly meeting should be held because she felt she needed one on one time with the special education teacher so that she could address the concerns of the students that they both serve. As the researcher, I asked if the other third-grade general education teachers should be present during that time. The participant stated she needed individual time to

discuss her concerns because the other general education teachers may not want to hear the level of details that she would be looking for. She was concerned that the other general education teachers may not want to sit for a long period of time, even though; they share some of the students. For the sake of time, the participant felt that could be a lot for the special education teacher because there are five third-grade general education teachers at their school.

The next participants work at the same school. One of the participants stated collaboration takes place among the general education teachers and special education teachers. She stated collaboration comes in with sharing M-Class data, Case 21 data, and seeing how strategies are being implemented. The next participant mentioned that an intervention teacher pushes in the classroom to provide interventions for students which had just recently begun. This occurred as a result of the results on the Case 21 assessment. The participant mentioned that students do not leave her classroom for intervention services. She explained that she does not have input with the intervention piece because her role is to teach math, science, and social studies however, she knew that M-class and sources from the Florida Center for Research is used for inventions within the local school district. Due to her previous experience at another school, she was aware of how to administer Dibels and Mclass. She stated that she administers both assessments to the third-grade students when needed. She explained some of the third-grade students did not show proficiency on the Beginning of the Year End of Grade test, therefore, there is not a lot of teaching happening due to assessing the students. The participant felt this situation could be improved if the reading specialist in the county

could come and help the English Language Arts teachers with assessing the students. She explained that at the end of the school year, the English language arts teachers could not test their own students. Another teacher has to do the assessment. She stated when this occurs; students are divided among the third-grade teachers. She stated the students are pulled from other classrooms during math and reading which impacts students missing instruction. The participant stated there could be as many as eight students missing from her classroom. As the assessments are given to the students, there is hope that students will be proficient or make growth in reading.

Summary of the special education teachers and general education teachers regarding reading interventions. The special education teachers felt that general education teachers should use the same strategy to address the reading deficit for students. They also felt additional time for planning was needed to address the reading interventions for students. General education teachers used the M-class assessments to monitor the progress of reading in order to know how to implement the appropriate intervention for students. At one school, the general education teacher and special education teacher share the same reading program as an intervention to check for fluency and comprehension. As the special education teachers and general education teachers provided their responses regarding the implementation of the interventions, it was obvious that both educators expressed the need to communicate about the implementation of interventions for students with a reading deficit.

Staffing/Training

Special education teachers. For students to be successful, general education teachers and special education teachers must focus on best practices, elements for instruction, and strategies to help all students learn at their highest levels. As the participants see the significance of reading interventions, concerns arise.

Teacher 2A stated in order to improve the implementation of reading interventions, there should be more staffing. She stated if there was more staffing; the special education teachers could push into the general education classroom and work with more with the students that are on grade level. Teacher 2A mentioned that some of the students needed a break from the resource setting due to distractions. She mentioned it would be beneficial to have more staffing in the resource setting while another special education teacher push into the general education classroom, particularly since most of the time, there is only one special education teacher in the resource setting. Teacher 2A is concerned she might lose the teacher assistant.

Teacher 1A was asked if she had training for providing strategies for the students with a reading deficit. Teacher 1A, a special education teacher stated,

Yes, there have been trainings. All staff had trainings. I have attended trainings that provided information regarding students with focusing concerns, not performing on grade level in various subjects. I attend workshops.

General education teachers. One out of five general education teachers expressed that training was needed for all teachers that did not know how to use the EASI system to locate or observe students that received or needed reading intervention.

Teacher 1B stated no one trained the general education teachers on the MTSS process. As a result, students did not receive interventions at the appropriate time. Teacher 1B mentioned students were discussed at the weekly Professional Learning Team meetings during Kid Talk, however, there were students who had Tier plans from the previous year, however, the next Tier plan was not started due to the lack of communication from staff that was knowledgeable about the process.

For students to meet benchmark in reading, general education teachers and special education teachers must rely on progress monitoring data, student report card, work samples, and teacher observations to see student growth in reading. As a result, strengths and weaknesses are determined in order for the general education teachers and special education teachers can provide the appropriate instruction and materials for the students. By providing the appropriate strategies and resources, both teachers will be able to see the proficiency level of students with a reading deficit.

Summary of special education teachers and general education teacher regarding reading staffing and training. In as much as there are concerns of special education teachers regarding staffing and training, their concerns varied. Special education teachers felt staffing and training were needed to help them understand what interventions and strategies could be utilized to help students become proficient in reading. One out of five general education teachers felt professional development was needed in order to understand how to use the EASI system to locate students that needed intervention as they went through the MTSS process so that students could receive the appropriate intervention.

Improving the Proficiency of Students With a Reading Deficit

Special education teachers. Based upon the responses of both the general education and special education teachers, assessments are needed to determine if students are or are not proficient in reading. When asked who has the responsibility for working with students identified with a learning disability who are not proficient with the Common Core Standards in reading, one out of four participants stated it was their responsibility for working with students identified with a learning disability who are not proficient with the Common Core Standards in reading.

Teacher 1A stated,

That's my responsibility. The general education teacher is responsible for delivering instruction on grade level. I am responsible for the instruction that is off grade level. There is collaboration among the general education teachers and special education teachers to discuss what is working/not working. As the special education teacher, I take more responsibility for the students not being proficient with the Common Core Standards.

The participant felt there should more communication between the special and general education teachers regarding reading instruction to meet the needs of the students. The researcher asked how this concern could be resolved. Teacher 1A's response was that the team could just meet and discuss the concern.

The other three out of four special education participants stated the general education teacher and special education teachers are responsible for working with students identified with a learning disability who are not proficient. Teacher 2A stated the

special education teachers share the responsibility with the general education teachers for students with intensive needs. She stated if the students are significantly below grade level, the special education is solely responsible for working with students identified with a learning disability who are not proficient with the Common Core Standards in reading. The participant explained that materials are not shared with the general education teachers. She mentioned special education teachers have their own materials, however, they do share Letter Land reading program which is used with their older students. Other reading programs such as Recipe for Reading and Making Connections are used with students with a reading deficit. Recipe for Reading is used for students that needs support in decoding, whereas, Making Connections is used for students that needs support in comprehension. The participant explained that Making Connections focuses on skills such as main idea, sequencing, main idea, compare /contrast, drawing conclusion, fact/opinion, and cause/effect. The levels of the Making Connections series are different; therefore, if the students are performing below third-grade level, the special education teacher would use the second grade edition. If the students are on grade level, the students would remain the general education classroom. When asked how this situation could be improved, the participant stated there needs to be more money for materials, and more teachers to work with the students. There is a particular need for additional staff when a reading group is ready to proceed with another story and the other groups are not ready. Teacher 2A mentioned home circumstances of students and the track out schedule impacts reading growth. Each of the factors mentioned confirms Teacher 2A's role as she takes on the responsibility to help students become proficient readers.

Teacher 3A stated that the responsibility of working with students who are not being proficient in reading is a shared responsibility between the general education teachers and special education teachers. The Common Core Standards falls ultimately on the teacher of record. She stated the special education was responsible for the IEP goals; however, she tries to support the general education teacher. The participant also stated that she gives assessments, progress monitor, and occasionally generates assessments.

Teacher 4A stated the general education teacher and special education teachers works with them. She stated her role as the special education teacher was to build skills to close the gap. The participant stated that some students receive reading instruction in the general education setting, even with differentiation. Teacher 4A stated third-graders are working on comprehension and fluency on their grade level. She emphasized this is a shared responsibility.

To ensure that students are ready for success after graduating from high school, Common Standards establish guidelines for what every student should know and be able to do in reading from kindergarten through 12th grade. Thus, students with a reading deficit are required to be proficient in reading as they receive reading instruction and intervention in their learning environment .It is of great importance that students receive reading support in the least restrictive environment. Therefore, the special education teachers mentioned in this study mentioned the pull-out model is used with their students at their perspective schools. Teacher1A, 3A, and 4A are the only special education teachers that use the inclusion model. Despite the teaching models, special education

teachers and general education teachers play a significant role ensuring that all students become proficient readers.

General education teachers. When asked about who has the responsibility of working with students identified with at learning disability who are not proficient with the Common Core Standards in reading, two out of five general education teachers mentioned that the general education teacher is responsible for the students not being proficient with the Common Core Standards in reading. Three out of five general education teachers mentioned it was a shared responsibility for each of them. In contrast, one general education teacher mentioned she has the responsibility for working with students identified with a learning disability who are not proficient with the Common Core Standards in reading. She mentioned the special education teacher is not responsible; however, her support is needed to assist her with helping the students to become proficient in reading. The participant did mention there are times she may ask the special education teacher to allow her students to complete an assignment in the resource classroom. This participant explained this is a separate role because special education teachers have their tools and resources that they utilize to help students with a reading deficit. It was interesting that this participant felt it was her responsibility when students with a reading deficit were not proficient with the Common Core Standards in reading because her colleague mentioned it was a shared responsibility. She explained that the students receive reading instruction for the skills identified on their IEP (Individualized Education Plan) for 45 minutes with the special education teacher in the resource setting,

therefore, her role as a general education teacher was to address the Common Core Standards in reading for third-graders.

The participant shared that the students with a reading deficit were lazy and had more ability that was not being shown. She stated that students felt the general education classroom was not the place to do harder assignments. The participant stated one of the students asked three times in one day when was it time to go to the resource classroom. She recognized the frustration of the students with a learning deficit; however, the students were aware of her expectations because she believed all the students could do the work because it had been demonstrated.

Although Teacher 4B felt it was a shared responsibility of students not being proficient in reading, she did mention that she would like to see improvements such as general education teachers should adding more details to their lesson plans, particularly, adding the reading IEP goals. Teacher 4B mentioned that she would like to request self-contained classes rather than have a block schedule. She stated since the school was a Title 1 school, general education teachers needed more time to teach subject matter. Teacher 4B stated it was not appropriate to take time away from another colleague due to block scheduling. The participant felt if general education teachers were in a self-contained setting, general education teachers would adjust their schedule. As the general education teachers and special education teachers investigate ways to allow students to become proficient readers, each must consider how they will present reading as they consider the student's reading level and needs. Both educators must also consider the learning environments as activities are implemented. As students receive the explicit and

direct instruction, each can share what they learned. To sum this up, the general education teacher and special education teacher must differentiate instruction, provide accommodations, and visual aids to meet student needs.

Summary of special education teachers and general education teachers regarding improving the proficiency of students with a reading deficit. Special education teachers and general education teachers play an important role with improving the proficiency level of students with a reading deficit. The majority of the special education teachers in the study felt it was the responsibility of the general education and the special education teachers regarding students that were not proficient in reading. General education teachers had some varying responses regarding the responsibility of students that were not proficient in reading. Two out of five general education teachers felt it was not shared responsibility, however, just as the special education teachers, the majority of the general education teachers felt it was a shared responsibility. Both educators expressed that the special education teachers are responsible for the goals on the students individualized education plan, whereas, the general education teachers are responsible for teaching the Common Core Standards.

Differentiation

Special education teachers. With this in mind, there is a need for awareness of materials and reading programs needed to help students to increase their reading performance. Teacher2A explained that materials are not shared with general education teachers. She mentioned special education teachers have their own materials, however, both use the same reading program entitled, Letter land that is used with younger

students. Thus, in order to differentiate instruction, she uses two reading programs to help students with their reading deficit. Recipe for Reading focuses on decoding, whereas Making Connections focuses on comprehension for all grade levels. Similarly, Teacher 4A mentioned she utilizes different books, alternative materials, and a Smart Board.

General education teachers. Although each of the general education teachers gave their response regarding the role of who had the responsibility for working with students identified with a learning disability who are not proficient with the Common Core Standards in reading, three out of the five general education teachers mentioned the need for differentiation to help students become proficient readers.

Teacher 1B stated that she used leveled books from the book room at her school to help struggling readers. She also mentioned that students could use an IPAD with a Google account to assist with reading. In addition to providing this support, Teacher 1B also modifies the mini lessons used with CMAPP which is used by all general education teachers within the local school district. Teacher 1B also uses reading resources via websites based upon student needs.

Two of the participants that worked at the same school mentioned students receive 45 minutes for reading if they have an IEP. Both general education teachers expressed that the special education teacher is using tools and resources to help the students with their reading deficits. One participant stated that there are times; students may have to complete an assignment in the resource setting because the student needs a grade from her classroom. The other participant mentioned that she is pushing forward to

address the Common Core Standards in reading and her expectation were set high for students with a deficit in reading.

As the general and special education teachers work on assisting the students with their deficit in reading, there is a need for more communication among the grade level to address reading instruction in order to meet the needs of the students. Teacher 2B felt improving the situation requires team meetings to discuss the proficiency concerns.

As general education teachers and special education teachers provided their responses relating to their role and responsibilities regarding progress monitoring, reading instruction, reading interventions, and reading proficiency, it seemed appropriate to ask the participants to address the learning environment for students with a disability. Thus, the theme, pull-out and push-in model emerged.

Pull-Out Model

Special education teachers. Although Public Law 94-142 has been replaced by IDEA, which mentions students with a disability must be in the least restrictive environment in which allows the students to receive an appropriate education designed to meet his or her educational needs with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate (IDEA, 2004). Therefore, general education teachers and special education teachers must be prepared to educate and accept students with many different disabilities within their general education settings. In addition both educators need to be well versed on how to best differentiate and/or modify assignments for all students, as well as become comfortable with collaboratively working with special education teachers. In this study, most of the schools used the pull-out model in their schools more. Each of the

participants cited their responses regarding their perceptions of the pull-out/ push-in services as they shared the strengths and weakness of each model.

Teacher 1A stated students are at different levels in the area of reading. If they are in third-grade, and below grade level, they receive support in the resource setting. If the students are on grade level, the students receive push-in services from the special education teacher. Teacher 1A participant reported if students are below grade level, it is bothersome to see them sitting in the general education classroom and not understanding the task, therefore being in a pullout classroom would be strength of the pull-out model. She reported there is one on one time, small group, direct explicit instruction, student can ask and answer questions within the pull-out model versus being in the general education classroom. The weakness of the pull-out model is that students are missing instruction from the general education teacher in which they need exposure to grade level instruction. She mentioned homework can be difficult due to Common Core. In addition, parents are struggling to assist with homework due to understanding of what is needed to help their child at home.

Teacher 2A reported that she only had experience with the pull-out model only; therefore, she could not list the strengths and weakness of the push-in model. She reported that having small group instruction is a strength of the pull-out model. The weakness of the pull-out model is time, schedules, and lack of resources on a year round calendar. Teacher 3A reported that there are less distractions and having a change of pacing is different as a strength. She felt the pull-out model allows the special education to maneuver. The participant also reported the impact it has on the students on the

spectrum. She reported students on the spectrum are given more opportunities to give sensory breaks if needed versus being in the separate classroom. In addition, the students have an opportunity to be a leader and feel successful. Even in the co-teaching model, they are trying to do the grade level work, which is difficult and they can't keep up with the pace, even with the modifications.

Teacher 3A mentioned students realize there is a difference, even if she brought the work in the resource setting, they act differently. It is like the pressure is off. The participant reported the weakness of the pull-out model is that it is hard to align. She reported that it takes deliberately planning to make sure the curriculum is aligned with the classroom, especially since you are not there every day. Listening plays a part, because teachers teach differently and it is important to listen so that the special education teacher can re-teach the skill. Teacher 4A stated her school is on a block schedule which impacts students that have IEP goals, because students are not allowed to be pulled to receive reading support due to missing math support in the general education classroom. Teacher 4A stated that her concern was that the whole school was not on the same schedule. She stated there could be students that have the same reading needs; however it interferes with math instruction because students are coming from different classrooms. Therefore, students cannot receive reading support in the resource setting unless administration make an exception for high needs learners. The participant stated this also impacts pull-out services for students that are in the 4th grade Read to Achieve blocks. The researcher asked the participant to explain Read to Achieve.

Teacher 4A stated,

Read to Achieve is a law that was passed by the state of North Carolina which states that all students must be proficient in reading or met a good cause exemption. One good cause exemption is having an IEP and received reading intervention for two more than years. If students don't meet these criteria, they go into a special 4th grade class. Technically, they are still are third-grade student until they take the Read to Achieve test in November and pass. If they don't pass the EOG at that end of third-grade, they take the Read to Achieve test. Students need to be on level P (TRC) or score a level five on the Case 21 benchmark in ELA to be considered an exemption. That is at the middle of the year. At the beginning of the year, all third-grade students are administered the EOG at the beginning of the year which is really the end of year test. If they get a four or five on it, they are automatically exempt. If they don't pass, they take a series of the Read to Achieve passages weekly. If they score a Level P on M-class, students met the requirement on the Read to Achieve passages, or pass the EOG with a level three, four, or five.

The researcher asked the participant to explain the levels of three. The participant stated, It just has to be a three. There is a wide window for levels one and two. There is a little window for level three, four, and five. The level three was created by the state of North Carolina solely to allow students an opportunity to be passed the Read to Achieve. Last year, it could be a three, however, they change things.

The participant stated she knew a lot of her special education support for the Read to Achieve camp. The researcher asked her to explain the Read to Achieve camp. She stated,

It was an intervention. Read to Achieve camp was for students that did not meet the good cause exemption. One year it was for six weeks and students came four days a week. Last year, it was four weeks. They also got a chance to work on projects and work in groups. They did a unit on animals and weather. They didn't just read the whole time. Students were given the chance to take passages two or three passages a week. If they pass, they met the good cause exemption and went to 4th grade. If they didn't pass, they remain a third-grader and go into a 4th grade class. Students receive 90 minutes of uninterrupted reading instruction a day. Then, they took the test in November.

During the interview, the researcher asked about the pull-out and push-in models within their school. Based upon the participants experience with the pull-out model, she reported that the strength of the pull-out model is that the special education teacher is in their own classroom, therefore, you have full control. Other strengths included that students have limited distractions and may be able to move more and be more relaxed. The participant stated the weakness of the pull-out model is that the special education teachers has to remove the students form the general education classroom and students view it as a break rather than a time to learn. Another weakness is that as the special education teacher, you must account for travel time from the general education classroom to the resource classroom.

Each of the special education teachers provided gave their perceptions regarding the pull-out model. Each agreed that the small group setting is a strength for students with a learning disability. Other concerns mentioned regarding the pull-out model were timing, scheduling, and curriculum alignment. The pull-out model has strengths and weaknesses per the responses of the special education teachers. In the next section, I shared the general education teachers responses regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the pull-out model.

The pull-out model is another service plan for delivering reading supports for students with a reading deficit. Students leave the general education classroom to receive reading support to address their deficits in reading, which could be phonic awareness, decoding, fluency, word recognition, and comprehension. Shanahan (2008) suggests the pull-out model offers the special education teacher flexibility as he or she provide appropriate instruction, strategies, and materials for students to address their' individual needs as they leave their different general education classrooms.

General education teachers. As stated previously, I interviewed five general education teachers. When I asked the participants to respond to the questions relating to the pull-out model and push-in model, four of them emailed me their responses because we didn't have time during the interview to get to that question and one of them shared their response at the interview. Teacher 1B reported that the strength of the pull-out model is when students receive smaller group instruction and often get the lesson twice to enhance understanding. The weakness of the pull-out model was that students lose instructional time. Another weakness was when the pull-out occurred the special

education teacher may not be working on the same standards as the general education teachers.

Teacher 3B reported that the strength of the pull-out model is that it gives the students a small group setting to receive their inventions. She reported the weakness of the pull-out model is when students miss some core instruction in the classroom. Teacher 3C reported that the strengths of the pull-out model allow the students get to move and sometimes transition to another classroom as a welcomed break. She mentioned students are served in a smaller and quieter setting. The participant reported that the weakness of the pull-out model is that it causes the students to miss the Core instruction. She also reported that the students form a club mindset often encouraging poor behavior. The participant shared that the students miss hearing the lesson taught on grade level. She also reported that the pull-out model “removes rigor” and “lowers the bar”.

Teacher 4B reported that the pull-out model is a strength because students who are easily distracted can focus better when they are pulled out of the general education classroom. She stated that space was an issue in her classroom; however, the resource setting would have more space. The weaknesses were scheduling a time for students to be pulled so they are not being pulled out so they are not missing direct direction. She emphasized that some students have a hard time transitioning back into the classroom routine when they return.

Teacher 4C was interviewed in her classroom. She stated that the strengths of the pull-out model allow the students to have small group interaction. They get to have the individualized focus as they focus on one teacher. The weakness in her opinion was that

were not any benefits for the general education teacher. Her concern was that students were missing instruction from the general education teacher and she didn't see how a student could catch up. She emphasized that if students were going to miss science and social studies which is tied to reading, they needed the background knowledge.

Summary of special education and general education teachers' perceptions of the pull-in model. The general education teachers and special education teachers had similar responses regarding the pull-out model. Both groups of educators agreed the small group instruction was a strength. In terms of weakness of the pull-out model, all participants agreed missing Common Core Instruction impacted student learning. Depending on the student's education needs, he or she may require either the pull-out or push-in model. Therefore as the researcher, a probing question arose regarding the strengths and weakness of the push-in model from the special education and general education teachers.

Push-In Model

Special education teachers. Each of the special education teachers emailed the researcher their responses regarding the push-in model due to time being spent on other questions asked during the interview. Teacher 1A reported the strengths of the push-in model was students with a reading deficit are exposed to grade level work and remain in the general classroom with their peers. She reported that they cannot identify who has disability because her role is to work with non-disabled students in a small group along with the students that have a disability. The participant explained that there were two teachers versus one teacher in the classroom which included the special education teacher

and general education teacher. In addition, lessons are taught in different ways which would impact student understanding of the instruction. The participant provided an example in the email by reporting the following:

For example, the general education teacher may be at the Smart Board and reading a passage. The special education teacher is looking at the students and can tell who needs more clarity. The participant described the instruction as being a tag team situation. Therefore, she does what is necessary to make sure all students understand the task. The participant did not provide any information regarding the weakness of the push-in model.

Teacher 3A reported that one of the strengths with the push-in model is that the special education teachers are getting to align their teaching with what the general education teacher is doing. Another strength was the special education teacher was getting to see more students versus the three or four students that were served by her. The participant expressed that she was grateful to see more students overall due to the MTSS process. The participant reported the weakness of the push-in model is high distractibility because there were two adults in the classroom. She reported behavior seems to be higher due to pressure of expectations, which is not true of all students. The participant thought both models are needed. She explained for some students with a reading deficit, co-teaching is really appropriate for them because they can handle the classroom expectations; they are more organized, and may need some support with the organization. The participant also reported other students with a reading deficit may need pull-out due to needing a break from the classroom environment.

Teacher 4A reported the strengths of the push-in model were that students would not have to leave the general education classroom, and if the classroom environment is done as a co-teaching model, all students will benefit from having an additional teacher within the classroom. The participant also reported that the students with a reading deficit would not miss Core instruction. The participant reported the weakness of the push-in model would be if the co-teaching model is not implemented correctly, the special education teacher might be seen as a teacher assistant rather than a teacher. Another weakness reported is that the general education classroom can be highly distracting, especially for students with attention concerns. Just as the special education teacher provided their perceptions of the push-in model, general education teachers responded too in the next section.

General education teachers. To implement the push-in model, the general education teacher and special education teacher must work together in close collaboration to ensure that students are receiving full access to Common Core standards. When asked about the strengths and weaknesses of the push-in model, Teacher 1B reported that the push-in model is a strength because the special education teacher gets to see how the general education teacher teaches the lesson and understand the routine that the students are expected to follow. The participant reported that the weakness of the push-in model is that the special education teacher can cause distractions with other students. She also reported that another weakness of the push-in model could be when the general education teacher has not informed the special education teacher of what is being taught. As a

result, it could be confusing to the student if they are receiving instruction in two different ways.

Teacher 3B reported that she only had experience with the pull-out model; therefore, she could not provide information regarding the push-in model. Teacher 3C reported that the strength of the push-in model allows the students to work on the same skills as their peers. The participant reported that the special education teacher becomes familiar with grade-level expectations. In addition, the general education teacher observes how the special education breaks instruction down to the students with a reading deficit. She also reported there is less disruption to the nondisabled students when the students with a reading deficit are not constantly coming and going. The participant reported that the weakness of the pull-out model was that it could be disruptive with another teacher speaking in the general education classroom. She also reported that the pull-out model highlights different abilities which draw attention to students. The participant reported that nondisabled students that receive Core instruction often request and demand the attention of the special education teacher.

Teacher 4B reported that the strength of the push-in model is that students do not have to transition and they do not miss out on what the classroom teacher is teaching. She also reported that the special education teacher and general education teacher can use the same vocabulary. Another strength is that the special education teacher is more familiar with what is going on and being taught in the classroom. The participant reported when there is too much going on in the classroom and the students are distracted is a weakness

with the push-in model. The participant shared that space could be a challenge, particularly in small classrooms.

Teacher 4C was interviewed face to face. She stated that the strengths of the pull-out model were that students receive individualized attention. She shared that the students are still with the special education teacher and she is aware of what the general education teacher is teaching. As a result, she can provide her input with the reading and writing input. The participant shared that the special education teacher knows the reading goals on each student's IEP which ties into their grade level curriculum, therefore, she is prepared for instruction. The participant mentioned that she realized that the special education teachers have a curriculum to follow and paperwork, however, she wondered if they could reinforce the skills that are taught in the general education classroom while being there. As the researcher, I asked the participant if the students with a reading deficit needed to have a skill introduced by the special education teacher before being taught by the general education teacher. She replied, "The special education teachers do not want to do it or they may say they do not know how to do the skill." The participant stated the weakness of the push-in model would be the distractions for the students with a reading deficit.

Summary of special education and general education teachers' perceptions of the push-in model. Reviewing the general and special education perceptions of the push-in model, showed their experiences with this approach. Three out of five general education teachers had experience, whereas all of the special educators had experience with the push-in model. It is evident that specially designed instruction may be provided

in a general education setting and /or within a resource setting depending upon the student's individual needs outlined in their Individualized Educational Plan. The ultimate goal is to ensure full access to the Common Core Standards for students receiving special education support through the Exceptional Children's Program. With this in mind, the general education teachers and special education teachers must communicate in order to know their roles in the instructional process for students. The next section will focus on the effectiveness of communication between the special education teachers and general education teachers.

Communication

Special education teachers. Communication is just not saying words. It is also asking questions, expressing comments, making suggestions, and addressing concerns in a way that others may understand. Communication involves the way educators behave as they approach their work. One of the challenges facing the special education and general education teachers is communication between them, particularly in schools where students are not proficient readers. When I asked the special education teachers if they communicated about the students that each of them served in reading, all of them stated that there is communication between them. Each of them communicates at IEP meetings and at Professional Learning Team meetings. Although communication takes place with the special education teachers and the general education teachers to collaborate about the students with a reading deficit, scheduling is still a concern for the special education teachers and general education teachers.

Teacher 1A stated that she may meet with the general education teacher prior to or during a parent conference meeting. Teacher 2A stated she meets with the general education teacher often, however, due to the schedule, the times they may meet occur during their lunchtime or during recess. This participant stated that she and the general education teacher may meet before or after school. This participant stated the general education teachers are very flexible at their school. The first and second participant communicated without addressing similar concerns of curriculum. In contrast, Teacher 3A addressed time as a factor due the scheduling. She stated that she uses the Face Time App to communicate with a colleague on the weekends. The participant mentioned that it was hard to communicate with the third-grade level because they don't align their schedules in the areas of reading, math, and writing.

Three out of four special education teachers shared that each of them communicates with the general education teacher via text message and email. Two out of four special education teachers shared communication takes place in the hallway at their school. Two out of four teachers shared communication takes place via post-it notes.

Teacher 4A stated the level of communication depends on the general education teacher. The researcher asked what could be done to improve the situation with communication. Teacher 4A stated,

I think it is a mindset. As the school system shifts and an inclusive model along with differentiated instruction such as Universal Design is implemented, I think people are going to have to change their mindset. Once there is a shift in the mindset, I think the communication will be better.

General education teachers. It is very important that communication that take place between to as there is a shared responsibility and support between the general and special education teachers. Five out of five general education teachers stated that each of them communicate with the special education teacher sat their school. The responses vary in terms of how and when they communicate. Teacher 1B of the participants mentioned that she does communicate with the special education teacher. She shared that she communicates with the special education teacher about students that are on the Tier plans. She sought her guidance by asking her what could be done in order to get the students to the next level.

The researcher asked, “Is this for students that you’ve had that would qualify for Exceptional Children services?” The participant stated, “ Yes, it would. This year, I don’t have any students with an IEP.” The researcher asks, “ But, last year, when you did have students with an IEP, did you schedule a time to meet or how did you communicate?”

The participant stated,

The former special education teacher came in the grade level meetings and we discussed what we covering in class and what we would be covering during that five minute block. She would leave to pick up kindergarten. As a third-grade team, we had time to pre-plan, so when she came in for those five minutes, we could go over what we currently teaching and what skills would be coming up. These plans were provided to her for to use and modify as needed. We keep abreast of where students are. I communicated more last year that this year. I still talk to her though. Sometimes, the focus gets off reading and it becomes behavior.

The researcher asked the participant to explain the behavior concerns as it related to communication and academics. The participant explained that there were times that reading was not occurring due to behavior in the general education classroom. This caused conversations to occur among the special education teacher and general education teacher because the behaviors impacted instruction. She stated it was better for the students with behaviors to be in the pull-out model because there was a teacher assistant and special education teacher in the classroom and the concern was to make sure students move to the next level. The participant did mention that this year no students were in served in the class currently being taught. However, the previous year, the former special education teacher would come in the grade level meetings and discuss what would be covered in class and what would be covered during that five minute block. She mentioned that the special education teacher would leave to pick up kindergarten students. The participants shared as a third-grade team, they had time to pre-plan, so when the special education teacher came in for those five minutes, the third-grade team would go over what was being taught currently and what skills would be coming up. The plans were provided for the special education teacher to use and modify as needed.

Teacher 3B stated that the special education teacher communicates verbally and in passing within the school environment. They also email each other. She stated the special education teacher may send a note. The next participant who is a colleague of the participant previously discussed stated communication only happens during the IEP meetings for the students that are in and not in her classroom. The participant shared that the parents are there and the focus is the student's needs and where they think they are

academically and socially. She stated there is a lot of conversation for the parent.

Therefore, the general education teacher and special education teacher wants to make sure they have adequate documentation as goals are discussed and added to the student's Individualized Education Plan. There was a significant difference of how these general education teachers communicate with the special education teacher at the same school.

The remaining two participants work at the same school. Both of them shared that communication takes place with the special education teachers at the PLT meetings. One of the general education teachers mentioned that she and the special education teacher communicate formally and informally. She shared by having the special education teacher present at the PLT meetings, communication takes place regarding essential questions regarding guided lessons, data, and re-teaching. The participant stated since the special education teacher serves other grade levels, it she does is not always available to meet all of the third-grade level meetings. Teacher 4B mentioned the special education teacher may see each other at the end of the day. She shared she may see the special education teacher because their classrooms are on the same hallway. The general education teacher stated that the special education teacher checks in with the ELA teacher to discuss what both of them what skill would be taught. She shared the special education teacher assisted the students with a reading deficit with writing an autobiography.

Summary of special education teachers and general education teachers. The special education teachers and general education teachers communicated with each other, however, there were varying ways that communication took place with each other.

Conclusion

In Section 2, I provided an overview of the research design that will be used for the qualitative case study. A case study is a qualitative research design and was determined to be appropriate for this study rather than the quantitative research design. This case study allowed the researcher to collect and analyze data regarding the understanding of both general education teachers and special education teachers and the appropriate classroom environment for students with learning disabilities that struggle in reading. This case study allowed the researcher to collect data relating to the role and responsibilities of both general education teachers and special education teachers with the implementation of reading interventions during the instruction of Common Core Standards within the least restrictive environment.

After carefully transcribing the data, themes were emerged by the special education teaches and general education teachers. The themes identified by the special education teachers were progress monitoring, collaboration, teacher role and responsibility, time and planning, structuring of groups, staff training, scheduling, determining pull-out services and push-in services, and communication. Themes that developed from the general education teachers were progress monitoring, assessment knowledge, improving reading instruction, determining pull-out services/ push-in services, differentiation, and improving the proficiency of students with a reading deficit. The common themes among both educators were progress monitoring, scheduling/time, and communication.

Section 3 will be a presentation and description of the project based on the data and themes. I will discuss current research that addresses the research questions and a project to address the findings in the project study.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

This qualitative case study was conducted to examine the roles and responsibilities of both special education teachers and general education teachers in relation to Common Core Standards instruction for students with disabilities and IEPs for these students, as well as teachers' perceptions of the push-in and pull-out models. This section contains a discussion of the project's goal, rationale, description, evaluation plan, target audience, implications, and literature review. The findings were applied to the design of an effective professional development opportunity by considering the themes identified by the special education teachers and general education teachers in this project study. In addition, this professional learning opportunity needed to be designed so that all educators could see the importance of collaboration as they sought best practices to ensure academic success for all students while serving them in the least restrictive environment. As a result, it promotes ongoing discussion as participants work and learn together with other professionals within the local school district.

Project Goals

The special education teachers and general education teachers interviewed for this study shared their concerns relating to their role and responsibilities serving students with reading deficits. As a result, the project was designed with the purpose to further develop teachers' knowledge and ability to implement Common Core Reading Standards and IEPs. As I reflected on common responses from the general education teachers and special education teachers that involved progress monitoring, scheduling/time, and

communication, I concluded that educators in both groups would learn best through an experience that would allow them an opportunity to share materials and assessments for tracking and sharing reading data to improve and strengthen reading instruction for students with reading deficits. In this way, educators might give students the necessary tools to become proficient readers.

The project takes the form of a 3-day workshop. Each day of the workshop will cover topics based on needs identified through the data analysis and interviews discussed in Section 2. The workshop will be guided by the presenter with the use of equipment, handouts, hands-on activities, PowerPoint presentations, and small group collaboration. The coteaching workshop will be guided by the presenter with the support of general and special education teachers.

The primary goal of this project is to allow special education teachers and general education teachers to understand their roles and responsibilities when serving students with reading deficits within their classrooms, along with showing differences in settings because of logistical concerns.

Due to concerns with the lack of time expressed by the general education teachers and special education teachers, both educators will have an opportunity to plan a reading lesson that can be used in the general education or resource classroom. Results indicated that some of the general education teachers were responsible for the Common Core reading standards, whereas special education teachers were responsible for the goals on the IEP. Thus, each needed a better understanding of their role and responsibility as outlined in the service delivery plan. Moreover, a goal for this project is to provide

awareness of the assessments and materials used with students with reading deficits. The project has been designed to permit educators to experience the significance of collaboration as they plan, share ideas, and implement appropriate strategies to help all students become proficient in reading.

Rationale

With the adoption of the Common Core Standards in North Carolina, there is a need to address the roles and responsibilities of general education teachers and special education teachers as they provide reading instruction for students with reading deficits. The emphasis on all students demonstrating proficiency on End-of-Grade Tests presents challenges for students with reading deficits. This emphasis also presents challenges for the special education teachers and general education teachers who serve these students because of the academic rigor and high expectations of the Common Core Standards.

To ensure that students with reading deficits receive a free and appropriate education, such students' IEPs must specify that they should receive instruction in the least restrictive environment. Although the pull-out model in which students' reading needs are addressed in a specific classroom setting has been the predominant approach to serving students with reading deficits, push-in services are also used. The data in this study highlight the perceptions of the teachers; however, there seems to be concerns among general education teachers and special education teachers regarding progress monitoring and interventions. Therefore, the roles and responsibilities of general education teachers and special education teachers needed to be better defined in relation to providing reading instruction to students with reading deficits. For example, some of

the special education teachers felt that general education teachers were responsible for the reading goals on students' individual educational plans. One general education teacher felt that the special education teacher should teach the same skill that was being taught in the general education classroom rather than focusing on a different skill.

To address the local problem, five general education teachers and four special education teachers from the school district were interviewed to gain greater insight into their roles and responsibilities when serving students with reading deficits. The interviews focused on the participants' perceptions of their roles and responsibilities as special education teachers or general education teachers regarding progress monitoring, reading instruction, and reading intervention, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the pull-out model. The participants in the project wanted to see their students become proficient in reading. Results of the study indicated that general education teachers were not aware of some of the assessments that special education teachers use to monitor students' strengths and needs. The workshop will provide the participants with handouts, materials, and websites to help them be more effective as they implement appropriate strategies and interventions to help students meet benchmarks in reading.

After a thorough analysis of the interviews, the findings of this study indicated a need for professional development. As general education teachers and special education teachers participate in the workshop, they will be able to collaborate and communicate about the reading needs and progress of students. A professional development program seemed to be the best project genre for addressing the results of the project study (Kennedy, 2016). The project will provide general education teachers and special

education teachers with meaningful professional experience to improve their teaching quality and teaching practice (de Vries, van de Grift, & Jansen, 2013).

Review of the Literature

Project Genre

In the literature review in Section 1, I outlined Vygotsky's theory of constructivism, which is based upon the concept of the zone of proximal development. This framework provided structure for exploring and understanding the roles that educators play when working with students with reading deficits. Vygotsky's theory suggests that students need assistance from educators during instruction. In the initial interviews for this study, I sought answers from general education teachers and general education teachers regarding their roles and responsibilities when providing reading instruction to students with reading deficits.

In the literature review, I explained how professional development is needed to address the research project. The data gathered in this study indicated a need for professional development for both general education teachers and special education teachers concerning the provision of reading instruction to students who are not proficient in relation to the Common Core Reading Standards. Participants' responses varied, in that some of the general education teachers and special education teachers felt that special education teachers were only responsible for individualized educational goals, and the general education teachers felt that they were responsible for the reading common Core Standards. Both groups of participants indicated that scheduling, time, and collaboration impact reading instruction. This section's literature review focuses on the professional

development workshop as the product of the analyzed data from interviews and document artifacts.

A literature search was conducted through the Walden University library. Search terms included *professional development, collaboration, Common Core Standards, coteaching, least restrictive environment, and progress monitoring*. Databases searched included ERIC, ProQuest Central, EBSCOhost, Sage, and Walden Dissertations. All literature selected for Section 3 was peer-reviewed and written within the past five years.

The participants in this study expressed a need for more collaboration among general education teachers and special education teachers regarding assessment use. In addition, both groups of educators expressed how time and scheduling impact student performance due to lack of communication and collaboration between general and special educators. A 3-day professional workshop will allow the special education teachers and general education teachers to become more successful in teaching students with reading deficits in the least restrictive environment with a focus on progress monitoring, scheduling/time, and communication (see Appendix A for project details).

The Need for Professional Development

Professional development for teachers is an important component of the effort to improve the education of students with disabilities (Tzivinkou, 2015). Research indicates that professional development enhances teachers' knowledge of teaching content in reading, which results in positive gains in teacher knowledge, instructional practice, and student achievement (Heller, Daehler, Wong, Sginohara, & Miratrix, 2015). To ensure that these gains continue, the Collaborative Language and Literacy Instruction Project

serves as a model for professional development that helps teachers incorporate research-based practices for literacy instruction, support mastery, and sustained use of these practices through coaching (Porche, Pallante, & Snow, 2012). *Coaching* is a term used in education to describe a situation in which an individual facilitates learning as he or she helps others to improve their own learning and performance through questioning, active listening, and appropriate challenges in a supportive and encouraging atmosphere (van Nieuwerburgh, 2012).

Another goal for this project is to have reading coaches share their expertise with both general education teachers and special education teachers. Findings of the study indicated that general education teachers were not aware of students who had Tier 2 plans and needed reading interventions to address reading deficits. In addition, some of the general education teachers did not have the necessary training to access EASI in order to identify students who needed reading interventions. Thus, reading coaches can play a vital role in assisting general education teachers with monitoring reading. (Jackson, Dyal, Wright, Carpenter, & Austin, 2016) agreed that reading coaches are needed to provide the necessary professional development and resources so that all students can be successful. Because general education teachers and special education teachers will be able to participate in the proposed professional development, both groups of educators will have an opportunity to learn about reading programs and strategies. During the interviews, I asked the participants whether general education teachers and special education teachers had training in providing strategies for students with reading deficits. A special education teacher stated, “Yes, there have been trainings. All staff had trainings. I have attended

trainings that provided information regarding students with focusing concerns, not performing on grade level in various subjects. I attend workshops.” I asked whether the participant had provided workshops for the staff. The participant responded, “No, but I would love to. There is a need.” Thus, it seems that professional development is an appropriate way to help general education teachers and special education teachers assist students as they strive to become proficient in relation to the reading Common Core Standards.

With the implementation of Common Core Standards, special education teachers have needed to work closely with general education teachers in order to provide useful and practical interventions and support. Thus, professional development is vital for both groups of teachers. Brownell et al. (2009) found that teachers who learned from literacy-focused professional development exhibited integrated knowledge and practice so that they could better provide reasons for implementing an intervention and how it would support the student. As a result, students with a reading deficit will have the opportunity to work toward mastery of a reading skill within the classroom. Professional development can make a difference for both teachers and students. Walsh (2012) noted that professional development is important, especially when strategies are being used and coteachers can tier assignments and provide scaffolding support to students with disabilities along with activities and materials that promote student engagement. As special education teachers and general education teachers continue to monitor student reading progress in relation to the Common Core Standards, both groups of teachers will be aware of the proficiency level of each student.

Progress Monitoring

Curriculum-based measurement has gained importance with federal legislation requiring the use of interventions when making special education eligibility decisions (Fan & Hansmann, 2015). Correct criteria must be applied to the progress monitoring data to determine whether students are responding to interventions. In addition, data are vital when making decisions about student needs and progress for formulating effective instructional programs (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Compton, 2008). Furthermore, Ardoin et al. (2013) argued that the lack of psychometric and empirical evidence for using curriculum-based measurement should be considered so that response-to-intervention (RTI) decisions are not potentially harmful, especially if a disability is suspected. Therefore, there needs to be a more objective and quantitative approach to determining whether a student needs an intervention (Petscher, Cummings, Biancarosa, & Fien, 2013). If collaboration and communication are demonstrated between the special education teacher and general education teacher, decisions regarding interventions can occur. One of the participants stated,

As the special education teacher, I was working on an IEP (Individual Education Plan) and saw that the student did not have any reading goals; therefore, as the general education teacher and I sat down and reviewed the data together, we found that his fluency was great, but his comprehension level was low and he scored a level 1 on his mid-year ELA benchmark, which is known as Case 21. It was determined that the student needed some support from the intervention teacher, and based upon the progress monitoring results, the student did not achieve growth. As a

result, the IEP team met to decide whether reading goals were needed. This experience confirms that the role of a special education teacher is to “deliver specialized expert, tertiary prevention to students who are not helped by prior levels of instruction” (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Compton, 2012)

Overall, progress monitoring is a responsibility shared by general education teachers and special education teachers as they provide data for students. Therefore, as part of the professional development project, both groups of educators will have the opportunity to look at the M-class data that are commonly given by general education teachers whereas special education teachers give the Core assessment to students with reading deficits. Both tools allow teachers to track students’ progress in reading. As a result, they are able to identify students’ reading needs, communicate their results, provide additional instruction, and use reading materials and websites in order to help students make progress and meet benchmark expectations in relation to Common Core Reading Standards. These data are vital when making decisions about students’ needs and progress when formulating instructional programs (Fuchs & Stecker, 2003)

As general education and special education teachers serve students with a reading deficit, information on progress monitoring of reading interventions and reading goals is such an important process to implement in order to improve outcomes and results for students. Special education teachers and general education need to be supported and provided with resources and tools in order to assist students with their deficits in reading. As both teachers collect data to progress monitor the reading needs of the students, it will

impact and improve their teacher making decision initiative as students become aware of their reading performance.

Time

Based upon the findings in this study, a lack of time is a challenge to communicate and collaborate due the responsibilities of planning instruction, assessing students, meetings, parent conferences, PLT, and IEP meetings. In order to help students with a reading deficit to become proficient in reading, there must be time for the general education teacher and special education to meet to discuss the strengths and needs of students during a PLT meeting. Ermeling (2012) stated the objective of a professional learning community should be to improve instruction and student achievement. Killion (2016) mentioned finding time for job-embedded professional learning is one of the most frequent cited challenges with implementing change in education. Educators and other policy makers recognize that professional learning is important in order to implement Common Core Standards, yet they realize time isn't available. Timing impacts the implementation of collaborative practices between the special education teachers and their colleagues in schools with the push-in model and pull-out mode due to a)lack of specific policy and institutional scheduling for collaborative activities, b)lack of common planning time, c)increased work load for both general education teachers and special education teachers, d) different teaching approaches and teaching methods with students with special needs (Strogilos & Tragoulia, 2013). One of the general education teachers mentioned she never communicated with the special education teacher face to face and desired to have time to discuss her concerns about the students that both served. Another

general education teacher mentioned that she learned something about one of her students at the IEP meeting that she did not know as a result of lack of time to discuss the needs of the student. In essence, scheduling and common planning are concerns that could be improved in majority of the schools. Common planning time must be scheduled for general education teachers and special education teachers to share personal knowledge and unique needs of the students (Royster, Reglin, & Losike-Sedimo, 2014). Planning time should be scheduled on a regular basis so that educators can find it significant and meaningful (Murawski, 2012). Professional development could be conducted to work on scheduling regular meetings which was a major finding. Therefore, it would be beneficial to invite pairs of teachers or groups of teachers that work together, both general education teachers and special education teachers so they can work on their practice. Owsue and Yibo (2014) stated when developmental opportunities are provided for educators which include curriculum and learning, student gains becomes a reality, and the results are evident along with improved student achievement. As general education teachers and special education teachers participate in professional development sessions together, each will have the opportunity to schedule regular meetings, plan lessons, evaluate the student's performance, and discuss the effectiveness of materials and strategies for struggling readers.

Planning

According to Solis, (2012), an effective teacher makes a positive impact on student achievement. Latest studies shows students with a disability demand a higher level of planning and preparation for successful implementation of goals, including

accommodations for the general education classroom (Polyzopoulou, Sokal Sharma, & Tsakiridou, 2014)), particularly with the universal design curriculum context (Tzivinikou, 2014).

Universal Design Learning is an approach that allows all students to access information, and gives them different ways to demonstrate their knowledge through representation, action/expression and engagement (Rose & Meyer, 2002). One of the participants that were interviewed mentioned the universal design when asked how communication could be improved among the special education teachers and general education teachers. She stated,

“I think as the school system shifts and an inclusive model along with differentiated instruction such as Universal Design is implemented, I think people are going to have to change their mindset. Once there is a shift in the mindset, I think the communication will be better.”

Kurth (2013) seemed to agree with the participant when he stated an inclusive classroom must have the appropriate accommodation to promote or enhance student opportunities. In an inclusive classroom, it is essential that the special education teacher and general education teacher work as a partnership. Initially, they should communicate and seek to problem solve together. Obiakor et al. (2012) stated inclusive instruction is effective when educators consult and collaborate with each other regarding student needs. Thus, the special education teacher has the responsibility to communicate with the general education teacher regarding the accommodations on the student's IEP to ensure student success.

As the general education teacher and special education teacher utilize their teaching style as they provide reading instruction with students with a reading deficit, it seems necessary to address planning within the learning environment. Therefore, collaboration must be implemented among both teachers. It is argued that teachers in the inclusive classroom may never acquire the skills for successful teacher collaboration, unless it becomes an effective practice within the school (Sledge & Pazey, 2013). This is interesting because one of the participants stated that her school only uses the pull-out model. Despite the learning environment, the general education teachers and special education teachers must have effective communication and collaboration due to providing practical interventions for struggling readers and the MTSS process (Evans & Weiss, 2014).

As general education teachers and special education teachers address the academic needs or even social, emotional, and behavioral concerns, MTSS provides level of support for struggling learners. As part of the process, resources and support for teachers are provided. They encourage a greater focus on collaboration between general teachers and special education teachers within each school. Therefore, it is essential to have professional development that promotes collaboration and communication.

Collaboration/Communication

Collaboration between special education teachers and general education teachers is one of the most significant factors related to the effectiveness of the education with students with a learning deficit (Soka & Sharma, 2014). A study was completed regarding a group of elementary school reading teachers that utilized their time in a

Professional Learning Community to develop an intervention system to address struggling readers in grades 3rd through 5th. Working together, they aligned text across the grade levels and developed lesson plans to address the components of reading. As a result, students reading levels increased and progress was made on the state end of grade testing in reading (D'Ardenne, Barnes, Hightower, Lamason, Mason, Patterson, & Erickson, 2013).

According to the study, (D'Ardenne, et al., 2013) teachers embraced the concept that interventions are needed for struggling readers if they want the gap to close in the area of reading. They also recognized the power of teachers developing interventions that were adaptive, but more importantly, they also witnessed the importance of collaboration as they came in one common place and grew professionally as they learned from each other.

Each participant in the study provided reading instruction to the student with a reading deficit. They provided visual aids and assistance as needed to help with their reading need in the general education classroom and special education classroom. Both teachers, realized there were concerns in the area of time, scheduling, and planning which needs to be improve, moreover, each cared about the student's proficiency level in reading. Based on the objectives of the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts, third grade students are expected to be proficient with phonics, word recognition, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. Therefore, teachers must plan lessons that will align with the standards in their daily instruction (Hiebert, 2013). Participating in professional development would allow special education teachers and general education

teachers to improve their practice as they collaborate with each other (Bernhardt, 2015; Whitworth, & Chiu, 2015). This professional development will allow the special education teachers and general education teachers to learn more on learning strategies that will help students experience academic success. It was also allow both of them to ask and answer questions relating to lesson plans, IEP goals, and academic performance and growth. Some participants interviewed in the project felt communication and collaboration was needed in order to improve the reading needs of students. Teacher 3C felt the implementation of reading interventions for students with a reading deficit was her responsibility within the general education classroom. Her response was there was no collaboration shared with the special education teacher. She explained it was needed because she was unaware of what was happening with the students that both serve in the area of reading. Teacher 3C mentioned that she does her best with implementing Daily 5 which is an intervention that allows the students read to self, read to someone, write or do word work. She stated that she hoped students were receiving reading interventions while being in the resource setting with the special education teacher. As she explained what intervention time looked like in her classroom, she stated that in order to improve the implementation of reading interventions, there was a need for collaboration between her and the special education teacher. She suggested a monthly meeting should be held because she felt she needed one on one time with the special education teacher so that she could address the concerns of the students that they both serve. As the researcher, I asked if the other third-grade general education teachers should be present during that time. The participant stated she needed individual time to discuss her concerns because the other

general education teachers may not want to hear the level of details that she would be looking for. She was concerned that the other general education teachers may not want to sit for a long period of time, even though; they share some of the students. For the sake of time, Teacher 3C the participant felt that could be a lot for the special education teacher because there were five third-grade general education teachers at their school.

Teacher 3B stated collaboration takes place among the general education teachers and special education teachers. She stated collaboration comes in with sharing M-Class data, Case 21 data, and seeing how strategies are being implemented. Teacher 4C mentioned that an intervention teacher pushes in the classroom to provide interventions for students which had just recently begun. This occurred as a result of the results on the Case 21 assessment. The participant mentioned that students do not leave her classroom for intervention services. She explained that she does not have input with the intervention piece because her role is to teach math, science, and social studies however, she knew that M-class and sources from the Florida Center for Research is used for inventions within the local school district. Due to her previous experience at another school, she was aware of how to administer Dibels and Mclass. She stated that she administers both assessments to the third-grade students when needed. She explained some of the third-grade students did not show proficiency on the Beginning of the Year End of Grade test, therefore, there is not a lot of teaching happening due to assessing the students. The participant felt this situation could be improved if the reading specialist in the county could come and help the English Language Arts teachers with assessing the students. She explained that at the end of the school year, the English Language teachers could not test

their own students. Another teacher has to do the assessment. She stated when this occurs; students are divided among the third-grade teachers. She stated the students are pulled from other classrooms during math and reading which impacts students missing instruction. The participant stated there could be as many as eight students missing from her classroom. As the assessments are given to the students, there is hope that students will be proficient or make growth in reading.

According to Milteniene and Venclovaite (2012), it is important to receive the support from colleagues and to use activities offered from each other, because it is through the closeness of collaboration that information is disseminated, knowledge is shared, and missing skills are developed.

Project Description

The data from the interviews allowed me to understand the role and responsibilities when teaching students with a reading deficit. Upon completion of the project, I will submit a copy of an executive summary to the director of the Exceptional Children's Department and the Senior Administrator of the Literacy department. I would write a letter to request permission to implement the project *Designing Effective Professional Learning for General Education Teachers & Special Education Teachers*, with the targeted audience of special education teachers and general education teachers. If permission is granted, I would ask the Literacy Central Office staff to assist me with the workshop. I would like to implement the Professional Development in the conference room at Central Office.

Existing Supports

The main source for potential resources and existing support would be the involvement of the schools in the local school system. Initially, I would like to do the project at the school where I am currently employed. By being at there, the resources are accessible such as training location, meeting space, materials and equipment can be provided easily since I would be the facilitator.

Potential Barriers

Potential barriers preventing the execution of the project could be the three day time period needed for the entire workshop. Obtaining dates and times could be an obstacle due to pre-planned school or district wide meetings. Not having the buy-in from my colleagues could postpone the workshop too. Another barrier could be participants not wanting to participate if they are not going to receive a credit towards their license renewal. It is possible that the Central Office personnel may already have a workshop outlined similar to this one.

Proposal for Implementation and Timetable

The implementation of the project will take place at the beginning of the school year, preferably when the general education teachers and special education teachers return from summer break on one of the teacher workdays, since students will not be at school. This provides for planning time with administration and Central Office Staff about the workshop. I could also request permission to attend a principal's meeting to discuss doing a workshop at their school before routines are established.

Roles and Responsibilities of Researcher and Others

In my role as the researcher, it is my responsibility to share the findings of the project study with the Central Office staff. I would also share the findings with the principal of my school. In return, I would request permission to present the project at my school if permission is granted. If granted, I would request that I do certain section of the workshop during an early release day. Once I completed the sections at the school level, I would request that the workshop be presented for the local school district. I would request that I be the facilitator and other colleagues be the presenters.

Project Evaluation Plan

The professional development project will be evaluated by the participants as they complete the evaluation form distributed by the facilitator at the end of each day of training. I will also request that the participants post any questions they may have on the parking lot located at the front of the room. That way, I can review the questions and provide feedback during a break or provide it at the end of the training. The evaluation forms will be given daily so that the participants can evaluate the program during the implementation phase so that any inappropriate actions can be identified and corrected immediately (See Appendix A).

To assess the appropriateness of the professional learning for my target audience, special education teachers and general education teachers in the local school district, I would first begin each of the three meeting days by stating the purpose of each session and learning outcome. This way, participants will have an awareness of what to expect as they share in meaningful experiences that includes, instruction, modeling, practice, and

providing feedback. These experiences are needed to achieve desired learning outcomes (Mangin & Dunsmore, 2014). Due to the importance of understanding the learning outcome, the evaluation is an important part of professional development (Lakin, et al 2016; Randel, Apthorp, Beesley, Clark, & Wang, 2016). Since the participants will be required to write a reflection daily, I will ask for volunteers to share their thoughts regarding the session for that day. The reflection will confirm the participant's learning, reaction, use of new knowledge, and student learning outcomes (Guskey, 2014).

I will close each of the three meeting days by asking the participants to complete the evaluation form. This will provide feedback if I need to change or tweak an item on the agenda. On the last day of the training, participants will complete the final workshop evaluation form. The responses from this form will be shared with Central Office personnel, in hope that this training will continue for educators that serve students with a reading deficit.

After two months, all participants will be asked to respond to a questionnaire regarding the effectiveness of the project development project. A summary survey will be presented to the Curriculum and Instruction Department at the Central Office for their opinion regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Provided in the evaluation is a list of the project objectives: role/responsibility of special education teachers and general education teachers when providing reading instruction, literacy strategies within the classroom environment, and working collaboratively to plan and present lessons. Since the goal of this project is to seek the role and responsibility of the general education and special education teachers, this evaluation will be summative,

which will provide feedback from the participants in the study. The evaluation will also indicate if the project was effective and if the objectives were accomplished (Shenge, 2014). The feedback collected from this final evaluation will be shared with the superintendent and the director of the Exceptional Children's Program since both are vital stakeholders, and can help determine if the workshop was worthwhile (Glover, et al., 2016). If so, the training could possibly be presented in other schools and at the yearly Exceptional Children's Conference.

Project Implications

Local Community

This project addressed the needs of the special education teachers and general education teachers in the southern part of the local school district. The project was designed to address a need regarding the roles and responsibility of both educators that serve students with a reading deficit. As the curriculum changes based on federal and state guidelines, all educators will need to stay abreast of their roles and responsibilities when working with students with a reading deficit. To ensure all students are proficient readers, special education teachers, general education teachers, intervention teachers, reading coaches, and reading specialist need to participate in the professional development. In return they will acquire skills and knowledge as they collaborate on a consistent basis to assist the struggling readers in their learning environment. Educators can share strategies and handouts with parents during parent conferences, IEP meetings, and on their school website. This information can also be shared with mentoring groups and non-profit organizations that provide reading support for children.

Far-Reaching Implications

The work from this project can illustrate ways to engage retired educators to volunteer at the school during the school day. It could also open up a door for after school personnel to work with struggling readers that attend an after school program.

Establishing a leadership team from the local school district that would partner with the Department of Public Instruction to review reading data can be a social change development in a larger context. Once the local school system understands the importance of collaborating with educators that teach struggling readers, then the school districts across the nation will see how communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity will close the gap in reading.

Conclusion

Section 3 was an explanation of the goals of the project and the second literature review. The project goal is to provide a three day professional development program to offer training opportunities for special education teachers and general education teachers. This professional development training will be implemented for both educators to have a more defined awareness of their role and responsibility as they provide reading instruction and interventions when implementing Common Core Standards for students with a reading deficit. As a result, the special education teachers and general education teachers would be able to a) list the strengths and weakness of students with a reading deficit, b) know and understand the different assessments used with a student with a reading deficit, c) demonstrate teaching strategies that result in student success, d) discuss researched -based materials to assist students with meeting benchmark, e) communicate

and collaborate about student performance , f) acquire strategies that creates a dynamic delivery in the learning environment.

In this section, I discussed the need for professional development, progress monitoring, time, planning, collaboration, and communication. This section allowed me to develop an implementation plan and timetable for project delivery. The project descriptions and the needed resources were described, existing supports, potential barriers were noted, and implication for social change and far-reaching were explained. In Section, 4, I will reflect on the knowledge I have obtained and skills that I can utilize that will promote reading success for all children.

Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions

Introduction

The purpose of the project was to create a professional learning opportunity for special education teachers and general education teachers to help them understand their roles and responsibilities as they implement Common Core Standards with students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. This section presents the strengths and limitations of the project; recommendations for addressing the problem; and reflection on what was learned about the research process and the growth I made as a scholar, practitioner, and project developer. The section concludes with an overall reflection on the importance of the project study and its potential effect on social change, its implications, and directions for future research.

Project Strengths and Limitations

The greatest strength of my project is its use of the responses of study participants to plan professional development. Through the process of professional development, general education teachers and special education teachers may better understand their roles as they each monitor students' progress in reading and provide reading instruction and appropriate interventions so that students can become proficient readers based upon the Common Core Standards. The project has merit, given that the findings of this study indicated that general education teachers and special education teachers need time to address the reading performance of students who are not meeting benchmarks. In addition, time and scheduling impact the need for collaboration and communication as curricula change. As the data revealed, professional development is necessary for general

education teachers and special education teachers to enhance their teaching skills as they implement instructional materials and technology for students receiving reading instruction in the inclusion or resource setting.

Another strength of this project is the opportunity for collaboration between general education teachers and special education teachers. During the three day professional learning opportunity, general education teachers will focus on reading instruction, literacy strategies/classroom environment, and building learning in collaborative groups. Focusing on these topics will allow general education teachers and special education teachers to collaborate and share ideas as they participate in hands-on activities. Administrators at the central office level may share the importance of attending this professional development with principals, who may, in turn, share this with their staff due to the shift toward eliminating and reducing self-contained classes in the local school district. This project will give the local school district an opportunity to share professional development with the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. This collaborative effort shows the power of commitment to education among the local school system, policy makers, and curriculum developers.

I have incorporated an evaluation form so that general education teachers and special education teachers can provide feedback regarding the professional development. Such feedback, in indicating the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the learning opportunity, would be an additional strength of this project. Overall, this professional development promises to offer strong support for student success, even if limitations exist.

Project Limitations

Although this project will have purpose, it will also have limitations. The exceptional children's department may seek to implement other programs for special education teachers and general education teachers. Thus, they may not consider my project due to the professional development sessions already scheduled and on the agenda for the upcoming school year. Therefore, some activities may not be permitted.

Another limitation could be the time during the school year when the professional development would be offered. The local school system has students who attend school on a traditional schedule as well as students who attend on a year-round schedule. Information about the professional development opportunity may not be disseminated or shared due to the times when teachers may or may not be at school. Therefore, general education teachers and special education teachers may not be able to talk, share ideas, and participate in the activities. For this reason, activities that involve general education teachers and special education teachers working together might be impacted. Ideally, both groups of educators would be willing to use their personal time to attend the professional development. The teachers who are able to attend could make a toolkit of materials from the conference, including handouts, PowerPoint presentations, notes, and links to resources.

Recommendations for Alternative Approaches

The themes from the study I conducted are reflected in a planned three day professional development workshop. It is possible that other projects could also address the concerns of special education teachers and general education teachers regarding

issues such as improving reading instruction, communication, and collaboration. The study results showed a need for professional development to address the themes that arose.

Trainings that allow general education teachers and special education teachers to collaborate can impact academic learning and success. As the local school system pushes for more inclusion classrooms at the elementary level, trainings for both groups of educators are necessary. To address issues regarding the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers and general education teachers, I recommend that administrators invite the appropriate central office personnel to a professional development session on inclusion during an early-release day each quarter. This would be helpful in addressing academic, curricular, and behavioral needs.

Another recommendation would be to write a white paper reporting the results to the administration and lobbying them to give up time for general education teachers and special education teachers to plan and conduct collaboration, as well as to have someone follow up with the teams of teachers to ascertain how their collaboration is going.

Scholarship

In reflecting on my experience of scholarship, I reviewed my own level of efficacy and the impact that my determination to achieve a higher level of knowledge and learning had on me. In the beginning, I felt as though greater knowledge was beyond my capability as I looked at the modules and learning outcomes of each course during my doctoral program. Thankfully, with faith in God and encouragement from my parents, best friend, siblings, friends, and church family, I continued. I realized that I was not

going to give up, and that I should finish what I started, which was the effort to obtain a doctoral degree.

While on this journey, I was challenged, encouraged, and inspired by many of my colleagues and professors. The feedback I received from postings, emails, and texts was uplifting. I feel that I have gained knowledge that I can apply to my life and share with others as they seek to better their lives. Many people have already been inspired to obtain a degree because of me. I have been reminded of the comforting scriptures that state, “I can do all things through Christ which strengthens me.” As I encourage others to stay focused on this journey, the acronym below sums it all up:

Follow

One’s

Course

Until

Successful

The total scholarship experience of writing, reading, going to the library, waking up early to work, and sacrificing leisure time was worth it. This redirected me to the work as I pursued the motto of Walden University: “A higher degree. A higher purpose.” I persevered because I was reminded of the words of my mother: “To whom much is given, much will be required.”

Project Development and Evaluation

The responsibility of developing this project was huge for me. I had never created a project of this scope, so this was a learning opportunity and experience. As I reflected

on all of the staff development trainings in which I had participated, I realized that I had no idea of what was involved in the actual planning process. It is more than developing an agenda. I learned that I had to consider the findings of the study. In addition, I had to consider the literature review and conduct a new one relative to the genre of professional development. These components were the guide that I needed to develop this project. While developing the project, I learned the significance of patience, accepting the input of others, being flexible, and implementing an effective project evaluation.

Evaluation and feedback are needful to determine the effectiveness of the overall presentation. Despite my unawareness of how the findings would be received, I decided that the superintendent of the local school district along with the directors of the curriculum and instruction department and the exceptional children's program deserved to see the results, in order to understand the need for this project. I plan to write an executive summary. I will email central office personnel to let them know that I would like to host a professional development session with the special education teachers and general education teachers. I will attach a copy of the executive summary to the email. I hope that the district will allow me to present the professional development in order to improve my leadership potential.

Leadership and Change

I have been in education for 25 years. I have worked in four public school systems with principals and assistant principals who have exemplified leadership qualities and abilities at the elementary and middle school levels. I now see that I have been a leader as a special education teacher for 25 years and have possessed the same leadership attributes

that I have perceived in my own leaders as I have worked with students, colleagues, and teacher assistants. As I reflect on the role of administrators, I realize that the role of a leader is not an easy one, but it can be rewarding when there is collaborative teamwork. I could not have persevered without help and support from others. Developing this project has enhanced my knowledge in various ways. As I engaged in the development of this project, I realized that I possessed a capacity for patient guidance that allowed me to foster growth and development for others.

Developing this project allowed me to address the concerns of general education teachers and special education teachers at the school level. I recognized that support is necessary to help them become more effective leaders in the learning environment. I have learned that people have different ideas, perspectives, and expertise that cause them to communicate/ behave in a certain manner. It is the role of a leader to maintain focus on a vision and to develop the strengths of everyone and build on their weaknesses in order to assess the progress of the group and move forward with future projects. I now see myself as a leader who provides emotional support as well as one who demonstrates responsibility for promoting professional growth and development.

The idea of change can cause confusion in individuals. Individuals tend to be comfortable with familiarity; therefore, when change is suggested or implemented, it at times produces challenges. These challenges can hinder the progression of change. When educators look at what is not working, goals need to be facilitated by a leader but should be designed collaboratively. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the leader to share ideas and listen to the ideas of others in order to implement strategies as needed. Thus, one

must keep an open mind and be flexible and adjust if necessary. A leader must continue to carry the torch and push for change so that goals can be realized.

Analysis of Self as a Scholar

The terms *scholar* and *scholar practitioner* were introduced when I began my master's program at Walden University. At my current point in my educational journey, I am convinced that being a scholar will always be a work in progress. As a doctoral student, I would say that scholars possess a passion for learning as they share their knowledge and ideas with others. During this phase of my educational journey, I have demonstrated patience, persistence, and a commitment to encourage others, despite many obstacles that I have encountered. In addition, scholars are enhancing their careers as they research, teach, and grow. As a doctoral student at Walden University, I have strengthened my role as a scholar practitioner as a result of the many courses I have taken, the interactions I have had with colleagues, and the research I have conducted. There is still more to learn and accomplish, but the journey has prepared me for being a scholar. As a result of this experience, I am ready to complete this part of my life as I work with others to make a positive social change.

Analysis of Self as Practitioner

Through the knowledge that I have acquired at Walden University, I have learned that I can be a leader and change agent by improving relationships between general education teachers and special education teachers in my local school district. I feel that it is my duty to speak candidly at leadership meetings, at PLT meetings, and in my conversations with central office personnel regarding concerns and ideas to assist parents

with children who have learning challenges. I believe that the interview process enhanced this drive in me, in that I knew that I would have to collect data, analyze data, and use findings from the project study to propose the Designing Effective Professional Learning for General Education Teachers/Special Education Teachers project.

Analysis of Self as a Project Developer

During my 25 years in the field of education, I have served as chairperson of the curriculum/instruction committee, school assistance team, and special education team; cochairperson of the special education team; and a mentor. I have always been a member or participant in a team working for school improvement at the school level. However, prior to this study, I never had to implement a project alone. Undertaking the project study forced me to brainstorm and seek support from others as I outlined my plans. I began looking at the themes and findings and determined what goals and activities would be needed for the professional development training. During the planning stages, I wanted to make sure that the project would encourage participation and collaboration while having sufficient duration for the general education and special education teachers so that both groups would want to promote the professional development opportunity to other educators (Desimone & Stuckey, 2014; Desimone et al., 2013). I thoroughly enjoyed working on this project, and I hope to develop more professional development trainings. As a result of this experience, I can say that I am a project developer. This was possible only because of the knowledge and skills I obtained as a doctoral student at Walden University. Implementation of this project gave me confidence that I could be in charge of a project, develop it, and see it come to fruition.

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Social Change

The findings of the project study and the review of the literature revealed a need for more collaboration among general and special education teachers (Shin, Lee, & McKenna, 2016). The project has the potential to augment efforts to incorporate more inclusion classroom environments and self-contained classrooms for students who are not meeting proficiency targets in reading, with emphasis on students who are performing significantly below grade level. General education teachers and special education teachers can promote positive social change by implementing a forum quarterly to address their professional needs to enhance student learning. With the strategic plan of the local school district placing emphasis on acquiring and using communication, collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking with students, it seems appropriate to discuss and promote social change initiatives.

As indicated by the general and special education teachers, time and communication are the major factors that impact the implementation of Common Core Standards. The study findings suggest that there is a need for more collaborative discussion of which skills are being taught, assessments/assessment results, and performance levels. Thus, by focusing on providing time for collaboration with colleagues, this project is intended to make educators aware of their responsibility toward students with disabilities. In doing so, the project has implications for student achievement. When general education teachers and special education teachers meet with one another, each group becomes more knowledgeable. As a result, they gain a better understanding of their roles in their classrooms. It is my hope that general education

teachers and special education teachers will share their expertise, provide strategies/materials, and offer feedback to ensure that students are receiving the academic support they need to be successful in meeting Common Core Reading Standards.

One application of this project could be incorporated in sessions for new teachers at the beginning of the school year, as well as at the end of the second and third grading period. Feedback from each session would help the facilitator enhance upcoming professional development. Ultimately, the professional development will be shared at the local, state, and national level.

Enhancing student learning is a continuous process. Because the general education teachers and special education teachers see the need for effective communication and collaboration, there is a need to address these areas. Specifically, future research should place emphasis on establishing criteria for the inclusion model, and collaborative initiatives for general education teachers and special education teachers. Recommendations of trainings regarding to differentiation should be offered to all teachers due to the diverse learners in the general education setting.

Conclusion

Reflecting on the development project has allowed me to view the initial stages of writing the prospectus and proposal. As I have read articles, chapters of course books, postings from professors and colleagues and dissertations, it has caused me to think critically and present my research as a scholar with scholarly writing. I selected professional development as the method to develop a project to meet the needs of the participants in the project study. The professional development, *Designing Effective*

Professional Learning for General Education Teachers and Special Education Teachers was designed to offer support and guidance through collaborative activities to allow both teachers to see the significance of teamwork as each share their expertise with each other to promote student learning.

The opportunity to implement a project study independently indicates that I have become a scholar, practitioner, and a project developer. I have shown advancement as a scholar through the coursework, assessments, peer and professor input, and interactions with colleagues. Having the opportunity to attend the residency in Arlington, VA allowed me to see the initial and final phases of the doctoral program. These doctoral experiences help me realize that I possess an influential role as I continue to make a difference in the lives of children and families.

References

- Agbenyega, J. S., & Deku, P. (2011). Building new identities in teacher preparation for inclusive education in Ghana. *Current Issues in Education, 14*(1). Retrieved from <http://cie.asu.edu/>
- Akiba, M. (2011). Identifying program characteristics for preparing pre-service teachers for diversity. *Teachers College Record, 113*(3), 658-697.
- Alberta Education. (2009). Setting the direction minister's form. Retrieved January 14, 2014, from <http://education.alberta.ca/media//1082130/sc>
- American Federation of Teachers (2013). Class size. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/issues/school_reform/class_size.index.cfm.
- Angle, B. (1996). Five steps to collaborative teaching and enrichment remediation. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 29*(1) 8-10.
- Ardoin, S. R., Christ, T. J., Morena, L. S., Cormier, D. C., & Klingbeil, D. A. (2013). A systematic review and summarization of the recommendations and research surrounding curriculum-based measurement of oral reading fluency (CBW-R) decision rules. *Journal of Psychology, 51*, 1-18. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2012.09.004
- Armstrong, A., Armstrong, D., & Spandagou, I. (2010). *Inclusive education: International policy and practice*. London, England: Sage.
- Ates, S. (2013). The effect of repeated reading exercises with performance-based feedback on fluent reading skills. *Reading Improvement, 50* (4), 158-165.

- Antoniou, P., Kyriades, L., & Creemers, B. (2011). Investigating the effectiveness of a dynamic intergrated approach to teacher professional development. *CEPS Journal : Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 1(1), 13.
- Baker, S. K., Fien, H., & Baker, D. L. (2010). Robust reading instruction in the early grades. Conceptual and practical issues in the integration and evaluation of Tier 1 and Tier 2 instructional supports. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 42(9), 1-20.
- Ballard, K. (2013). Thinking in another way: Ideas for sustainable inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(8), 762-775.
- Bascia, N. (2010). Reducing class size: What do we know? Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Bernhardt, P. E. (2015). 21st century learning: Professional development in practice. *Qualitative Report*, 20(1), 1-19.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (2013). Including people with disabilities: An indigenous perspective. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(6), 571-583.
- Blum, G., Wilson, M., & Patish, Y. (2015). Moving toward a more socially just classroom through teacher preparation for inclusion. *Catalyst: A Social Justice Forum*, 1(4). Retrieved from <http://trace.tennessee.edu/catalyst/>
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Boyd, M. P., & Smyntek-Gworek, S. (2012). Morning meeting in a third grade classroom: Literacy and learning [standards]. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 47(2), 4-12.

- Bronson, C. E., & Dentith, A. M. (2014). Partner teaching: A promising model. *Education, 134*(4), 506-520.
- Brownell, M., Bishop, A., Gersten, R., Klingner, J., Denfield, R., & Dimino, J. (2009). The role of domain expertise in beginning special education teacher quality. *Exceptional Children, 75*(4), 391-411.
- Bru, E., Stornes, T., Munthe, E., & Thune, E. Thune, E. (2012). Students' perceptions of teacher support across the transition from primary to secondary school. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 54*(6) 519-533.
doi:10.1080/00313831.2010.522842
- Bruce, C. D., & Flynn, T. (2013). Assessing the effects of collaborative professional learning: Efficacy shifts in a three-year mathematics study. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 58* (4), 691-701.
- Carrington, S., & Brownlee, J. (2001). Preparing Teachers to Support Inclusion: the benefits of interaction between a group of preservice teachers and a teacher assistant who is disabled. *Teaching Education, 12*(3), 347-357.
- Cassady, J. M. (2011). Teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of students with autism and emotional behavioral disorder. *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education, 2*(7), 5.
- City, A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Coburn, C. E., Hill, H. C., & Spillane, J. P. (2016). Alignment and accountability in policy design and implementation research. *Educational Researcher, 45*(4), 243-251.

Collins, B. C., Karl, J., Riggs, L., Galloway, C. C., & Hager, K. D (2010). Teaching core content with real-life applications to secondary students with moderate and severe disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 43(1), 52-59.

Common Core Standards Initiative. (n.d.). Home page. Retrieved from http://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/teachlearn/testing/resources/mclass_reading_3d_blue_prints.pdf

Common Core Standards Initiative. (2010a). *Common Core Standards State Standards for English language arts & literacy in history, social studies, science, and technical subjects*.

Cook, B.G., Shepherd, K.G., Cook, S., & Cook, L. (2012). Facilitating the effective implementation of evidence-based practices through teacher-parent collaboration. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 44(3), 22-30. *Education Research Complete EBSCO (host)*.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2007). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cosier, M., Causton-Theoharis, J., & Theoharis, G., (2013). Does access matter? Time in general education and achievement for students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 34 (6), 323-332.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.) Merrill Education.

- D'Ardenne, C., Barnes, D. G., Hightower, E. S., Lamason, P. R., Mason, M., Patterson, P. C. & Erickson, K.A. (2013). PLCs in Action: Innovative Teaching for Struggling Grade 3-5 Readers. *Reading Teacher*, 67(2) 143-151.
- DeMatthews, D., (2014). Deconstructing systems of segregation: Leadership challenges in an urban school. *Journal of Cases in Leadership*, 17(1), 17-31.
- Desmione, L., Smith, T., Phillips, K. (2013). Linking student achievement growth to professional development participation and changes instruction: Results a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(7), 81-112.
- Desmione, L., & Stuckey, D. (2014). Sustaining professional development. In L. Martin, S. Krangler, D. Quatroche, & K. Bauserman (Eds.), *Handbook of professional development in education: Successful models and practices, pre-k-12* (pp. 467-482). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- Dettmer, P., Thurston, L. P., & Dyck, N. J. (2004). Consultation, Collaboration, and Teamwork for Students with Special Needs (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- de Vries, S., van de Grift, W., & Jansen, E. (2013). How teachers' beliefs about learning and teaching relate to their continuing professional development. *Teachers and Teaching*, 20(30), 338-357.
- Diliberto, J. A. & Brewer, D. (2014). Six tips for successful IEP meetings. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 47(2), 128-135.
- DuFour, R., Eaker, R. & DuFour, R. (Eds). (2005). *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

- Ediger, M., & Rao, D. B. (2011). *Essays on teaching mathematics*. New Delhi, India: Discovery Publishing House.
- Ermeling, B. A. (2012). Connect the dots: A dedicated system for learning links teacher teams to student outcomes. *Journal of Staff Development*, 33(2), 24-27.
- Evans, C., & Wess, S. L. (2014). Teachers Working Together: How to Communicate, Collaborate, and Facilitate Positive Behavior in Inclusive Classrooms. *Journal of the International Association of Special Education*, 15 (2), 142-146.
- Fan, C. & Hansmann, P.R. (2015). Applying Generalizability Theory for Making Quantitative RTI Progress- Monitoring Decisions. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 40 (4), 205-215.
- Fenty, N. S., McDuffie-Landrum, K., & Fisher, G. (2012). Using collaboration, co-teaching, and question answer relationships to enhance content area literacy. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 44(6), 28-37.
- Fienberg, J. (2011). Retrieved March 10, 2013 from [http:// www.wordle.nd/](http://www.wordle.nd/).
- Fletcher, J., & Vaughn, S. (2009). Response to intervention: Preventing and remediating academic difficulties. *Child Development Perspectives*, 3(1), 30-37.
- Fore, C., Hagan-Burke, S. Burke, M. D., Boon, R. T. & Smith, (2008). Academic achievement and class placement in high school: Do students with learning disabilities achieve more in one class placement than another? *Education & Treatment of Children* 31(1), 55-72.

- Forlin, C., Chambers, D. (2011). Teacher Preparation for Inclusive Education: Increasing Knowledge but Raising Concerns. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 17-32.
- Foreman, S. G., & Crystal, C. D. (2015). Systems consultation for multitiered systems of supports (MTSS): Implementation issues. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 25(2-3), 276-285.
- Fredriksson, P., Ockert, B., & Oosterbeek, H. (2013). Long-term effects of class size. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(1), 249-285.
- Friend, M., & Bursuck, W.D. (2009). *Including Students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers*. (5th ed.) Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/ Merrill.
- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, 20 (1), 9-27. doi: 10.1080/10474410903535380.
- Friend, M. & Cook, L. (1992). The new including: How it really works. *Instruction*, 101(7), 30-36.
- Friend, M. (2008). *Co-teaching! A manual for creating and sustaining classroom partnerships in inclusive schools*. Greensboro, NC: Marilyn Friend, Inc.
- Fuchs, L. S. & Fuchs, D. (2008). The role of assessment within the RTI framework. In D. Fuchs, & S. Vaughn (Eds.). *Response to intervention: A framework for reading educators* (pp. 27- 49). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

- Fuchs, L. S., & Stecker, B. M. (2003). *Scientifically based progress monitoring*. National Center on Student Progress Monitoring: Washington, D.C.
- Gable, R. A., Tonelson, S. W., Sheth, M., Wilson, C., & Park, K. L. (2012). Importance, usage and preparedness to implement evidence-based practices students with emotional disabilities: a comparison of knowledge and skills of special education and general education teachers. *Education & Treatment of Children, 35*(4), 499.
- Gao, W., & Mager, G. (2011). Enhancing pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy and attitudes towards school diversity through preparation. A case of one U.S. inclusive teacher education program. *International Journal of Special Education, 26* (2), 92.-
- Gaskins, I., (1998). There's more to teaching at-risk and delayed readers than good reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 51*(7), 534-547.
- Gewertz, C. (2012). History lessons blend content knowledge, literacy. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed For Quick Review, 78*(4), 11-16.
- Gilson, C. M., Little, C. A., Ruegg, A. N. & Bruce-Davis, M. (2014). An investigation of elementary teachers' use of follow-up questions for students at different levels. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 25*(2), 101-128.
- Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th ed.) Boston, MA: Pearson Educational.
- Glover, T. A. Reddy, L. A., Kettler, R. J., Kurz, A., & Lekwa, A. J. (2016). Improving high-stakes decisions via formative assessment, professional development comprehensive educator evaluation: The school system improvement project. *Teachers College Record, 118*, (14), 1-26.

- Gore, (2004). *Successful Inclusion Strategies for secondary and Middle School Teachers*. USA: Crowin Press.
- Gothshall, C., & Stefanou, C. (2011). The effects of on-going consultation for accommodating students with disabilities on teacher self-efficacy and learned helplessness". *Education, 132* (2), 321.
- Gurur, H., & Uzuner, Y. (2010). A phenomenological analysis of the views on co-teaching. Applications in the inclusion classroom, *Educational Services: Theory & Practice, 10* (1), 311-331.
- Guskey, T. R. (2014). Evaluating professional learning. In S. Billett, C. Hartes, & H. Gruber (Eds.). *International Handbook of Research in Professional and Professional and Practice-based learning*. 1215-1235. Netherlands, Springer.
- Haager, D., & Vaughn, S. (2013). The common core state standards and reading: Interpretations and implications for elementary students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice (Wiley-Blackwell), 28*(1), 5-16.doi: 10.1111/drp.12000.
- Hallahan, D.P., Kauffman, J.M., & P.C. (2012). *Exceptional learners: An introduction to special education. (12th ed., pp 22-49)*. Boston: Pearson.
- Hamilton-Jones, B., Vail, C. O. (2013). Preparing special educators for collaboration in the classroom: Pre-Services Teachers Beliefs and Perspectives. *International Journal of Special Education, 28*(1), 56-68.
- Hancock, D.R., Algozzine, B. (2011). *Doing Case Study Research: A practical guide for beginning researchers (2nd ed.)* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Hardy, I., & Woodcock, S. (2015). Inclusive education policies discourses of difference, diversity and deficit. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 19*(2), 141-164.
- Harris, J. (2013). Building better lessons: Teachers find innovative solutions to improve their practice. *Journal of Staff Development, 34*(1), 32-35.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Sunny Press.
- Heller, J. I., Daehler, K. R., Wong, N., Shinohara, M., & Miratrix, L. W. (2012). Differential effects of three professional development models on teacher knowledge and student achievement in elementary science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49*, (3), 333-362
- Hiebert, E. H. (2013). For the CCSS assessments and beyond: develop your student's stamina for grappling with complex texts. *Reading Today, 31*(2), 18.
- Hiebert, E. H., Wilson, K. M. & Trainin, G. (2010). Are students really reading in independent reading contexts? An examination of comprehension-based silent reading: *New directions for teachers and researchers* (2010): 151-167.
- Hodkinson, A., & Devarakonda, C. (2011). For pity's sake: Comparative conceptions of inclusion in English and India. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 4*(2), 255-260.
- Hoy, A.W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and teacher education, 21*(4), 343-356.

- Hudson, R. F., Torgesen, J. K., Lane, H. B., & Turner, S. J. (2012). Relations among reading skills and sub-skills and text-level reading proficiency in developing readers. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 25(2), 483-507.
- Hwang, Y.S., & Evans, D. (2011). Attitudes towards inclusion: Gaps between belief and practice. *International Journal of Special Education*, 26(1), 136-146.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 1400 (2004).
- Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education: A program evaluation of eight schools. *Remedial and Special Education*, 27(2), 77-94.
- Isbell, L. & Szabol, S. (2015). Assessment: Teacher Efficacy and Response to Intervention. *Delta Kappa Gamma*, 81(2).
- Jackson Dean, M., Dyal, A., Wright, J. V., Bowden Carpenter, L., & Austin, S. (2016). Principals perceptions of the effectiveness and necessity of reading coaches within elementary schools. *Reading Improvement*, 53(2), 75-86.
- Jimerson, S. R., Burns, M. K., VanDerHeyden, A. M. (2007). *Handbook of response to intervention. The science of assessment and intervention*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Jones, J., Burr, S., Kauffman, L., & Beck, J. (2013). Beyond the fluff: Integrating fine arts in the common core classroom. *Focus on Inclusive Education*, 10(4), 1-7.
- Jones, J. L. & Hensley, L. R. (2012). Taking a closer look at the impact of classroom placement students share their perspective from inside special education classrooms. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 35(3), 33-49.

- Jones, R.E., Yssel, N. & Grant, C. (2012). Reading instruction in tier 1: Bridging the gaps by nesting evidence-based interventions within differentiated instruction. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(3), 210-218. doi:10.1002/pits. 21591.
- Kangas, S. N, (2014). When Special –trumps ESL: An Investigation of Service Delivery for ELLS with Disabilities . *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 11(4), 273-306. doi:10.1080/15427587.2014.968070
- Katz, J. & Mirenda. P. (2002). Including students with development disabilities in general education classrooms. *International Journal of Special Education*, 17 (2), 26-36.
- Keller- Margulis, M. A. (2012). Fidelity of implementation framework: A critical need for response to intervention models. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(4), 342-352. doi: 10.1002/pits.21602.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945-980.
- Kibler, A. K., Walqui, A., & Bunch, G., C., (2015). Transformational opportunities: Language and literacy instruction for English language learners in the Common Core era in the United States, *TSEOL Journal*, 6(1), 9-35.
- Killion, J. (2016). Establish Time for Learning: Finding Time to Collaborate Takes Creativity and Commitment. *Journal of Staff Development*, 37(3), 26-31.
- Kurth, J.A. (2013). A unit- based approach to adaptations in inclusive classrooms. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 46, (2) 34-43.

- Kurz, A., Elliott, S. N. Webby, J. H., & Smithson, J. L. (2010). Alignment of the intended, planned, and enacted curriculum in general and special education and its relation to student achievement. *Journal of Special Education, 44*(3), 1-20.
- Kurz, A., Elliott, S. N., Lemons, C. J., Zigmond, N., Kloo, A., & Kettler, R. J. (2014). Assessing opportunity- to- learn for students with disabilities in general and special education classes. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 40* (1), 24-39.
- Kuyini, A.A.R.,& Abosi, O. (2013). *Teachers' pedagogical competencies in including children with learning difficulties in primary schools in Ghana* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Univeristy of Brunei Darussalam, Bandar Seri Begawan.
- Kuyini, A. A. R., & Abosi, O. (2011). The 2nd Generation Street Children (SGSC) in Accra: Developing teaching strategies to enhance positive learning outcomes in schools. *World Journal of Education, 1*(2), 161-171.
- Kyriakides, L., Creemers, B. P., Antoniou, P., Demetriou, D., &Charalambous, C .Y. (2015). The impact of school policy and stakeholders' actions on student learning. A longitudinal study. *Learning and Instruction, 36*, 113-124.
- Lakin, J. M., & Chaudhuri, S. (2016). Getting More Out of Educational Workshop Evaluations: Positively Packing the Rating Scale. *Educational Research Quarterly, 40*(1), 51-67.
- Lalvani, P. (2013). Privilege, compromise, or social justice: Teachers' conceptualizations of inclusive education. *Disability & Society. 28* (1). 14-27. doi: 10.1080/09687599.2012.692028.

- Lauria, J. (2010). Differentiation through learning style responsiveness strategies. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 47 (1), 24-29.
- Lodico, M .G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2010). *Methods in education research: From theory to practice*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Malak, S. (2013). Inclusive education reform in Bangladesh. Pre-service teachers' responses to include students with special education needs in regular classrooms. *International Journal of Instruction* , 6(1), 196-214.
- Malone, T., & Yoon, J. (2014). Wordle: A case study for learning possibility of vocabulary terms to visual learners. In *Society for International Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* , 2014 (1), 2918-2924.
- Mangin, M. M.,& Dunsmore, K. (2014). How the framing of instructional coaching as a lever for systemic a individual reform influences the enactment of coaching. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51, 174-213. doi:10.1177/001316X14522514.
- Manoli, P. & Papadopoulou, M. (2012). Graphic Organizers as a Reading Strategy: Research Findings and Issues. *Creative Education*, 3, 348-356. doi: 10.42361/ce.2012.33055.
- Martin, S. (2010). Teachers using learning styles: Torn between research and accountability? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(8), 1583-1591.
- Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2001). Promoting inclusion in secondary classrooms. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, 24 (4), 265-274.
- MClass: (n.d.) Dibels Next/IDEL/Assessment/Amplify/ Retrieved from www.amplify.com/assessment/mclass-dibels-next.
- MClass :(n.d.) mClass Home/ Retrieved from www.mclasshome.com/

- McCray, E.D., & McHatton, P. A., (2011). "Less afraid to have them in my classroom": Understanding pre- service general educators' perceptions about inclusion. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(4), 135-155.
- McGill- Fanzer, A. & Allington, R. (2005). The gridlock of low reading argument: Perspectives in practice and policy. *Literacy Teaching and Learning: Current Issues and Trends*, 173-183.
- McLeod, S.A. (2007). Psychology Research Ethics. Retrieved from [http:// www. simply psychology .org/Ethics/html](http://www.simplypsychology.org/Ethics/html).
- McLeod, S. A. (2010). Zone of Proximal Development. Retrieved from [http:// www. Simplypsycholgy.org/Zone-of Proximal-Development/html](http://www.Simplypsycholgy.org/Zone-of Proximal-Development/html).
- McLeskey, J., Rosenburg, M. S. & Wrestling, D .L. (2013). *Inclusion: Effective practices for all students*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- McLeskey, J. & Waldron, N. L. (2011). Educational Programs for elementary students with learning disabilities: Can they be both effective and inclusive? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 26(1), 48-57.
- Melekoglu, M. A. (2013). Examining the impact of interaction project with students with special needs on development of positive attitude and awareness of general education teachers toward inclusion. *Educational Services: Theory & Practice* 13(2), 1067-1077.
- Merriam, S. B (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Merriam, S. B. (2014). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Miltenien, L., & Venclovait, I. (2012). Teacher collaboration in the inclusive education. *Special Education, (2)*, 111-123.
- Mousouli, M., Kokaridas, D., Angelopoulou- Sakadami, N., & Aristotelous, M. (2009). Knowledge and attitudes towards children with special needs by physical education students. *International Journal of Special Education, 24(3)*, 85-89.
- Mraz, M., Nicholos, W., Caldwell, S., Beisley, R., Sargent, S., & Rupley, W. (2013). Improving oral fluency through readers' theatre. *Reading Horizons, 52(2)*, 163-180.
- Muhanna, M. (2010). *Investigation of differences in attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge of inclusion of students with Autism between special and general primary teachers in Jordan*. Unpublished Master of Education (Research) thesis, Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Sydney.
- Murawski, W. (2009). *Collaboration teaching in secondary schools: Making the co-teaching marriage book!* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murawski, W. (2012). Tips for using co-planning more efficiently. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 44 (4)*, 8-15.
- National Governors Association & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core Standards (English language arts)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *National Reading Panel Report: Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the*

scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction.

Washington, DC: Author.

NC Department of Public Instruction. (2014, November). *Communication and Visibility Briefs*. Retrieved from Multi-Tiered System of Support NC Department of Public Instruction: <http://mtss.ncdpi.wikispaces.net/Briefs>

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2012-2013). Accountability Services, reporting section, reports of disaggregated state, school system (LEA), and school performance data for 2012-2013. Retrieved April 19, 2015, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability>

Nguyen, H.T. (2012). General Education and Special Education Teachers Collaborate to Support English Language Learners with Learning Disabilities. *Issues In Teacher Education*, 21(1), 127-152.

North Carolina Department of Education (2012). NC Responsiveness to Instruction State update. Retrieved on November 29, 2014 from www.dpi.edu.

Obiakor, F., Harris, M., Mutua, K., Rotatori, A., & Algozzine, B. (2012). Making inclusion work in general education teacher classrooms. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 35(3), 477-490.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education-University of Toronto and the Canadian Education Association (OISE- UT/CEA) (2010). The facts on education: Do smaller classes improve learning? Retrieved from <http://www.ceace.ca/sites/cea-ace.ca/files/cea-2010-foe-class-size.pdf>

- Otaiba, A., Connor, C. M., Folsom, J. S., Wanzek, J., Greulich, L., Schatscheider, C., & Wagner, R. K. (2014). To wait in tier 1 or intervene immediately. A randomized experiment examining first-grade response to intervention in reading. *Exceptional Children* 81(1), 11-27. doi: 1177/00144402914532234.
- Owusu, A. A., & Yiboe, K. T. (2014). Participation in professional programmes and curriculum implementation: Perspectives of senior-high school French teachers in Ghana. *Journal of Educational and Practice*, 5 (8), 98-112.
- Petscher, Y., Cummings, K. D., Biancarosa, G., Fien, H. (2013). Advanced measurement applications of curriculum-based measurement in reading. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*. 38(2), 71-75. doi: 10.1177/1534508412461434.
- Polyzopoulou, K. & Tsakiridou, H. (2014). Greek teachers' attitudes the inclusion of students with special needs. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2(4), 2018-218.
- Porche, M. V., Pallante, D. H., & Snow, C. E. (2012). Professional development for reading achievement: Results from the Collaborative Language and Literacy Instruction Project (CLLIP). *The Elementary School Journal*, 112(4), 649-671.
- President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education (2002). A new era: Revitalizing special education for children and their families.
- Rafferty, L. (2012). Self-monitoring during whole-group reading instruction: effects among students with emotional and behavioral disabilities during summer school interventions sessions. *Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties*, 17(2), 152-173.

- Randel, B., Apthorp, H., Beesley, A. D., Clark, T. F., & Wang, X. (2016). Impacts of professional development in classroom assessment on teacher and student outcomes. *The Journal of Educational Research, 109*(5), 49-51.
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rose, D., & Meyer, A. (2002). *Teaching Every Student in the Digital Age: Universal Design for Learning*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Rozalski, M., Stewart, A., Miller, J. (2010). How to determine the least restrictive environment for students with disabilities. *Exceptionality, 18*(3), 151-163.
- Royster, O., Reglin, G.L., & Losike- Sedimo, N. (2014). Inclusion professional development model and regular middle school educators. *Journal of At Risk Issues, 18* (1), 1-10.
- Ryan, T., Kaffenberger, C. J., & Carroll, A.G. (2011). Response to Intervention. An opportunity for school leadership. *Professional School Counseling, 14* (3), 211-221.
- Ruijs, N. M., & Peetsma, T. D. (2009). Effects of inclusion on students with and without special education needs reviewed. *Educational Research Review, 4*(2), 67-79.
- Selvaraj, J. (2015). Inclusive Education in New Zealand: Policies, Politics and Contradictions. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 19*(1), 86-101.
- Shanahan, T. (2008). Implications of RTI for the reading teacher. *Response to intervention: A framework for reading educators*. 105-122.
- Sharpe, M.N., & Hawes, M.E. (2003). Collaboration between general and special education: Making it work. *Issue Brief, 2*(1) 1-6.

- Shenge, N.A. (2014). Training evaluation: Process, benefits and issues. *IFE Psychologia: An International Journal*, 22(1), 50-58.
- Shin, M., Lee, H., & McKenna, J. W. (2016). Special education and general education pre-service teachers' co-teaching experiences a comparative synthesis of qualitative research *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 20(1), 91-107.
- Signing Up to Join. (ca.2016). Retrieved from <https://www.linkedin.com/help/linkedin/answer/2964/signing-up-to-join-linkedin?lang=en>.
- Sileo, J. M. (2011). Co-teaching: Getting to know your partner. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 43(5), 32-38.
- Simpson, R., Peterson, R., & Smith, C. (2011). Critical educational components for students with emotional and behavioral disorders: Science policy and practice. *Remedial and Special Education*, 32 (3), 230-242.
- Singh, D. (2007). General education, teachers and students with physical disabilities. *International Journal of Learning*, 14 (7) 205-210.
- Sledge, A., Pazey, L. B. (2013). Measuring teacher effectiveness through meaningful evaluation: can reform models apply to education and special education teachers? *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 36 (3), 231-246.
- Soka, L., Sharma, U. (2014). Canadian in-service teachers' concerns, efficacy, and attitudes about inclusive teaching. *Exceptionality Education International*, 23 (1), 59-71.

- Solis, W., Vaughn, S. Swanson, E., & Mcculley, L. (2012). Collaborative models of instruction: The empirical foundations of inclusion and co-teaching. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*(5), 498-510.
- Spear-Swerling, L., & Chessman, E. (2011). Teachers' knowledgebase for implementing response-to-intervention models in reading. *Reading and writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, (25)*, 1691-1723. doi: 10.1007/s11145-01109338-3.
- Stake, R.E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Stanovich, K.E. (1980). Towards an interactive compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly XVI*, 32-71.
- Steffes, L. A. (2010). General education teachers' perceptions of accommodations for students with learning disabilities in inclusive secondary classrooms, Walden University, Minneapolis, MN. Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing, 3427686.
- Strogilos, V., & Tragoulia, E. (2013). Inclusive and collaborative practice in co-taught classrooms: Roles and responsibilities for teachers and parents. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 35*, 81-91.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2009). Responsiveness to intervention and school-wide positive behavior supports: Integration of multi-tiered system approaches. *Exceptionality, 17*(4), 223-237.

- Sweet, A. & Snow, C. (2003, May 1). Rethinking reading comprehension. Solving problems in the teaching of literacy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED481439). Retrieved May 20, 2009, from ERIC database.
- Sydney, R. F. (1999). Inclusion: A qualitative study of in-service general education teacher's attitudes and concerns. *Education, 120*(1), 173-180.
- Takala, M., Pirttima, R., & Tormanen, M. (2009). Inclusive special education: The role of special education teachers in Finland. *British Journal of Special Education, 36*(3), 162-173. doi:10.1111/j.1476-8578.2009.00432.00452.
- Teigland, C. (2009). What inclusive education means for overall student achievement. *The Connections of Association of Person with Severe Handicaps, 35* (3), 12-14.
- Tellis, W. M. (1997). Application of a case study methodology. *Qualitative Report, 3*(3), 1-19.
- Therrien, W. J. (2004). Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of repeated reading: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education, 25*(4), 252-261.
- Toma, J. D. (2011). Approaching rigor in applied qualitative research. *The sage handbook for research in education: pursuing ideas as the keystone of exemplary inquiry*, 405-423. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C.A., Rose, E., Lindamood, P., Conway, T., & Garvan, C. (2001). Preventing reading failure in young children with phonological processing disabilities: Group and individual responses to instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(4), 579-593.

- Tsakiridou, H., & Polyzopoulo, K. (2014). Greek teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of students with special education needs. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2(4), 208-218.
- Tzivinkou, S. (2014). Universal design for learning-application in higher education: A Greek paradigm. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 60, 156-166.
- Tzivinikou, S. (2015, in press). Building effective co-teaching in inclusive settings: consideration from 15 case studies. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*.
- van Nieuwerburg, C.(Ed.) Coaching in education: Getting better results for students, educators, and parents. London: Karnac.
- Villa, R., Thousand, J., Meyers, H., & Nevin, A. (1966). Teacher and administrator perceptions of heterogeneous education. *Exceptional Children*, 63 (1), 29-45.
- Villa, R., Thousand, J., & Nevin, A. (2008). A guide to co-teaching: Practice of tips for facilitating student learning (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, J.M. (2012). Co teaching as a school system strategy for continuous improvement. *Preventing School Failure*, 56 (1), 29-36.
- Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of educational research*, 63(3), 249-294.
- WCPSS: A PARENT GUIDE TO READ TO ACHIEVE. Retrieved from [wcpss.net/Parent/guide/ read to achieve](http://wcpss.net/Parent/guide/read%20to%20achieve).

- Weibe Berry, R.A. (2006). Inclusion, power, and community: Teachers and students interpret the language of community in an inclusion classroom. *American Education Research Journal*, 43(3), 489-529.
- Werts, M. G., Carpenter, E. S., & Fewell, C. (2014). Barriers and benefits to response to intervention: Perceptions of special education teachers. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 33 (2), 3-11.
- White, R. B., Polly, D., & Audette, R. H. (2012). A case analysis of an elementary school's implementation of response to intervention. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 26(1), 73-90.
- Whitworth, B. A., Chiu, J. L., (2015). Professional development and teacher change: The missing leadership link. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 26(2), 121-137.
- Wiebe Berry, R. A., (2006). Inclusion, power, and community. Teachers and students interpret the language of community in an inclusion classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 489-529.
- Woodland, R., Lee, M. K., & Randall, J. (2013). A validation study of the Teacher Collaboration Assessment Survey. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 19 (5), 442-460. doi: 10.1080/13803611.2013.795118
- Wrights law (n.d.) wrightslaw.com
- Yearta, L. S., Jones, J. P., & Griffin, J. (2014). Focus on Inclusive Education: Inclusion Solutions: Exploring standards, English language arts, and the inclusion classroom: Bradley Witzel, Editor. *Childhood Education*, 90(5), 375-378.

- Yearta, L.S. (2012). *The effect of digital word study on fifth graders' vocabulary acquisition, retention, and motivation: A mixed methods approach*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Yell, M.L. (2006). Excerpt from *The Law and Special Education* p. 310- 314. Pearson Education Inc.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and Methods* SAGE publications. *Thousands Oaks*.
- Zigmond, N., Kloo, A., & Volonino, V. (2009). What, where, how? Special education in the climate of full inclusion. *Exceptionality, 17*(4), 189-204
- Zyngier, D. (2014). Class size and academic results, with a focus on children from culturally, linguistically and economically disenfranchised communities. *Evidence Base, 1*(3), 1-24.

Appendix A: The Project

Workshop Information

The purpose of this 3-day professional development program is to offer training opportunities to special education teachers and general education teachers. In the three day program, both educators will participate in discussions, role-play and hands on activities to help their students.

The design of the three day offering is informed by Vgotsky's Theory Zone of Proximal Development.

The target audience is special education teachers and general education teachers in the local school district.

The goal is to provide understanding of the role and responsibility of the general education teacher and special education teacher when providing reading instruction and interventions when implementing Common Core Reading standards for students with a reading deficit in the least restrictive environment.

The learning outcomes are: Special education teachers and general education teachers will be able to

1. List the reading strengths and weakness of students with a reading deficit.
2. Know and understand the different assessments used with students with a deficit.
3. Demonstrate teaching strategies that result in student success.
4. Discuss researched-based educational materials to assist students with meeting benchmark.
5. Communicate and collaborate about student performance and placement.
6. Communicate and collaborate about strategies that create a dynamic delivery in the resource setting and general education classroom.

Housekeeping:

- Please silence phones
- You are welcome to use restroom facilities
- Minimal sidebars
- Refreshments are provided and you are welcome to bring these to your tables
- Review of the three day schedule
- Please be careful of break and lunch times so that we return and are punctual!
- Reflective Journaling is encouraged for your own professional use. Composition books are on your tables* NOTE: This would be great evidence for the Standard 6 of the Teacher Tool Evaluation
- Importance of Evaluations
- Questions?

Designing Effective Professional Learning For Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers

Day 1

Objectives

After participating in the 3 day training, special education teachers and general education teachers will be able to:

- ▶ Understand their role and responsibility when providing reading instruction with students with a reading deficit.
- ▶ Utilize reading strategies/resources to assist students with a learning deficit.
- ▶ Develop collaborative initiatives regarding student needs, performance, and curriculum.

5 Components of Reading

- ▶ **1. Phonemic awareness**
- ▶ **2. Phonics**
- ▶ **3. Fluency**
- ▶ **4. Vocabulary**
- ▶ **5. Comprehension**

Progress Monitoring

Define the meaning of progress monitoring individually; as general education teachers and special education teachers share their role of progress monitoring at their school.

Progress Monitoring

Define progress monitoring
 Curriculum Based Measures (CBMs)
 Brief standard administration
 Same measures used for screening
 Monitor Systematic Growth
 Analyze Student Rate of Improvement (ROI)
 Inform instruction/intervention

Grade level expectations

- ▶ K/3 special education teachers will meet in a group to discuss grade level expectations per Core assessments.
- ▶ K/3 general education teachers will meet in a group to discuss grade level expectations per Mc class assessments.

Goal

- ▶ The goal of the state is that every student read at or above grade level by the end of 3rd grade.

Discuss with your group:

- a. How are the students with a reading deficit performing in your school?
- b. Discuss how often/when the general education teacher and special education teacher meet to discuss how students are performing in reading.

Scenario

- ▶ Pair up with a special education teacher and a general education teacher.

Read the scenario about Peter. Complete Activity 2 Handout independently. Then discuss the responses.

Note: Be prepared to provide a list of assessments with everyone.

Reading Needs

- ▶ Allow the general education teacher and special education teachers to share the strengths and weaknesses found from the scenario about Peter.
- ▶ Discuss if the responses were the same or different.

Reading Support For Decoding

- ▶ Websites: starfall, abyca.com.
- ▶ Reading Horizons
- ▶ Bingo
- ▶ Nursery Rhymes
- ▶ Draw Your Words
- ▶ Segmenting words with beads
- ▶ Writing Words with Saving Cream

Reading Support for Fluency

- Roll and Read
- Fluency practice with a timer
- Have students practice reading nonsense words
- Read aloud
- Choose a book provided by the facilitator and try one of the strategies.

Reading Support for Comprehension

- Monitoring Comprehension
- Metacognition
- Graphic organizers
- Answering questions
- Generate Questions
- Recognize story structure
- Summarizing
- Watch the Video: Keep it or Junk It

Classroom Models

- Pull-out vs. Push-in
- Define the models
- Strengths of both models
- Weakness of both models
- Watch the video: Co-teaching Model for Special Education (YouTube 1, 2008)
- Listen and watch Central Office Personnel demonstrate the inclusive models
- Discussion about inclusion within the school district.

Designing Professional Learning For
Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers

Day 3

Meetings

- Discuss PLT meetings
- General Education Teachers and Special Education Teachers will use an agenda from the ir school and role -play
- Purpose of PLT meetings

Meetings

- Purpose MTSS
- Purpose of DECI meetings
- Discuss DECI meetings
- General Education Teachers and Special Education Teachers will use an agenda from the ir school and role -play

Lesson Planning

- Unpack the standards using the CMAPP on your laptop.
- Discuss how the IEP goals are incorporated in the general education classroom as CMAPP is a guide for teaching the Common Core Standards.
- Note: Participants will list what that most enjoyed about the project development.
- Participants will write and tell what could they use now as they return to their school.



4. What should happen?

5. What assessment could you use?

6. What would be your responsibility as the special education teacher?

7. What would be your responsibility as the general education teacher?

Activity 2: Choice Menu

Read to self and complete the graphic organizer with fiction text.	Read to self and complete graphic organizer with nonfiction text.	Read with a partner.
Do word sort.	Do sight word vocabulary worksheet.	Do activity with starfall.com.
Do activity with abyca.com	Read story on Tumble Books	Practice reading missed words from the Core Assessment

Day 1: Reading Instruction

Target Audience: -Special education teachers and General education teachers	
Setting: Conference Room at Central Office	
Topics: Components of Reading Progress Monitoring	
Purpose:	This session will enable special education teachers and general education teachers to discuss their role and responsibility when providing reading instruction students with a reading deficit.
Day 1 Learning Outcomes:	<p>Special education teachers will be able to identify the reading needs of students with a reading deficit.</p> <p>General education teachers will be able to identify reading needs of students with a reading deficit.</p> <p>Special education teachers and general education teachers will be able to collaborate about assessment results.</p>
Time Required:	7 Hours
Materials & Equipment needed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 or 4 Tables set up for 12 • Overhead projector, laptop, projection screen, link to internet • Post-it notes and note pads on tables • Composition notebook for reflective journaling • Tray of varied colored pens and markers • Poster paper • Folder for each participant with handout materials: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Name Card 2. Components of Reading handout 3. Day 1 evaluation form

	<p>4. Reading Scenario Sheet</p> <p>5. Think-Pair-Share with a partner (modeling Collaboration between special education teacher and general education teacher)</p> <p>6. Poster paper</p>	
Activities and Time Outlined:	<p>Welcome/Overview: Objectives/outcomes</p> <p>Icebreaker/*Activity 1</p> <p>Distribute Handout on Components of Reading</p> <p>PowerPoint/Discussion (Think-Pair-Share on Components of Reading/Progress Monitoring)</p> <p>Morning Stretch Break</p> <p>Active Learning Activity Read the scenario and discuss reading needs and strengths</p> <p>Lunch</p> <p>Warm-up Activity – Brain Pop</p> <p>Distribute the poster paper to make a Venn Diagram</p> <p>PowerPoint /Discussion/</p> <p>Afternoon Break</p> <p>Reflection Activity</p> <p>Day 1 Evaluation</p>	<p>9:00-9:30 am</p> <p>9:30-10:55 am</p> <p>11:00-11:50 am</p> <p>11:50-12:00 pm</p> <p>12:01-12:45 pm</p> <p>12:45-1:00 pm</p> <p>1:00-1:15 pm</p> <p>1:15-2:00 pm</p> <p>2:00-3:00 pm</p> <p>3:00-3:15</p> <p>3:15-4:00 pm</p>
Evaluation:	Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers will complete the evaluation form after this session.	
*Activity One	Participants are given the poster paper to write their responses regarding the scenario that describes a student with a deficit. Participants are encouraged to	

	<p>compare their answers.</p> <p>Venn Diagram: This opportunity will allow the participants to provide a hands-on experience while both teachers turn and talk regarding their findings regarding the reading strengths and weakness in the scenario.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Day 1 Activities: Roles and Responsibilities of Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers when Providing Reading Instruction

Morning Session: 9:00 – 12:40

Welcome and Overview (10 minutes) 9:00-9:10

Seated 3-4 per table, participants will be welcomed and provided an overview of the 3-day program

Icebreaker: *Biographic Name Card* (30 min. / 9:10 – 9:40).

Getting to Know Each Other

- Participants will actively engage in the icebreaker in order to know other participants from a different school.
- Participants will state their name, current experience, as well as what he or she expects to learn or gain from today's session.

Materials needed for the day: bio card, pens/pencils, markers, oversized flip chart

Activity#1 Instructions:

- Each participant at the table will be numbered 1-3 or 4 (based on the number at the table)
- Each participant will complete the card as indicated above.
- The completed card will be handed to the person seated to his/her right.
- The person taking the card will introduce the person whose information is on the card to those at the table.

- The group is encouraged to ask one question of the person as a way of further getting to know each other.
- Participant #1 will then introduce the table members to the larger group.

Prior to the start of the PowerPoint introduction, participants will list words that come to their mind regarding reading instruction. This will prepare the participants to think about reading instruction as they think about the reading needs of struggling readers. This activity will prepare the general education teachers and special education teachers to brainstorm individually, then share their thoughts with the participants at their table. In return, the group will list what reading instruction is to them on the poster paper. The poster will remain up in the conference room so that the participants can see the responses of the general education teachers and special education teachers.

NOTE: The facilitator will provide a brief overview of the PowerPoint to be presented over the three days of the project. Participants will be given specific details of the procedure for their participation and eventual learner outcome. They will understand that there will be breakout groups of three or four individuals for their discussion, collaboration, and activity completion first on the components of reading and secondly, progress monitoring.

PPT Presentation: 9:45 - 11:15am

The facilitator will provide the following information in the trainer notes:

Progress Monitoring is assessments that determine if students are making adequate progress or need more intervention to achieve grade level reading outcomes (U.S. Department of Education 2002).

The purpose of ongoing Progress Monitoring is to more closely monitor the rate of progress of students receiving strategic interventions in reading so an immediate adjustment in curriculum and/or instruction can be made to meet the student's specific needs in a timely fashion.

Curriculum Based Measures refers to the research-based practice of regularly assessing students' academic performance with brief measures. The measures are only one minute in length and are the same as the ones used for benchmarking. They have strong reliability, validity, and instructional utility and are the results of 25 years of research. The measures assess fluency to monitor student growth and the level of difficulty of the measures does not change over time. The measure themselves are stable and are written with the end of year expectations. The one variable that changes each time the measure is given is the child's academic performance against the skill being assessed. A unique feature of curriculum based measure is not only do they provide information about progress toward meeting a goal, but also the rate of improvement against target goals.

Progress Monitoring is one way to see how well our intervention efforts are working in helping the student reach crucial reading milestones.

PowerPoint Topics

- Components of Reading
- Progress Monitoring

After viewing slides 3-8, participants will work in breakout groups.

Morning Break: 11:15 – 11:25

Activity #2 Following Break (11:25-12:00)

Instructions: Participants will use the *Think-Pair-Share* technique to provide at least 2 things they gleaned from the PPT about Components of Reading and Progress Monitoring.

Think-Pair-Share active learning strategy is very valuable to engage the general education teachers and special education teachers since both provide reading instruction to students with a reading deficit. By reading the scenario regarding Peter allows both to share their thoughts and ideas. As a result, it shows teamwork and collaboration.

The facilitator will review and then conclude with Slide 8. Participants will list the strengths and needs on a poster board regarding the scenario about Peter. The facilitator will provide large flip charts for the groups to report out. The participants will be dismissed for lunch, after they are reminded about the after lunch activity.

Lunch 12:40 – 1:15pm

Afternoon Activity: 1:15 – 1:25

Special Education Teacher and General Teacher will pair up together with a different partner. They will share their thoughts about Peter. They will both answer the questions on the handout.

Following Lunch, participants will convene to review morning activities. Participants will have an opportunity to collaborate and communicate about a student with deficits in reading.

PowerPoint Presentation and Group Work: 1:25 -2:40

Instructions for individual and partner work. Sitting with their partner, participants will be given the handout, Reading Scenario:

Participants will read the instructions and answer the questions independently. Both the general education teachers and special education teachers will discuss their responses.

This activity allows both teachers to have time to communicate about a student as if the student was at their school. Groups will share their responses to the group if there is tape under their

chairs. This way, the group can hear from different participants, however, they are welcomed to ask questions and share if time permits. Listening and sharing ideas involves team work to ensure that educators are seeking best practices to assist students with a learning deficit.

The facilitator will record on a white flip-chart, participants' responses regarding the role and responsibility of the general education teachers and special education teacher. Discuss the importance of collaboration.

Afternoon Stretch Break: 2:40 – 2:55

Afternoon Activity: 2:55 – 3:45

General Education Teachers and Special Education Teachers will write down a question on an index card regarding Reading Instruction and Progress Monitoring and place it the box at their table. Participants at the table can respond. Each group will have a spokesperson to read and share the response with the entire group. After, this activity, all participants will write a reflection about Reading Instruction and Progress Monitoring.

Day 1 Final Events 3:45 – 4:00

Facilitator will direct the group's attention to the Progress Monitoring reflection activity. Participants will keep the reflection as an artifact for the Teacher Tool Instrument.

The Day 1 Evaluation allows for an evaluation of the entire day's work to ensure that objectives were met, and that concerns and program goals were addressed.

DESIGNING EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL LEARNING FOR GENERAL EDUCATION
TEACHERS & SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

DAY 1

DATE: _____

CONTENT	1	2	3	4
	FAIR			EXCELLENT
The workshop was applicable to my work				
The material was presented in an organized manner				
The activities were effective				
The handouts were appropriate and helpful				
I would be interested in a follow-up presentation				
I would recommend this workshop to other special education teachers/general education teachers				
PRESENTATION				
The facilitator was knowledgeable about the topic				
The presenter was personable and professional				
The presenter was a good communicator				
The presenter responded appropriately to questions				

<p>What could be done to improve today's workshop?</p> <p>What do you want to know more about today's topic? What resources do you need from the facilitator?</p>	
<p>Additional Comments:</p>	
<p>Rate today's workshop: POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT</p>	

Day 2: Literacy Strategies / Classroom Environment

Target Audience: Special Education teachers and General education teachers	
Setting: Conference Room at Central Office	
Topics: Reading Strategies Push- in vs. Pull-out services	
Purpose:	Participants will understand literacy strategies that will result in improved reading instruction and delivery in the classroom and result in student success.
Day 2 Learning Outcomes:	Special education teachers and general education teachers will be-participants will be able to outline key instructional strategies role play and use these strategies thy will use in their classrooms.
Time Required:	7 Hours
Materials:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 or 4 Tables set up for 12 • Overhead projector, laptop, projection screen, link to internet • Post-it notes and note pads on tables • Composition notebook for reflective journaling • Tray of varied colored pens and markers • Poster paper • Folder for each participant with handout materials: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distribute reading handouts on decoding reading strategies 2. Distribute reading handouts on comprehension reading strategies 3. Power Point/ Discussion presentation on push-in model and pull-out model 4. Distribute Choice Menu handout 5. Distribute Collaboration Tips <p>Day 2 evaluation form</p>

Activities and Time Outlined:	<p>Overview: objectives/Outcomes</p> <p>Icebreaker/Activity 2</p> <p>PowerPoint/Discussion</p> <p>Morning Stretch Break</p> <p>Active Learning Activity (Decoding/Reading Strategy)</p> <p>Lunch</p> <p>Warm up Activity/Brain Pop</p> <p>PowerPoint/Discussion on Classroom Environments</p> <p>Afternoon Stretch Break</p> <p>Reflection Activity</p> <p>Day 2 Evaluation</p>	<p>9:00-9:30 am</p> <p>9:30-10:55 am</p> <p>11:00-11:50 am</p> <p>11:50-12:00 pm</p> <p>12:01-12:45 pm</p> <p>12:45-1:00 pm</p> <p>1:00-1:15 pm</p> <p>1:15-2:00 pm</p> <p>2:00-3:00 pm</p> <p>3:00-3:15</p> <p>3:15-4:00 pm</p>
Evaluation:	Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers will complete evaluation for this session.	
*Activity 2	Choice Menu - The objective of this activity is for each participant to choose a reading strategy to use with a partner. In a timed setting, each participant is to locate another activity to do independently. Participants will write a reflection regarding the activity.	

Day 2 Activities: Literacy Strategies/Classroom Environment

Morning Session: 9:00 – 12:40

Welcome and Overview (10 minutes) 9:00-9:10

Seated 3 or 4 per table, participants will be welcomed and provided an overview of the 3-day program

Icebreaker: (30 mins/ 9:10 – 9:40)

What DO YOU KNOW ABOUT READING

A GROUP ACTIVITY: This activity is for each participant to learn and understand words associated with reading. A ball will be thrown and the participants must choose a number on the ball in order to answer the question provided by the facilitator. This activity will allow all participants to learn together. This activity can also be used with students that are struggling in reading. It's another strategy that can be used with students versus paper and pencil.

Materials needed for the day: pens/pencils, markers, sticky note pads, 1 oversized flip chart per table

Icebreaker Instructions:

After all participants have participated in the activity, participants will volunteer and share their feelings about the activity. Other participants will share how they think students would feel if a similar activity was used in the learning environment. After the discussion, the introduction of the PowerPoint presentation will begin.

PowerPoint Topics 9:45 - 11:15am

- Reading strategies
- Push-in vs. Pull-out

After viewing Slides 9-14, participants work in breakout pairs to collaborate about Peter and consider which of the strategies could be useful to assist him with his reading deficit. The presenter will facilitate the discussion about students not being proficient in reading. Participants will answer the questions on the PowerPoint. General education teachers and special education teachers will meet and discuss how Mclass and Core assessment impact student learning. Participants will complete Activity 2. The presenter will ask the presenters to provide a list of ways they assess students. Distribute handouts on reading support for decoding and comprehension.

The facilitator will announce the morning break, after which the discussion will continue about the reading strategies and assessments.

Morning Break: 11:15 – 11:25

Following Break (11:25-12:00) Participants will provide at least 3 things they gleaned from the earlier presentation about reading strategies and progress monitoring.

Facilitator will wrap up and dismiss for lunch, and then introduce activities after lunch which is Push-in vs. Pull-out. .

Lunch 12:40 – 1:15pm

Following Lunch 1:15-1:35

Participants will convene to review morning activities. The groups will use the oversized flip charts to share their responses, and elect one member to share with the large group. The facilitator will wrap up and direct the group to a general discussion about the least restrictive environment.

Afternoon Activity: 1:35 – 2:25

The discussion will address push-in and pull-out models. Participants will tell orally share what the strengths and weaknesses are of each model. The presenter will list them on the flip chart. Participants will watch a video (Co-Teaching Model for Special Education You tube by William & Mary October 12, 2012) to show how reading can be successful with a strategy. The facilitator will pass out handouts on collaboration and inclusive environments. Coggins, S. (2012). Collaborative Learning Tips in Inclusive Learning Classrooms. Retrieved from hub education.

Have a conversation on collaboration with the handout entitled, Collaborative Learning Tips in Inclusive Classrooms.

Using Collaborative Learning in Inclusive Classrooms Handout

Collaborative learning is an approach whereby students are encouraged to interact in pairs or small groups, as a way to encourage increased learning outcomes. Studies have shown different benefits to collaborative learning, including but not limited to: academic achievement, improved self-esteem, active learning, and social skill development.

- It is found that inclusive classrooms that need more individualized approaches to learning for various special education students benefit greatly from collaborative

learning. Here are some tips that may be useful for teachers who are seeking to use this approach in their classes.

- **Teaching Tips for Collaborative Learning in Inclusive Classrooms**

1. **Know your learning aims.** When using the collaborative learning approach, it's important to know exactly what you're hoping to achieve when using this approach. Why are you opting to use collaborative learning and not any other type of approach for this particular classroom task? What should the students gain from this activity?

2. **Be aware of various issues arising from collaborative learning.** Although there are many advantages to collaborative learning, there are also some issues that need to be taken in to consideration. One such issue, for example, is something called fragmentation (Malmgren, 1998). This is a situation whereby students with disabilities tend to miss class times whenever they have to see 'specialists' (social workers, speech pathologists, etc). Since fragmentation can be detrimental to students' abilities to work appropriately with their groups/peers, teachers need to make appropriate adjustments and management of expectations under such circumstances.

3. **Consider the best type of groupings to be initiated in the classroom.** While some types of work will benefit from homogeneous groups, others may work better with heterogeneous groups. It's important to be aware of the tasks beforehand and plan accordingly.

4. **Allocate time for planning and initiating classroom management.** Teachers may wish to include a session on setting collaborative group guidelines, creating posters, and such activities in order to prepare for possible issues in personality and behavior clashes.

5. **Prepare adequate self and group assessment guidelines.** It is good for the students to be aware of how they will be assessed individually and as a group when working in a collaborative setting. Having self assessment and group assessment pro forma will be useful.

6. **Provide an environment where students are able to "test and re-check."** Or, otherwise known as "trial and error." This way, the students can all experiment and find different ways to learn together.

7. **Learn how to develop successful relationships in a collaborative learning environment.** There are many factors to consider when it comes to developing good collaborations in the classroom, including cooperation, communication, and

compromise. Make sure that your class is aware of these important factors to encourage successful collaborative relationships.

written by: S.A. Coggins • edited by: Sarah Malburg • updated: 9/11/2012

Afternoon Stretch Break: 2:25 – 2:35

PowerPoint presentation and Role-Playing: 2:35 -3:45

Participants will share which model is used in their school. Discussion will be held regarding scheduling. Discussion will be held regarding who is responsible for Common Core Standards due to students being served in the inclusion classroom/resource setting. The facilitator will record on a Flip chart for the entire group's benefit. Then, summarize and direct the group's attention to the reflection, as the participants write their reflections about today's session. Participants will complete Day 2 Evaluation.

Day 2 Final Events 3:45 – 4:00

Facilitator will wrap up and introduce Day 3 Activities.

The focus will be Collaboration and Lesson Planning

The Evaluation allows for an assessment of the entire day's work to ensure that objectives were met, and that concerns and program goals were addressed.

DESIGNING EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL LEARNING FOR GENERAL EDUCATION
TEACHERS & SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

DAY 2

DATE: _____

CONTENT	1	2	3	4
	FAIR	←————→		EXCELLENT
The content was as was described for today				
The workshop was applicable to my work				
The material was presented in an organized manner				
The activities were effective				
The handouts were appropriate and helpful				
I would be interested in a follow-up presentation				
I would recommend this workshop to other special education teachers and general education teachers				
PRESENTATION				
The facilitator was knowledgeable about the topic				
The presenter was personable and professional				
The presenter was a good communicator				
The presenter responded appropriately to questions				
What could be done to improve today's workshop? What do you want to know more about today's topic? What resources do you				

need from the facilitator?
Additional Comments:
Rate today's workshop: POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT

Day 3: Building on the learning. Teachers work in collaborative groups to plan and present lessons.

Target Audience: Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers	
Setting: Conference Room at Central Office	
Topics: Collaborative Planning Collaborative Groups	
Purpose:	Working collaboratively, participants will be able to create dynamic lesson plans for execution in the classroom.
Day 3 Learning Outcomes:	Special education teachers and general education teachers will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify effective strategies for teaching students with a reading deficit. - Use strategies to create effective lesson plan for students with a reading deficit. - Collaborate with colleagues to prepare and present lesson plans.
Time Required:	7 Hours
Materials:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 or 4 Tables set up for 12 • Overhead projector, laptop, projection screen, link to internet • Post-it notes and note pads on tables • Tray of varied colored pens and markers • Poster paper • Folder for each participant with handout materials: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poster Paper for a Concept Map 2. Collaborative Planning

	3. Day 3 evaluation form and Final Evaluation	
	4. Lesson Plan Template	
Activities and Time Outlined:	Welcome/Overview: objectives/Outcomes	9:00-9:30 am
	Icebreaker/*Activity 3 –Role Play PLT meeting	9:30-10:55 am
	PowerPoint/Discussion	11:00-11:50 am
	Active Learning Activity Role Play IEP meeting	11:50-12:30 pm
	Lunch* (Working Lunch)	12:30-12:45 pm
	Warm-up Activity/Brain Pop	12:45-1:00 pm
	Reflection Activity/	1:00-1:15 pm
	Afternoon Stretch Break*	1:15-2:00 pm
	Lesson Plan Reading Activity in Collaborative Groups	2:00-2:45 pm
	Sharing of Lesson Plans	
	Final Wrap-up and Evaluation	2:45-3:15 pm
		3:15-3:35 pm
Evaluation:	Teachers will complete the evaluation form after this session. This derived information will allow administrators to further plan necessary training.	

Day 3 Activities: Planning Strategies
Morning Session: 9:00 – 12:40

Welcome and Overview (10 minutes) 9:00-9:10

Seated 3 or 4 per table, participants will be welcomed and provided an overview of the 3-day program

Icebreaker: *3-step interview* (30 mins./ 9:10 – 9:40) –

Still Getting to Know Each Other

Even after working together for three days, many professionals still don't connect as they should to develop and network. This activity not only allows members to get to know each other, but participants can reinforce learning by sharing what they have learned over the period of time in the program.

Materials needed for the day: blank sheets of *writing paper*, pens/pencils, markers, sticky note pads, lesson plan template, lesson plan exemplar

Icebreaker Instructions:

Have students split into pairs. Each person interviews the other, with questions provided by the instructor. Then the pair finds another pair and form a quad. Each person takes turns introducing his or her partner and a summary of his/her responses to the group.

Facilitator will ask a member to share out to the larger group.

Activity #1: PPT Presentation: 9:45 - 11:15am

PowerPoint Topics: Collaborative Groups/ Lesson Planning

Participants will discuss meetings at the school level with the focus being on PLT meetings, IEP meetings, and Lesson Planning. The facilitator will allow for a morning stretch break, but a return time earlier to complete the activity.

Morning Break: Open

Facilitator will lead a discussion regarding meetings at their schools. Facilitator will mention that in the study, some special education teachers felt general education teachers were responsible for implementing Common Core Standards. Whereas, general education teachers felt special education teachers were responsible for implementation of individual education plans.

Following Break (approximately 11:20)

Instructions: Participants will use their composition notebooks to respond to the types of strategies they feel would best suit their needs in their classrooms. Additionally, they will share in their table about how PLT and IEP meetings are facilitated at their school. The facilitator will wrap up and dismiss for a working lunch.

During the Working Lunch

In collaborating with partners at their table, participants will continue to give feedback and ask question to their colleagues. At this time, participants will be asked to take out their laptops and get a CMAPP lesson so that he or she can unpack the Common Core Reading Standards per grade level. Participants will choose a card from a container. The card will indicate which grade level you will plan for. Each participant will use a concept map to determine what question should be derived from the goal.

Using a flip chart provided to each group, participants will share instructional strategies they gleaned from the PPT presentation. The presenter will ask participants to share out to the larger group.

After sharing out and providing a wrap up, the facilitator will guide the group toward creating lesson plans in reading per goals from CMAPP and student Individualized Education Plan.

Lesson Planning Activity: 2:00 – 3:45

To demonstrate their understanding of the presentation topics, participants will work on lesson plans with partners of their own choosing. The lesson plans will incorporate components of reading and a reading strategy from the presentation held during the three day training. To complete these activities, participants will be given the option to use their laptops. Participants will be provided an exemplary and a template to work together to produce a lesson plan for the classroom. The plans will be shared during the final hour of the day.

The facilitator will add the information to add to the wiki account for the use of all participants. This will allow for current and continued use and networking to provide and solicit support. Participants will create a Linked In account for the use of all participants.

Day 3 Activity 2 Lesson Plan Handout Page 1

Teacher:

Week of :

Goal	
CCSS Standards aligned to Individual Education Plan	
Objectives	
Procedures	
Materials	

Assessment	

Teacher notes:

Day 3 Final Events 3:45 – 4:00

Facilitator will wrap up and conclude Day 3 Activities. Participants will list all of the ways that their experiences as participants in this training program will help them become better teachers. What did they experience during this workshop that they can use now? Participants will then share with group members.

The evaluation allows for an assessment of the entire day's work to ensure that objectives were met, and that concerns and program goals were addressed.

Participants will complete the **final evaluation** after this session. This derived information will allow administrators to further plan necessary training, as well as provide facilitator with valuable information for future presentations.

DESIGNING EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL LEARNING FOR GENERAL EDUCATION
TEACHERS & SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

DAY 3

DATE: _____

CONTENT	1	2	3	4
	FAIR			EXCELLENT
The content was as was described for today				
The workshop was applicable to my work				
The material was presented in an organized manner				
The activities were effective				
The handouts were appropriate and helpful				
I would be interested in a follow-up presentation				
I would recommend this workshop to other special education teacher and general education teachers				
PRESENTATION				
The facilitator was knowledgeable about the topic				
The presenter was personable and professional				
The presenter was a good communicator				
The presenter responded appropriately to questions				
What could be done to improve today's workshop? What do you want to know more about today's topic? What resources do you need from the facilitator?				

Additional Comments:
Rate today's workshop: POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT

DAY 3					
FINALWORKSHOP EVALUATION					
Workshop Title:			Date:		
Facilitator(s):			Location:		
Categories (On a scale of 1 to 5/ 1 = poor and 5 =	1	2	3	4	5
Achievement of workshop aims and objectives					
Relevance of content to your work with elementary					
Impact on the way you work					
Pace of the workshop					
Quality of the learning materials and resources					
Facilitation and presentation of the content					
Quality of training materials					
<p>Comments:</p>					
<p>What worked well? Explain why.</p> <p>What could be changed or improved?</p> <p>Did the workshop help participants understand and use the workshop materials?</p> <p>Explain:</p>					

Thank you for completing the Designing Effective Professional Learning For General Education Teachers & Special Education Teachers form training. Your contribution will have a significant impact on improving teaching and learning at the elementary level in the future.

Summative Evaluation Questions

Posed to Administrators:

1. What are some specific strategies presented in the program that you have witnessed being used in the general education teachers and special education teachers classroom?
2. What specific elements of the training program do you see being used in the teachers' classrooms that present a positive impact on students?
3. What recommendations would you make that would add to the success of the program?

Summative Evaluation Questions

Posed to General Education Teacher and Special Education Participants

1. Have you been able to collaborate with other general education teacher and special education teachers at the site to plan and share lessons? If so, how often does this occur?
Once a week ____ Once bi-weekly ____ One a month ____
2. Since the training sessions, have you been able to connect with other educators, such as intervention teachers, reading coach, inclusion instructional coach, etc., to share information?
3. What strategies gleaned from the 3-day presentation are you using in your room, and what is the response from students?
4. What are some recommendations that you have that would make the program more successful?

Appendix B: Teacher Sample Interview Guide

School Name: _____

Interviewee (Title and Name): _____

Interviewer: _____

Introduction

During our time together, I would like to audiotape our conversation. This will allow me to accurately record our conversation. I will have you sign a release form granting me permission. The tapes will be destroyed after they are transcribed. As stated in the consent form you signed, your participation is voluntary and you can withdraw at any time. The information collected from our conversations will be private.

The interview is planned to take no longer than an hour.

Signing this document, I acknowledge that I have read the agreement and I grant permission to the interviewer to audiotape our conversation:

Signature: _____ **Date:** ___/___/___

Interview Questions

What is your current title? _____

How many years have been working with students with disabilities?

Have you worked with students with disabilities in the pull-out model? If so, what grade?
_____ What grade? _____

Have you worked with students with disabilities in the push-in model? If so, what
grade? _____ What grade? _____

1. Who has the responsibility, or do you share it, for monitoring the progress of students for Common Core Standards in the area of reading? Do you consult or collaborate? Are there separate parts that you each do? What would you do to improve the situation?
2. Who has the responsibility, or do you share it, for providing Common Core Standards reading instruction? Are there separate parts that you each do? Do you consult or collaborate? What would you do to improve the situation?
3. Who has the responsibility, or do you share it, for providing Common Core Standards reading interventions? Are there separate parts that you each do? Do you consult or collaborate? What would you do to improve the situation?
4. Who has the responsibility, or do you share it, for working with students identified with a learning disability who are not proficient with the Common Core Standards in reading? Are there separate parts that you each do? Do you consult or collaborate? What would you do to improve the situation?
5. Who has the authority to designate pull-out activities and times, or do you share it, for working with students identified with a learning disability? Are there separate parts that you each do? Do you consult or collaborate? What would you do to improve the situation?
6. Do you and the general education teacher communicate about the students that you both serve in the area of reading?

Research Questions

Research Question 1. What are the perceived roles and responsibilities of general education teacher and special education teachers?

Research Question 2. How do the general education and special education teachers provide Common Core Standards Reading instruction?

Research Question 3. Who has the responsibility of providing reading intervention strategies with students that are identified with a learning disability who are not meeting benchmark with the Common Core Standards?

Research Question 4. What do elementary special education teachers and general education teachers perceive as the strengths and weaknesses of the pull-out model for students with disabilities?

Resources

Coggins, S. (2012). Collaborative Learning Tips on Inclusive Classrooms. Retrieved from hub.education.com.