GET THEM OUT OF MY CLASSROOM:
The effectiveness of the inclusion for students with EBD

by

Christine Livingston

A Research Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
in

Education

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

Alan B Block

Dr. Alan Block

GET THEM OUT OF MY CLASSROOM:
The effectiveness of the inclusion For students With EBD

by

Christine Livingston

A Research Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
in

Education

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

_____
Dr. Alan Block

The Graduate School

University of Wisconsin Stout

December, 2003

The Graduate School

University of Wisconsin Stout

Menomonie, WI 54751
December 2003

ABSTRACT

Livingston	Christine	M.
(Writer) (Last name)	(First)	(M.I.)

Get Them Out of My Classroom: The effectiveness of inclusion of students with EBD

(Title)

Education	Dr. Alan Block	December/2003	36
(Major)	(Research Advisor)	(Month)	(Pages)

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th Edition)

(Name and the Style Manual Used in This Study)

Why are students with emotional behavioral disorders often excluded and removed from the inclusionary movement? The purpose of this thesis is to examine what happens to students with EBD (emotional behavioral disorders) in and out of the classroom. Children with EBD are educator's greatest challenge. They have the highest drop out and failure rate out of any other disability category. Children with EBD are also less likely to go to college and to obtain gainful employment. Children with EBD are more often taught in separate classrooms or facilities from those of their peers without disabilities.

The objectives of this study are to answer the questions: 1) How did special education evolve? 2) Why is inclusion in schools typically not a successful learning environment for students with EBD? 3) How can the inclusive environment be more successful for students with EBD? 4. What are the limitations for the inclusive environment?

The comparative study conducted in 2003 attempted to examine the literature dealing with inclusion of children with emotional behavior disorders and their success or lack of success in the exclusionary environment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of my friends and family who hung in there while I was writing this thesis. I would like to thank my mom for taking the time to review my thesis (again and again and again!) and for listening to my litany of complaints. I would like to thank my grandmother for taking the time out of her days to edit my paper.

I would also like to thank all of the UW-Stout professors who made getting my degree possible. I would also like to thank Dr. Alan Block. It was with his guidance and encouragement that I was able to finish my thesis.

Finally I would like to thank my former students who serve as the inspiration for this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

"Although special education started more than 150 years ago, it was not until the 1960s that contemporary special education as we know it began as a public policy commitment" (Paul et al., 1997, pg 12). Before that time, students with special needs were either institutionalized, nit educated, or if their families could afford it, educated by a tutor. Special education, as we know it today, was developed in the midst of social and political unrest. This was a time in our history when people were protesting against the racism, bigotry, segregation, and other social injustices of American culture (Paul et al., 1997). The civil rights movement was gaining momentum and advocates for the disabled saw this as an opportunity to gain more equality for people with disabilities.

In the 1960s the federal government established an office designed specifically for special education. It was called the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (Paul et al., 1997). This office specialized in developing curriculum for the teachers of students with disabilities. Students with disabilities were slowly gaining educational rights, but it would not be until 1975 that advocates for rights for the disabled saw their first win. In 1975, Congress passed a law the allowed every student with disabilities to have a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment, called P.L. 94-142 (Paul et al., 1997). This meant that every student had the right to be educated in their neighborhood school where they would go if they did not have a disability (Paul et al., 1997).

This was a major victory, but many students found themselves in classrooms that were segregated from their non-disabled peers (Paul et al., 1997). With the authorization

of PL 94-142 the area of special education saw enormous growth. Along with this growth came increasing opposition for special education and its practices, stating that it stigmatizes the students and deprives them of the learning environment found in the regular education classroom (Yell, Mitchell, Rogers, & David, 1998). Many argued that the separate classrooms were another form of segregation and it violated the civil rights of those with disabilities and that they should be able to be educated among their non-disabled peers. This argument started the desegregation of special education classrooms, otherwise known as REI (regular education initiative) or mainstreaming.

With the reauthorization of P.L. 94-142 as IDEA, in 1997, the term mainstreaming was renamed inclusion. With inclusion, students would have an educational program that focuses on their abilities and not their disabilities, (Stainback, W. & Stainback, S., 1996). The hope was that inclusion was to eliminate special education altogether and that students with disabilities would be served in their classrooms with modification (Stainback, W. & Stainback, S., 1996).

Advocates for full inclusion stress that the students with disabilities will benefit both academically and socially in the inclusive setting. Through the inclusion model, students with disabilities will be able to socialize with their non-disabled peers and the stigma of being in special education classrooms will disappear. Some advocates believe that persons with disabilities should be viewed as a minority group and treated as such (Hallahan & Kauffman, 2003). Others state that pullout programs do not work and may actually impede on the child's educational success (Hallahan, & Kauffman, 2003). Those opponents believe that the general education classroom will become a more tolerant and humane system (Braaten, S. & Gable, R.A., 1995).

In contrast, people who oppose inclusion say that people with disabilities do not make up a homogenous group in which needs are the same and can all be met in the regular education setting (Braaten et al., 1995). The advocates for full inclusion state that full inclusion reduces the stigma of being labeled, while others state that it is not the label, but the disability itself that stigmatizes the students (Helfin, J.& Bullock, L., 1999). Critics of full inclusion say, "that if mandated, it will spur the privatization of education, resulting in an exodus of students without disabilities to private schools, leaving the public schools to students with disabilities" (Helfin & Bullock 1999, pg 2). Additionally, the inclusion movement is a political movement and students with EBD do not hold any political clout (Long & Morse, 1996). Students with emotional behavioral disorders or EBD "have no effective parent groups or community support groups, as do the parents of learning disabled and the developmentally delayed students arguing for their children's rights" (Long & Morse, 1996, p. 123).

"Students with EBD are considered the most difficult to include and have been cited as the exemplars of times when full inclusion is not appropriate" (Helfin & Bullock., 1999, p. 4). Students with EBD are often regarded as more difficult to teach than students with other disabilities, and are more likely to be (a) mis - or under identified, (b) recommended for exclusion from the general education settings, and (c) found to attain marginal or unsatisfactory educational outcomes:

> The majority of students with EBD are educated in separate classes or facilities from their peers without disabilities and that the services offered in regular education environments often fall short of what is needed to provide a successful academic and social experience with students with EBD (Gunter et al., 2002, p.

126).

In the United States there are more than 460,000 students identified as having emotional behavioral problems (EBD) (Gunter et al., 2002). Since the establishment of IDEA in 1975 more than one million American students have been identified as having EBD (Gunter et al., 2002). Emotional disturbance is defined as follows:

> (I) The term means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree that adversely affects a child's educational performance:
>
> (a) An inability to learn cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors.
>
> (b) An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers.
>
> (c) Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances.
>
> (d) A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression.
>
> (e) A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal of school problems. (Hallahan & Kauffman, 2003).

There is substantial empirical evidence that shows a correlation between academic failure and behavior in students with EBD. EBD students have a tendency to have anti-social, aggressive, oppositional, and defiant behaviors that negatively affect their academic performances and prevent the cultivation of appropriate peer relationships (Gable, Hendrickson, Tonelson, & Van Acker, 2002). "Academic failure - especially in

out, and can accelerate the rate of antisocial and maladaptive behavior" (Gable et al., 2002, p. 459). Many experts argue that teachers need to see the academic and non-academic issues of students with EBD as learning disabilities (Gable et al., 2002).

Teachers today find many obstacles to overcome in order to deliver instruction of high quality to their students. Some of these obstacles; "changing student demographics, dwindling resources, state legislated curriculum, high-stakes testing, and the proliferating of unsubstantiated practices" (Gable et al., p. 460) are among the few. Studies have also shown that students who exhibit challenging behaviors in the classroom often receive less instruction time than those students who do not (Gable, et al., 2002). Research also shows that:

> Teachers give challenging students fewer opportunities to respond. Those same students give correct answers less often, and in turn, receive less praise than more compliant, higher performing classmates. Often an unspoken agreement is struck between teachers and student- I won't bother you, if you don't bother me. The net result is a curriculum of non-learning (Gable, et al, 2002, p. 461).

Other studies have indicated that students with EBD had "the lowest grade-point averages of students in all disability categories, approximately 50% of students with EBD had failed one or more courses in the most recent school year; more than 66% had failed the competency exam for their grade level; and only one third of the students with EBD completed school" (Sutherland & Wheby, 2001, p. 113). In fact students with EBD are twice as likely to drop out of school (54.8%) than the general population (24.4%) (Helfin et al., 1999). These statistics show that our schools are failing to educate the students

with Emotional Behavioral/Disorders. Inclusion does not show much promise in improving these statistics. In fact, inclusion may exacerbate the problem, and many court rulings oppose full inclusion for students with EBD, (Helfin, et al, 1999). Disruptive, Distractible behavior, is how most teachers would describe students with EBD. Many teachers report that they are lacking the skills necessary in order to sufficiently deal with these behaviors (Scott, 2002). The general education classroom teachers tend to be very intolerant of these disruptive behaviors and as a result these students are removed from the classroom and placed in more restrictive environments:

To a certain extent, some students with challenging behaviors do require more restrictive placements in order to facilitate their success and to ensure the success of their general education peers. But for the majority of these students effective individualized interventions can be efficiently applied in general classroom environments (Scott, 2002, p.21).

There are also major roadblocks to this idea. Insufficient training, funds, and support, and the fact that it is easier just to have the child removed from the classroom makes it hard to implement any of these intervention plans (Scott, 2002). The problem with inclusion is that the educational policies that are handed down through the legislation make it difficult to include and educate those with disabilities while trying to maintain the standards set by legislation (Long, 1996). Especially with the establishment of Public Law 105-17 that "required all students with disabilities to be assessed like other students using either the same assessment instruments employed with typical learners, or some type of alternative instrument" (Friend & Bursuck, 2002, p. 11).

With all of the pressure today to increase academic standards and judging teachers

on their students' academic scores and not on their ability to get along with one another, teachers resent having to take time to work with their students' social and emotional needs (Long, 1996). Teachers are more reluctant to have students with emotional behavioral disorders integrated into their classrooms. "Teachers are overwhelmed by the demand to find the time and energy to improve their instructional skills while trying to meet the social/emotional needs of their non-troubled students experiencing normal developmental crises, the increasing number of abused, impoverished high risk students, and the increasing number of unidentified but active emotionally disturbed students in their classrooms" (Long, 1996, pg 121):

> All too often, innovative public school programs begin and the new students arrive before the new staff is hired and the current staff completes the necessary training. When this happens the program is guaranteed to fail. Inclusion needs to become a grass roots movement with real teacher input and support if it is going to have a chance to succeed (Long, 1996, p. 120-121).

Two centuries ago, when the public school system was first being established those students with mental, physical, and emotional disabilities were not allowed to attend public school. It would not be until 1975 that the educational rights of these students would be recognized. Even though legislation was passed to insure that all students with disabilities receive free and appropriate public education, other educational initiatives are still being passed that makes this difficult to happen. With the current legislation [No Child Left Behind] and with PL 105-17 that requires all students with disabilities to be assessed with the same instruments as their non-disabled peers, schools

and teachers may find it no longer advantageous including students with disabilities into their classrooms. Also, with the focus in education today on testing and test scores; little attention is paid to the social and emotional needs of students, especially those with emotional/behavioral disorders.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The American public school system has gone through many changes since it conception. "In the thirteen colonies of pre-revolutionary America, only the larger towns in New England were required by law to build schools. Elsewhere education was neither free, nor public" (Tyack, D., Anderson, J.D., Cuban, L., Kaestle, C.F., & Ravitch, D., 2001, p. 20). Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities (emotional, physical, or developmental) were not found in the public schools. During the eighteenth century, limited attempts were made to teach students with any type of disability. Children or youth who had emotional or behavioral problems were believed to have been under Satan's power (Kaufman, 1997). Instead of educating these youth; neglect, abuse, and inhumane medical treatment (blood letting), and corporal punishment was commonplace.

While middle to upper class white males went to "Dame Schools" to learn their letters and some behavioral skills (Tyack, et al, 2001), youth with disabilities found themselves on the street or in insane asylums undergoing inhumane treatment (Kauffman, 1997). For many white males, the "Dame School" was the only education that they received. By the time the Revolutionary War broke out most Americans who were able to be educated only had enough skills to "read the newspaper and the bible, and figure their taxes" (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 21).

With the gaining of independence came the task of figuring out how to become a nation instead of separate colonies (Tyack, et al., 2001). Some believed that the answer lay within the schools (Tyack et al., 2001). Thomas Jefferson was one of the leading advocates for creating an educational system that was supported by the public. "Jefferson

said that in a democracy the people vote and choose their rulers, and that means you have to learn to read and write and you have to learn enough of the foundations of education to be a citizen" (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 23). He believed that an education would make the citizens productive members of the new democracy (Tyack et al., 2001). Jefferson also believed that only the ones that can be educated and have the potential to be productive members of society, should be educated. This left out those with mental, physical, or emotional disabilities (Tyack, et al., 2001).

Jefferson continued to push for public education all through his political career. He believed that education and democracy went hand in hand. Jefferson stated, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be" (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 25). Even though Jefferson advocated for public education for everyone, some of the founding fathers did not agree. Many of the founding fathers were believed that the federal government should not handle education and that it should not be available to everyone, (Pulliman, 1968, p. 37). The Constitution does provide the separation of church and state and that control of schools should be handled locally and not federally (Pulliman, 1968).

After the War for Independence there was a population boom with the great influx of immigrants coming into the United States. With the expanding population there was a greater need for public education and many saw schools as a way to Americanize the immigrants (Pulliman, 1968). By the time of the War of 1812, the American people became interested in free public education for all its citizens (Pulliman, 1968). It was not until the 1830s and 1840s that the public school movement first took root in Massachusetts with the help of Horace Mann, who was the Secretary of Education for the

state of Massachusetts (Tyack, et al., 2001).

When Mann began to tour the schools he found that the schools and their teachings varied from city to city. Mann wanted to establish a public school system called the "common school" (Tyack et al., 2001). The common schools would serve: all boys and girls, and teach a common body of knowledge that would give each student an equal chance in life. It is a free school, it knows no distinction of rich and poor … it throws open its doors and spreads the table of its bounty for all the children of the state … Education then, beyond all devices of human origin, is the equalizer of the condition of men, the great balance wheel of the social machinery (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 29). Living in a free country should also mean that everyone should have the right to a free education.

This may have been true for the White Americans, but the African Americans and those with physical, mental, and emotional disabilities did not have the same rights to a public education. "Until 1950, educational programs serving students thought to have emotional and behavioral disorders were found only in institutions for the socially maladjusted (delinquent) or hospitals for the mentally ill" (Wood, 2001, p. 1). These children found themselves subjected to cruel punishment, neglect and forced labor (Kauffman, 1997). Schools were not expected to teach students with disabilities and they had the right to deny public education to those with disabilities.

In the latter part of the 19th century, the face of America was also changing due to the expanding western frontier:

> The period between the Civil War and the First World War was the era of the development of the modern American school system. Westward

> expansion and the growth of industry, agriculture and population put vastly increased demands upon existing schools and required the building not only of new schools but of whole new educational systems (Pulliman, 1968, p. 61).

Congress passed a law providing that every state needed to put into its constitution that every child will be able to benefit from a free public education (Tyack, et al., 2001). The compulsory attendance laws were enacted in the latter part of the 19th century. "One of the reasons for enacting compulsory attendance laws was the large number of non-English-speaking immigrant youngsters who poured into the United States" (Kauffman, 1997, p. 72). Teachers soon found themselves teaching students who disrupted their teachings and who seemingly did not benefit from school. Before the compulsory education laws were passed these youth would drop out of school only to find themselves roaming the streets and creating havoc:

> Partly out of concern for such problems, the public schools established ungraded classes. In 1871, New Haven, Connecticut, opened an ungraded class for truant, disobedient, and insubordinate children. Soon afterward, other cities followed suit, and classes for the socially maladjusted and "backward" students (those with mental retardation) grew rapidly (Kauffman, 1997, p. 72).

Soon these classes became the place to dump any student that showed sign of mischief or rebelliousness (Kauffman, 1997).

Because of the compulsory attendance laws, by the end of the 19th century, public school enrollment exploded. "Public school expenditures rose from $69 million in 1870

to $147 million in 1890. Public school enrollment increased from 7.6 million in 1870 to 12.7 million in 1890" (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 58). This meant that America was providing free public school to more children than any other nation (Tyack et al., 2001).

From the turn of the twentieth century only half of all school age children actually went to school (Tyack et al., 2001). Those who went to school only went for five years (Tyack et al., 2001). Schools at this time were overcrowded, with drafty and decrepit buildings. Many children felt that they would rather be working than attending schools. "Out of five hundred or so children, 80 percent said they would rather work in a factory than go to school" (Tyack, et al., 2001, p. 5). The Progressive Movement produced "comprehensive high school, tracking, educational testing, home economics, the junior high school, the student council, the daily flag pledge, high-school athletics, the school assembly, etc." (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 181). This movement was geared toward giving the students a moral education and preparing them for the labor work force (Bowles & Gintis, 1976). During this time, "the public school became an arena to Americanize the immigrants. It was to be the center of assimilation, where any trace of foreign culture was to be eliminated" (Berube, 1994, p. 24). The Progressive movement also marks the taking of control of the educational system by the government, (Bowles & Gintis, 1976).

The Progressive movement in education addressed and tried to change these issues. "They lobbied for the enforcement of state laws that banned child labor and made school attendance compulsory. At the same time, they sought to improve the way classes were taught" (Tyack et al., 2001, p.76). Even though they made school attendance compulsory, this did not include those students with disabilities (Yell et al., 1998).

One of the leading proponents of progressive education was John Dewey. John Dewey believed in having a more child-centered curriculum. He believed that:

> If schools were anchored in the whole child; in the social, intellectual, emotional, and physical development of a child, teaching would be different - and learning would be different and schools would be very different, hospitable places for children (Tyack, et al., 2001, p. 77).

Because of the child centered curriculum there was a greater interest in educating youth with disabilities. "By 1910 concern for the mental and physical health of children greatly expanded (Kauffman, 1997, p. 74). In 1914, the first teacher-training program for special education was established in Michigan. Also at this time there was an increased interest in education of children with special needs in the schools versus institutions (Yell et al., 1998). These students were taught in segregated classrooms and were not integrated into the mainstream. There was a general belief that the homogenous classrooms were more beneficial to the students with special needs (Yell, M.L. & Rogers, D., 1998).

Around the time of World War I, schools had the responsibility of Americanizing their immigrant students. Before this war many schools taught in the language of the majority. By the time that the United States was entrenched in World War I, President Roosevelt declared that every school needed to adopt an English only curriculum.

On the heels of World War I, during the progressive period in education, came the idea of IQ testing and tracking (Tyack, et al., 2001). The IQ test was first adopted by the American army to test army recruits for officer positions (Tyack et al., 2001). "By the 1920s over a million children were undergoing IQ tests each year" (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 102). Many thought that this would work also in schools to divide the children into

groups based on their test scores. The children were tracked into different classes that taught them life skills. IQ tests were also used for placement of students into special education classrooms (Safford, P. & Safford, E., 1996). Many objected to the tests saying that the tests were subjective and that they unfairly placed students of a different culture and race at a disadvantage, (Tyack, et al., 2001). Others objected to the placement of students in special classes, stating that once a student is identified as having special needs and placed in special classrooms, they are stuck there for the rest of their academic career (Safford, P. & Safford, E., 1996).

"By 1930, sixteen states had enacted laws allowing local school districts to recover the excess costs of educating exceptional children and youths" (Kauffman, 1997, p. 74). Around the time of the Great Depression school enrollment increased drastically due to the widespread unemployment (Tyack et al., 2001). As a result of this, the schools faced with financial hardships and over-crowding, funding for special classes was cut and the state of segregated classrooms soon rivaled institutions with their disregard of human rights (Yell, M.L. & Rogers, D., 1998). The 1930s and 1940s did see an increase in enrollment in special education and the majority of those classes aimed at educating those with mental retardation. There were few programs at this time aimed at educating youth with emotional or behavioral problems (Kauffman, 1997).

The 1950s marked a dramatic change in America's schools. The 1950s were a time of political and social unrest. The United States was in the throws of the Cold War and the beginnings of civil unrest. The government was concerned about school curriculum and minority groups wanted the desegregation of the schools:

The promise of public schools from the time of Jefferson, Horace Mann,

> and the early proponents of common schooling was that all students were entitled to a quality education and to be educated together … In the 1950s, however that simply was not the case, especially for African Americans and people with disabilities (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 132).

This changed with the 1954 Supreme Court ruling, stating that segregation was not constitutional. This was the turning point for the civil rights movement. The Court held in *Brown V. the Board of Education* that segregated schools were unconstitutional and that separate does not mean equal (Yell et al., 1998). This case was decided under the Equal Protection Clause of the fourteenth amendment. It provides, "that the states may not deny any person within its jurisdiction equal protection under the law. If the states have undertaken to provide an education to its citizenry, then they must do so for all its citizens" (Yell, M.L., & Rogers, D., 1998, p. 3).

The continued fight for equality gained momentum in 1964 with the signing of the Civil Rights Act. "The Civil Rights Act of 1964 banned discrimination on the basis of race in all federally funded programs, including school" (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 146). The Civil Rights Act also opened the way for women and persons with disabilities. During the 1960s and the 1970s the educational system had to face the challenges of the civil rights movement. More and more people were calling for equality in education and for the right of everyone to learn (Yell, M.L. & Rogers, D., 1998). This was to be the start of the equity movement in school education (Berube, 1994).

The civil rights movement ended the segregation of schools and it aimed at creating a more equal educational environment. That movement opened the door for other disadvantaged groups. Advocates for this group saw the movement as an

opportunity to gain more rights for people with disabilities. It would not be until 1973, that the declaration of civil rights was made for people with disabilities, called Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (Paul, Churton, Morse, Duchnowski, Epanchin, Osnes, & Smith, 1997). This was the first major step Congress took to ensure that people with disabilities were not discriminated against based on their disabilities. Section 504 stated that, "no otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States...shall solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any activity receiving federal financial assistance" (Yell M.L., & Rogers, D., 1998, p. 8). A handicapped person was identified as having a physical or mental impairment that limits his/her participation in life's activities (Yell et al., 1998).

Many advocates for children with disabilities believed that the students should be educated within the school that they would attend if they did not have a disability and with their non-disabled peers (Yell, M.L., & Rogers, D., 1998). One of the most significant victories for students with disabilities and their families was the passing of the Education of the Handicapped Children Act of 1975 or Public Law 94-142 (Paul, Churton, Morse, Duchnowski, Epanchin, Osnes, & Smith, 1997).

> This law provided that every student with disabilities had the right to a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment: This act, which reflected the major principles set forth previously in the courts, established the right of all children to a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. It included, among other things; provisions for culture-fair assessment, individual educational

programs, and the participation of parents in decisions about the education of their children" (Paul et al., 1997, p. 18).

The focus of the 1970s was to create teacher education programs that would meet the needs of P.L. 94-142. "It was during this period that the traditional teacher education and research programs in special education, which were relatively few in number in the 1960s, were greatly expanded" (Paul et al., 1997, p. 19). Soon colleges started offering teacher education programs focusing on the education of the special needs population. P.L. 94-142 was as significant a victory to the students with special needs as the Supreme Court decision of Brown V. the Board of Education.

"The third great reform movement began in the early 1980s and was dubbed the excellence reform movement. It was triggered by the U.S. Department of Education's 1983 report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform"* (Berube, 1994, p. 93). "The report focused on the economic consequences of the lack of preparation of students graduating from public schools to enter the workforce and, from an international perspective, the relative performance of American students on math science and achievement" (Paul et al., 1997, p. 20). The purpose of this movement was to improve the performances of the students in public schools. "The reforms advocated, among other things, basic changes in the philosophy of education, the management of schools, the curriculum, the professionalism of teaching, and the education of teachers" (Paul et al., 1997, p. 20).

As was common for the other reform movements in education, this movement came at a time when the nation was in an economic crisis (Berube, 1994). In 1983, President Ronald Regan started a campaign for school reform. He stated that "our

agenda is to restore quality to education by increasing competition and by strengthening parental choice and local control" (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 184). The report recommended "higher standards for graduation, more courses in traditional subjects and in the new "computer sciences," a longer school day and school year, and more homework" (Tyack et al., 2001, p. 187).

With this report the education reform went from equity in education to excellence in education. This had an adverse affect on special education. During the equity movement of the 1960s and 1970s when many gains were made for special education students. "Students with disabilities tend to do less well in an environment that values excellence more than equity" (Paul et al., 1997, p. 20). Due to the shift in educational philosophy, advocates for students with disabilities began pushing for the placement of these students in classrooms with their non-disabled peers versus segregated classrooms. Madeline Will, the chief of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped established a federal policy called the Regular Education Initiative (REI) or otherwise known as Mainstreaming (Paul et al., 1997). This policy emphasized more classroom time with non-disabled peers versus pullout programs. Advocates for REI stressed that all children have the right to be educated with their age appropriate peers and to reduce the stigma of pullout programs (Paul et al., 1997).

In 1990 special education was once again being reformed. Public Law 94-142 was amended and renamed, The Individual with Disabilities Education Act or IDEA. In 1997 this law was once again amended, but was not renamed (Hallahan & Kauffman, 2003). The stipulation of this law was that students with disabilities be placed with their non-disabled peers in the least restrictive environment possible (Hallahan & Kauffman,

2003). The corner stone of this was the individualized education program or IEP (Hallahan & Kauffman, 2003). "The process of writing an IEP and the document itself are perhaps the most important features of compliance with the spirit and letter of IDEA (Hallahan & Kauffman, 2003, p. 31).

The IEP shows the student's represent level of performance and the student's needs. The IEP also has goals and objective for the teacher to meet the student's needs (Hallahan & Kauffman, 2003). Each IEP is different and there is not a standard formula that all schools use. For example students with emotional behavioral disorders would have an IEP that is geared towards the social and emotional aspects of their education versus the academic aspects. If the IEP is prepared properly the following criteria has been met:

> The student's needs have been carefully assessed. A team of professionals and the parents has worked together to design a program of education to meet the student's needs. Goals and objectives are clearly stated so that progress in reaching them can be evaluated (Hallahan & Kauffman, 2003, p. 31).

The IEP was the corner stone of IDEA and inclusion was the new movement to come out of IDEA. The REI or Mainstream Initiative was renamed Inclusion during this time. Inclusion is defined as:

> All students with disabilities - no matter the types or severities of disabilities - attend only classes in general education. In other words there are no separate special education classes. All students with disabilities attend their neighborhood schools (i.e. the ones that they would normally

> go to if they had no disabilities). General education not special education assumes primary responsibility for students with disabilities (Hallahan & Kauffman, 2003, p. 44).

Inclusion is not without its critics. Many say that due to the severity of some students' disabilities and the increasingly demanding teaching environment, the inclusion of all students despite their disabilities is not possible (Helfin & Bullock, 1999). Students with Emotional Behavioral Disorders are often cited as being the most difficult to include and often are the exemplars of the inclusion movement. Some experts even state that the including of students with EBD may hinder the inclusion of others with disabilities (Helfin & Bullock, 1999).

With the new millennium came new ideas on educational reform. President George W. Bush believed that every child can learn and that schools should be held accountable for the education of each individual student. He assumed, "that every child can learn basic skills, essential knowledge, and higher-order thinking skills. The phrase "No child left behind" became the mantra of the 2000 presidential election" (Berube, 2002, p. 62).

In June of 2002, President George W. Bush set forth a new educational policy titled "No Child Left Behind Act." This policy set out to change how our educational system is run and it is to hold each teacher and each school accountable for every student's performance (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). "The *No Child Left Behind Act* brings new thinking and new resources to the challenge of educating all of the nation's children" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 3).

The *No Child Left Behind Act* is especially detrimental to those students with

disabilities, especially those with emotional behavioral disabilities. According to the current administration, schools in the United States are failing to appropriately educate children. The administration's focus in not on buildings, particular groups of children, or even who the children are that are being educated. The focus is primarily on the qualifications and preparation of the teachers. In the *Executive Summary of Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge, The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality,* Rod Paige, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education states, "President Bush said recently, 'We give our teachers a great responsibility: to shape the minds and hopes of our children. We owe them our thanks and our praise and our support.'" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p.vii). To that end, the *No Child Left Behind Act* requires that all teachers in core academic subjects be highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

A highly qualified teacher is viewed as such: 1) the teacher has a full state certification or has passed the teacher licensing exam. 2) The teacher cannot have an emergency or provisional license or have had any of the licensure requirements waived. 3) New incoming teachers face even stricter guidelines than their predecessors:

> An elementary school teacher who is new to the profession, means that the teacher holds at least a bachelor's degree; and has demonstrated, by passing a rigorous State tests, subject knowledge and teaching skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and other areas of the basic elementary school curriculum (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 5).

A middle school or high school teacher needs to have a bachelor's degree and to pass competency exams in the area that he/she teaches in. Also a new middle school or

high school teacher needs to have, "successful completion, in each of the academic subjects in whom the teacher teaches, of an academic major, a graduate degree, coursework equivalent to an undergraduate academic major, or advanced certification or credentialing" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 5). Congress indicates that the more qualified the teacher, the more successful the students in their classrooms will be.

Additionally, the summary states that Congress defines highly qualified teachers as those who not only posses full state certification, but also have a "solid content knowledge of the subjects that they teach." (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p.vii). Congress has determined that by fall of the 2005-2006 school year, all new elementary teachers will need to pass tests in subject knowledge and teaching skills in math, reading, and writing. Middle and high school teachers will need to pass rigorous subject-matter tests or have the equivalent of an undergraduate major, graduate degree or advanced certification in their respective fields. According to the research in this report, only teachers with strong academic backgrounds in their subject areas are most likely to improve student performance, but is this what children with EB/D need?

The report states that schools of education and formal teacher training are failing to produce the types of highly qualified teachers that are required from the [No Child Left Behind]. Highlighted are:

1 Only 23 states have implemented teacher standards tied to their respective academic content standards for grades K-12.

2 Academic standards for teachers are low.

3 Forty-five states have developed alternatives routes into the teaching profession.

4 States are increasingly relying on teachers who are hired waivers and lack full certification, or teachers that are hired on a provisional licensure (this will be phased out under the new law) (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. viii).

The report describes highly qualified teachers, in regards to their preparation in content knowledge as opposed to components such as pedagogy or teaching practicum. The report states that research has found teacher quality to be a key determinant in the success of students. The report also states the large-scale studies suggest that teacher quality is more closely related to student achievement than any other factor (i.e. class size, spending, and materials). While the report to Congress does not cite research sources, it does cite smaller studies, stating that researchers have concluded that "according to some estimates, the differences in annual achievement growth between having a good teacher and having a bad teacher can be more than one grade level of achievement in academic performance" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p.7). The report draws the implication that teacher quality (defined as content knowledge) is of paramount importance, that students that are unfortunate to have several bad teachers will be at "devastating odds against success" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p.7).

With regard to teacher preparation, the report states, "Scientific evidence also raises the question about the value of attendance in schools of education" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p.8). But that the emphasis on seriously improving the state of the schools in the United States is that "the best available research that solid verbal ability and content knowledge are what matters most" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p.9). The social and emotional aspects of the students and the curriculum are left out in this report and teacher training institutions are not being trained

to deal with the behaviors that will crop up in the classroom, especially with the inclusion of EBD students (Scott, 2002).

There is a fear within the special education community that the "No Child Left Behind Act" will be detrimental to the inclusionary environment and especially in regards to those students with EBD. With Public Law 105-17, stating that students with disabilities have to take the same state and general assessments as their non-disabled peers would and be graded the same as if they were not disabled (Yell et al., 1998). These children are already facing a better than 50% dropout rate. Clearly, this number will increase dramatically.

CHAPTER THREE

SUMMARY

"Study after study over the past three decades has indicated that some 6% to 10% of children and youths have emotional or behavioral problems that seriously impede their development and require treatment if these students are to function in school and in the larger society" (Kauffman & Lloyd, 1995, p.2). Many of these children have had behaviors that were serious enough to have had them placed in another classroom or facility.

With the Inclusion Movement many of these children will now be placed in a general education classroom and many of their teachers have not been prepared to deal with their taxing behaviors (Kauffman, et al, 1995). Students with EBD need to have a curriculum based on their assessment, IEP goals and objectives. Students with EBD typically have goals that are geared towards dealing with emotions and behaviors in order to function fully in every day life:

> Given what we know about effective programming for students with emotional behavioral disorders, the outlook for public schools' resources in the foreseeable future, and the movement to include all students with disabilities in regular schools and classes, we need to assess the probability that inclusion will produce the results that we want (Kauffman et al., 1995, p. 4).

A central issue in regards to dealing with social/emotional/behavioral issues is in the typical approach of punishment, reprimands, and response cost. All of these approaches may suppress behavior (at best) but offer no substitute. (Long & Morse, 1996) Before a child with EBD can be successful in the regular education classroom, pro-

social instruction must occur. Goldstein, describes the need to prepare the curriculum (Long & Morse, 1996). He contends that the EBD teacher must develop the curriculum around the students needs, define the purpose of the curriculum, the planned comprehensiveness, the relevance, prescriptive ness, and open-ended needs of the students (Long & Morse, 1996).

Additionally, Bos and Vaughn (2002) describe the factors to consider when determining how significantly the behaviors may impact the student's ability to be successful in the regular education classroom, they are:

1. Persistence of the problem.
2. Severity of the problem
3. Speed of progress
4. Motivation
5. Parental response
6. Other teachers' responses
7. Relationship with the teacher
8. Instructional modifications and style
9. Adequate instruction
10. Behavior-age discrepancy (p. 4-5)

The authors state that educators must remember that students whose behavior problems are so severe, warrant special assistance that may involve a wide range of support services including but not limited to academic support, counseling, individualized instruction, a teaching assistant, and full-time instruction in the EBD classroom (Bos & Vaughn, 2002).

The decision to include students with EBD in the general education classroom must be determined by the IEP, not the general school philosophy (Bos and Vaughn, 2002). Peterson and Hittie (2003) state that although many students with EBD are included in the general classroom, supports for these students are typically inadequate. They state that the treatment of students with EBD in the general education classroom often exacerbates their problems. Peterson and Hittie (2003) contend that some schools have made proactive efforts to include students with EBD and the key is to develop collaborative and flexible supports through partnership of professionals, family, friends, and community.

When considering the placement of these students in regular classrooms the following things need to be considered:

1. How will the non-disabled class members be affected by the behavioral and educational modifications that are made?
2. How will the parents of the non-disabled students feel to have a highly aggressive and volatile student in the classroom?
3. If special schools and classes are eliminated how will school personnel deal with behavioral issues and to ensure that the rights of the EBD student are not violated?
4. What are the benefits to the EBD student to be included into regular classrooms?
5. Will training be given to the regular education teachers so that they will have the skills necessary to deal with any behavior problems that may erupt in their classroom?

6. What assessment will be used to evaluate the success or failure of the inclusion movement (Kaufman & Lloyd., 1995, p. 4-5)?

Only a century ago there was an overwhelming agreement that all persons with disabilities should be placed in institutions or other places of learning irregardless of the severity of the disability. This caused "great injustices and the needless exclusion of many individuals from regular schools and communities" (Kaufman & Lloyd., 1995, p. 5). The same could be said for the inclusion movement and the inclusion of all students into regular schools and classrooms regardless of the severity of their disability. "While we attempt to make regular schools and classrooms inclusive in the best sense for as many students as possible, we should not be guided by overgeneralizations or become detached from the realities of classroom teaching" (Kaufman & Lloyd, 1995, p.5).

The staff also needs to be trained in order to be prepared to deal with the many issues that arise with having EBD students in the classroom:

1. Carry in a stressful home problem and act it out in the classroom
2. Misperceive and over react to normal classroom disappointments and frustrations by screaming and threatening others
3. Believe any consequences they receive are because the teacher is hostile and rejecting
4. Have immature social skills and show friendship by teasing, hitting, and name calling
5. Feel guilty for some action and then respond in self-abusive behaviors
6. Justify their aggressive behaviors by blaming others while perceiving themselves as the victims and not as the aggressors (Long, 1996, 123).

It is hard to expect teachers who are academically oriented and not trained in behavioral issues to appropriately handle the aforementioned behaviors when they arise (Long, 1996).

In order for students to be successfully included full time into the general education population the following things need to happen:

1. The school staff must meet and agree to participate in the Inclusion Movement. This means a willingness to participate in an ongoing training in this area.
2. An emotionally disturbed student should not be administratively assigned to a classroom teacher. A mutual process should take place to find the best fit between the teacher and the students. The receiving classroom teacher also must be willing to serve as this student's advocate
3. The support staff, including the principal, must agree to participate in advanced crisis-intervention training in order to have the skills to support the classroom teacher and the student during times of conflict.
4. The classroom group must be open to accepting new students or at least not scapegoat or reject them.
5. The emotionally disturbed student must function no more than two years below the academic norm of the classroom, be motivated to keep up with the daily academic assignments, use the support staff and make a personal commitment to this placement (Long, 1996, p.124).

There is also a worry that full inclusion in schools may lead typically, to developing students to leave the public school system and enroll in private schools. This

will cause the resegregation of our schools and the schools would be failing to provide the students with an equal opportunity education.

With the "No Child Left Behind Act" all schools are held accountable for their students' testing, many administrators may decide that they do not want special education students lowering their schools ability to meet the state standards (Hauffman & Kauffman, 2003). With all of the empirical evidence that indicates the current failure rate of students with EBD, the new standards of "No Child Left Behind" will leave these children even further behind.

REFERENCES

Berube, M.R. (1994). *American school reform: Progressive, equity, and excellence movements, 1883-1993.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Bos, C.S., & Vaughn, S. (2002). *Teaching students with learning and behavior problems.* Boston, MA: A Pearson Education Company.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America.* USA: Persus Books L.L.C.

Braaten, S. & Gable, R. A. (1995). *Preventing school failure,* 39(3). Public law P.L. 94-142.

Friend, M., & Bursuck, W.D. (2002). *Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education Company.

Gable, R.A., Henrickson, J.M, Tonelson, S.W. & Van Acker, R. (August 2002). Integrating academic and non-academic instruction for students with emotional/behavioral disorders. *Education and Treatment of Children, 25*(4), 459-475.

Gallagher, P.A. (1988). *Teaching students with behavioral disorders.* Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co.

Gunter, P.L., Coutinho, M.J. & Cade, T. (2002). Classroom factors linked with academic gains among students with emotional behavioral problems. *Preventing Failure, 46*(3), 126-132.

Hallahan, D.P., & Kauffman, J.M. (2003). *Exceptional learners introduction to special education.* Boston, MA: Person Education, Inc.

Helfin, J.L. & Bullock, L. M. (1999). Inclusion of students with emotional/behavioral disorders: A survey of teachers in general and special education. *Preventing School Failure, 43*(3), 1-19.

Horn, R.A. Jr. (2002). *Understanding educational reform.* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Kauffman, J.M. (1997). *Characteristics of emotional and behavioral disorders of children and youth.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Kauffman, J.M. & Lloyd, J.W. (Mar95). *Inclusion of All Students With Emotional or Behavioral Disorders? Let's Think Again,* 76(7), 1-7.

Long, N.J., & Morse, W.C. (1996). *Conflict in the classroom.* Austin, TX: PRO-ED, Inc.

Paul, J.L, Churton, M., Morse, W.C., Dunchnowski, A.J., Espanchin, B., Onses, P.G., & Smith, R.L. (1997). *Special education and practice.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Peterson, J.M., & Hittie, M.M. (2003). *Inclusive teaching creating effective schools for all learners.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Pulliman, J.D. (1968). *History of education in America.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merril Publishing Company.

Safford, P.L., & Safford, E.J. (1996). *A History of Childhood Disability.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Scott, T.M. (Fall 2002). Removing roadblocks to effective behavior intervention in inclusive settings: Responding to typical objections by school personnel. *Beyond Behavior, 12*(1), 21-26.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1996). *Controversial issues confronting special education divergent perspectives.* Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Sutherland, K.S., & Wheby, J.H. (2001). Exploring the relationship between increased opportunities to respond to academic requests and the academic and behavioral outcomes of students with EBD. *Special Education, 22*(2), 113-121.

Tyack, D., Anderson, J.D., Cuban, L., Kaestle, C.F. & Ravitch, D. (2001). *School: The story of American public school.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

U.S. Department of Education; Office of Postsecondary Education, Office Policy Planning and Innovation. (2002). *Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The secretary's annual report on teacher quality.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1-66.

Yell, M.L & Rogers, D. (1998). The legal history of special education: What a long, strange trip it's been. *Remedial and Special Education,* 19(4), 1-14.