
Learning and Literacy Programming

Calgary Board of Education - Year 3 - Final Report

Shahz Ashraf, Researcher Analyst, Office of the Chief Superintendent
Jennifer Batycky, Specialist, Learning Support

2009-2010

Learning and Literacy

INTRODUCTION

The Learning and Literacy Program research is in its third year. This year involved continuing research in the phase 1 and 2 schools. The research also expanded to include phase 3 schools. In total fourteen schools participated in this process. The schools that participated were:

Area I

Division II (4-6)

- Captain John Palliser (year 2)

Division III (7-9)

- Arbour Lake (year 3)
- Montgomery (year 2)

Area II

Division II (4-6)

- Huntington Hills (year 2)

Division III (7-9)

- George P Vanier (year 2)

Area III

Division II (4-6)

- Keeler (year 1)

Division III (7-9)

- Ernest Morrow (year 1)
- Sir Wilfred Laurier (year 1)

Area IV

Division II (4-6)

- Earl Grey (year 3)

Division III (7-9)

- AE Cross (year 2)

Area V

Division II (4-6)

- Ethel M Johnson (year 3)

Division III (7-9)

- Louis Riel (year 3)
- Harold Panabaker (year 3)
- Nickle (year 3)

Learning and Literacy Programming is characterized by students placed in Learning and Literacy (L&L) programming situated together with a community school class. Teachers plan and team teach the blended class in all areas at the Elementary level and in a minimum of core subjects in the Jr. High level. The team teaching environment allows two teachers to be available in the classroom setting in order to be flexible in providing greater support for the L&L students in a blended environment. Additionally, this initiative is designed to provide assistive technology to L&L students placed to access necessary learning tools to accommodate their learning needs.

The program focus supports a change in pedagogy to better meet student needs who have been identified with Learning Disabilities (coded 54) within the Calgary Board of Education. It has been designed and resourced to ensure all Key Components of Programming for Students with Learning Disabilities are built into the program and are consistently maintained.

This third year research has attempted to establish the impact this program has had on student learning and to evaluate how the program components are being implemented at the schools involved. The goal of this report is to provide system direction for the L&L program and to provide some recommendations for how to continue to move the program forward in a consistent systemic manner.

Research Questions

The primary goal of this evaluation focused on three primary questions:

- 1) How has the blended L&L program impacted student's academic and social outcomes?
- 2) In what manner have schools adopted key components of the L&L model?
 - a. Collaborative team planning and teaching
 - b. Parental Involvement
 - c. Administration Support
 - d. Implementation of assistive technology
 - e. Student integration
 - f. Pedagogy
 - i. UDL
 - ii. Multiple literacies

Students' academic outcomes have been monitored through the use of standardized reading assessments and information on this aspect of the program can be acquired by contacting Sara Peden in Learning Enhancement, 403-777-7240 ext. 2272 or sjpeden@cbe.ab.ca.

METHODS

Each of the fourteen schools participated in a multi-layered process that included the following components

- Fall and spring reading assessments for all students in the L&L program
- On-line surveys for students, parents, teachers and administration
- Interviews with teachers, administration and parents
- Focus groups with students
- Classroom observations

Additionally, we went into four school sites (Arbour Lake, G.P. Vanier, Huntington Hills and Ethel M. Johnson) to collect a video documentation highlighting the key components of the L&L program.

FINDINGS

This section will present the overall themes gathered upon review of the qualitative and quantitative data. The responses from the surveys have been included in the appendices. Although the results are woven into this section of the report, the overall results were very positive and reflect the strong leadership in the program system wide and the continued efforts of each school to adhere to program integrity. Given this is the first year of the survey and the high participation rate, it provides some excellent baseline data and some strong support for the blended L&L model.

Within the fourteen school sites there was a varying level of program integrity. It was evident that the majority of schools in the blended models flourished when attention was given to following five components of the program: Teacher Teams, Effective Student Integration, Application of Universal Design for Learning Principles, Use of Assistive Technology, Effective Professional Learning Communities. It was highlighted in the year two report that the model of implementation required greater differentiation in between Jr. High and Elementary settings; however year three has shown that this model can be successfully applied to support the needs of L&L students in highly effective ways, regardless of student grade divisions, when strong administrative leadership is effective in cultivating these five components.

Teacher Teams

Under this umbrella excellent models of best practice were observed in many different sites. 62.9% of teachers who responded to the survey felt this model has helped develop their team teaching skills. While the actual application may have varied, the underlying philosophy was that both teachers were responsible for the learning of all students. Teachers who planned together based upon the strengths each teacher brought to the team, and then supported each other in the classroom delivery, created an effective partnership for student learning. At the elementary level this was most effective when two teachers were assigned to one group of students and in the words of one team of teachers,

“We look at our students as a group and how each one needs to be supported. We plan together, we teach together and we focus on the L&L students together. We do our I.P.P’s together and we write report cards together. Two heads are always better than one on anything we approach in our classroom”.

In several settings, this spirit of collaboration expanded to the whole Division II setting as groups of teachers worked together with larger groups to attend to planning and teaching in a model that would allow for a greater number of differentiated groupings based upon learning styles compared to ability levels. Although initial implementation of team teaching in a traditional Jr. High model was clearly difficult, successful schools have worked in creative ways to foster the relationships among teaching teams to benefit students. The most successful Jr. Highs created models where blocks of instructional time for students was combined based upon a Humanities and Math/Science approach. This resulted in the number of team partners being reduced for L&L teachers, increasing opportunities for teachers to plan and teach together. In some Jr. High settings one teacher may have as many as five team teaching partners, providing for very little opportunity for common planning time and therefore a fragmented curriculum delivery. One Jr. High teacher shared that he believed there were huge benefits to his teaching as he has the opportunity to team with a teacher with expertise in learning disabilities. He felt that as a result, he was better able to see how to modify and adapt his lessons for his regular students.

This was also evident in student responses, as students felt supported by many teachers and felt a connection to several adults in the building rather than one. One student in grade nine reported, “I like always having more than one teacher because you know there is always someone who can help you. I wish we could have even more teachers in our classroom.” Or a grade six student who said, “Two teachers are way better than one because it means there are more teachers to help you when you get stuck. In my old class I always had to wait a long time to get help and it made me way more frustrated at school”. In the survey responses, 40.1% of the Jr. High students strongly agreed that being in a room with two teachers helped them to learn better. Also, 53.8% of parents strongly agreed that two teachers more effectively help their child learn core academics.

However, in order for the teaming model to be successful at any level it must be supported by school Administration through the creation of common planning time, timetables that have larger blocks of learning time and fostering a culture of “teachers for students” compared to “teachers for subjects”.

Effective Integration of Students

“Academically the benefit has been huge, they have the modeling of what needs to be done, what needs to happen. Standards are higher in an integrated setting for the L&L students....” *Math/Science Teacher, Grade 7*

“This is the way we should be teaching students who are identified with learning disabilities. They come in grade seven and if they have been in traditional settings, they feel stupid We spend grade seven building self-esteem and helping students be advocates for their own learning.

In the integrated model they see themselves as learners and are part of a learning group.” *Jr. High Principal*

“I like being in the room with all the kids better. It doesn’t make you feel like it is a special program. It makes you feel just like you are getting extra help” *Grade six student*

“Being integrated is easier for me. I like it because you get to be with your friends and when you do group work you have more options for who can be in your group. I also like that you can work with your friends and your assignments get broken down into parts, so you can pick the parts that you can do and you don’t feel stupid.” *Grade nine Student*

“The blended model has created some good opportunities for students who are designated L&L and the community students. There have been so many opportunities for all students to be supported in a variety of manners. You can’t tell the difference when you walk into a room between the L&L and the regular students, they are all part of one group who benefit from each other socially, emotionally and academically.” *Elementary Principal*

In particular the aspect of integration was the concept that was most embraced and received the greatest level of support during the interviews and was very clear in the survey results. Given the overall responses, it would be harder for the L&L program to go back to a segregated program than to proceed forward addressing the difficulties associated with the program change. Again, while integration has been quickly adopted in a more seamless manner in the elementary setting, the Junior High students are benefiting immensely with respect to social skills and general self-esteem perceptions. However, it was observed that some sort of small group L&L time was helpful for the students. In one school this came in the form of a “technology option” which positioned students as the “experts” of technology in their core classes. In another school, it was the weekly guided reading opportunities. Academic integration did appear to be more difficult in some core subjects at some Jr. High schools in part due to the widening gap of student academic ability. However when other factors such as team-teaching and principles of UDL were in place, the integration appeared to be more seamless.

Application of Universal Design for Learning Principles

Universal Design for Learning calls for ...

- Multiple means of representation to give learners various ways of acquiring information and knowledge
- Multiple means of action and expression to provide learners alternatives for demonstrating what they know
- Multiple means of engagement to tap into learners’ interests, offer appropriate challenges, and increase motivation

(Retrieved June 17th, 2010 from: <http://www.cast.org/research/udl/index.html>)

In settings where teachers were applying principles of UDL to their whole class, it was more apparent that the L&L students felt included in the true classroom work and appeared to be more engaged. It was clear that teacher teams applying principles of UDL were providing a more responsive educational program for all students in their classroom. Teachers, who previously taught the regular community class, repeatedly articulated a shift in their practice with respect to UDL once the blended model was implemented and recognition that UDL benefited all their students. We observed some exemplary practice in this area with teachers who created big questions and multiple entry points for students within these large studies. One teacher created visual journals for all students to document their learning, allowing all students to demonstrate their learning in creative ways and from a strength based approach. In many settings, teachers remarked that because of UDL all students were made aware of themselves as learners and were able to understand what tools they needed to help them learn or show what they know. As one teacher noted in her own application of UDL to her Jr. High setting, “The work isn’t bigger, but it is different”. Assessment for and of learning was stronger in classrooms with an emphasis on UDL, contributing to the responsive nature of the curricular programming. However, this also appears to be the section of the work to which teachers were applying a lot of their focus in creating lessons with a UDL approach, and some system wide sharing of best practices relative to specific units of study would be an asset.

In settings where core content was the focus and the primary delivery was worksheet based, L&L students were not provided the range of opportunities to engage in the academic work. Additionally, there was a large discrepancy between Elementary and Jr. High student responses in terms of their perception of being able to demonstrate their knowledge beyond written work and tests; elementary students strongly agreed 67.9% compared with 38.8% of Jr. High students. This could be in part due to larger discrepancies in achievement gaps; however it was observed that some Jr. High settings were able to apply principles of UDL when core curriculum was approach with an inquiry-based approach to learning.

Instructional Technology

“The highlight has been watching quite of few of my students enjoy working with their laptops. They are willing, comfortable and confident with their laptops. In our classroom laptops have become more integrated. It has helped the L&L student in their confidence. They view laptops not a something that makes them different but as a tool that helps them. We are using the laptops in an integrated manner all the time” *Grade five/six L&L teacher*

“Teacher change has been leveraged in a diverse integrated setting. Technology was huge in our school. We got our one-to-one teacher laptops at the same time as the integrated model and so the modeling from our integrated classes has been big. The technology piece has helped leverage change in the whole school. It isn’t the only driver but one the rest of the staff has caught onto quickly.” *Jr. High Principal*

While a small minority of students in some of the Jr. High settings feel that having a laptop ostracizes them, the overall data revealed that technology was something the students felt gave them an extra support to make sense of their work and also to express their knowledge. In

approximately 50% of the settings, students in the L&L program were seen as experts in the technology and often sought after for group members due to their level of competence and their access. In interviews with teachers and administrators, it would appear that within their peer groups the L&L teachers also became viewed as “school experts” in technology. Settings where the laptops were used for group projects and seen as learning supports for all students, technology was viewed by students as a tool for academic competence and even excellence. It was clear that the technology provided many more opportunities for students to engage in the academic conversations. In one particular elementary class the teachers made effective use of online media sources (iTunes and Amazon) to purchase audiobooks so that all students could engage in conversations relative to the novel content, rather than being limited to low vocabulary texts. The technology not only gave students ways to gather information, the technology provided opportunities for students to share their ideas with others. The survey results supported the interview results as 73.6% of elementary students and 41.6% of Jr High students felt very strongly about their capabilities with technology to help them learn and show what they know. The use of D2L was also an effective platform to allow L&L students to access pertinent material for review or to allow more time to engage with the assignments. It was observed that the Smartboards were also effective when used in an interactive manner and this gave all students other ways to access and share information beyond pencil and paper tasks.

Certainly issues of software and hardware were presented as posing some obstacles, but the overall concern was a continued hope for funding of this level of technology and a desire to increase the technology among the regular student population. Each school was highly appreciative of the system support and the opportunity to have a specialist come into their schools and help integrate technology into particular content areas. The loss of support in this area, particularly for new teachers entering into the programs will be felt in the programs.

Technology infusion in the L&L program appeared to be the area where teachers identified the most changes in their practice, but also a desire to continue their personal growth in technology integration. Teachers and administrators could clearly see the benefit of the technology and how through the proper application in the classroom students were more engaged. Administrators were 70.6% strongly in agreement that their teachers were capable at implementing the technology provided to support student learning.

Effective Professional Learning Communities

In highly effective programs, the interviews revealed that all teachers from the blended classrooms were involved in meaningful professional learning communities. This enabled teachers to constantly look at student achievement and then in a group in order to adjust practice to ensure success of all students. As one Jr. High teacher said, “We had a whole school focus this year on differentiation, so it helped everyone apply UDL to their own classrooms and we could better support each other.” When teachers were involved in school wide professional learning groups, it was repeatedly noted by administration that their expertise relative to supporting coded students and assistive technology positively impacted teachers from other programs. Additionally, teachers involved in strong PLC groups appeared to be more engaged in a reflective practice which allowed them to constantly assess practice to ensure the learning of all students.

BARRIERS

In this section some concerns are highlighted which were expressed at the majority of the settings. These issues seemed to appear in varying degrees of importance across the programs and appeared to inhibit some of the programs success.

- Staffing
 - In several sites administration expressed frustration in not being able to keep probationary teachers in L&L postings. While an understanding exists relative to the collective agreements, concern over stability in specialized programs was evident.
 - In the placement of new staff. The participation of teachers from “the new teacher cohort” opportunity offered by Calgary Board of Education was viewed as very positive and administration wondered about the opportunities for continuous contract teachers’ involvement in such a program prior to being placed in a special education program through summer institutes or D2L courses
 - It is important that all human resources (i.e. teacher F.T.E.) allocated for the success of the L&L program be dedicated to that program and not redeployed to cover existing gaps in the community program.
- Complex Students Needs
 - Students with multiple and complex special needs are a reality. However, concerns exist relative to students with very severe behaviour disabilities as sometimes one teacher in the blended class spends the majority of his/her time with one severe behaviour student instead of teaching all students.
- School-based class creation
 - Schools where L&L students were placed with a disproportionate amount of other students with special learning needs from the community created very difficult classrooms in terms of instruction and in creating a true integrated model. It is important to ensure that when possible, community students are divided among all classes to create equitable settings.
- Resources
 - Teachers are spending lots of time modifying existing resources or trying to locate resources on the internet that can support students in the L&L program, especially at the Jr. High level. Further investigation may be needed for some recommendations for useful resources and greater opportunities to network with other L&L teachers to share resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the qualitative and quantitative data has revealed that the L&L programming model is highly successful. It is the overall recommendation that this model continue to be implemented within the Calgary Board of Education as it benefits the learning of all students, especially ones with identified learning disabilities. Given all the gains, returning to a segregated model would not be recommended. However, the following six recommendations should help to move the system L&L programming forward.

1. School based administrative support is imperative. In settings where the administrators had a clear vision of the system program and worked with the teachers to implement this vision, the program experienced greater success. Some ways in which administrators work effectively to support the program were: timetabling, joint planning time, meaningful professional learning communities, class size, teacher assignments and class composition relative to additional students with identified special needs in the blended class.
2. It would be important for schools to go back to the year 2 specific recommendations and ensure that all of those have been implemented. In our observations, some of the issues presented in year 2 have not been addressed in specific sites and this continues to impact the success of the program for those students and teachers.
3. In the blended model there seems to be some confusion for how to best support the reading and writing needs of L&L students. Continued focus on intentional teaching strategies to the L&L students in the blended model is essential. This appeared to be of higher concern in the Jr. High settings and is reflected in the survey responses. Only 28.8% of Jr. High students who responded strongly agreed that they were more confident in their writing skills.
4. The formation of a teacher network so that teachers can come together and share best practice and resources in a face to face setting.
5. Consideration should be given to creating clearer protocols for school, area and system personnel to access when severe behavior needs arise in individual students. This would assist in creating more appropriate programming when current L&L programming is not meeting needs of students.
6. Teachers should also ensure that they are regularly using the system D2L site for Learning and Literacy. Many of the questions teachers still have are answered in this forum. It is very comprehensive and well maintained with current professional development opportunities.

Appendix 1 Elementary Student Survey Results

3. Please let us whether you agree or disagree with the following questions:					
	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Storngly Disagree	Response Count
1. I feel good about how I am doing in school.	41.5% (22)	52.8% (28)	1.9% (1)	3.8% (2)	53
2. I have friends in my class.	77.4% (41)	17.0% (9)	5.7% (3)	0.0% (0)	53
3. I am excited to come to school and learn.	32.1% (17)	45.3% (24)	20.8% (11)	1.9% (1)	53
4. I feel like I am part of my school community.	62.3% (33)	34.0% (18)	3.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	53
5. I am a better reader now than I was at the beginning of the year.	66.7% (34)	27.5% (14)	5.9% (3)	0.0% (0)	51
6. I am a better writer now than I was at the beginning of the year.	50.9% (27)	35.8% (19)	9.4% (5)	3.8% (2)	53
7. I know how to use lots of different programs and tools on my computer to help me learn or to show what I am learning	73.6% (39)	26.4% (14)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	53
8. My teachers know how to help me use my computer to learn and show what I am learning.	77.4% (41)	18.9% (10)	0.0% (0)	3.8% (2)	53
9. My teachers help me learn in different ways.	77.4% (41)	18.9% (10)	3.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	53
10. I am allowed to show what I know in lots of ways besides written work and tests.	67.9% (36)	28.3% (15)	3.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	53
11. I feel ready to move to a higher grade next year.	64.2% (34)	26.4% (14)	3.8% (2)	5.7% (3)	53
				<i>answered question</i>	53
				<i>skipped question</i>	2

Appendix 2: Jr High Student Survey Results

3. Please let us whether you agree or disagree with the following questions:					
	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Response Count
1. I am satisfied with how well I am doing in my core courses.	21.1% (30)	62.7% (89)	11.3% (16)	4.9% (7)	142
2. I think I am doing better in my core courses than I would be if I were in a class with only one teacher.	40.1% (57)	34.5% (49)	16.2% (23)	9.2% (13)	142
3. I am more accepted by my peers than if I were in a class that was only for students with learning disabilities.	30.9% (43)	40.3% (56)	20.1% (28)	8.6% (12)	139
4. I feel a sense of belonging in my school.	32.4% (46)	41.5% (58)	16.2% (23)	9.9% (14)	142
5. I am more ready for next year than I would be if I were in a class with only one teacher.	33.3% (47)	42.6% (60)	14.2% (20)	9.9% (14)	141
6. Being in a class with two teachers will help me be more ready for High School.	42.3% (60)	35.7% (50)	12.9% (18)	8.6% (12)	140
7. I am a better reader now than I was at the beginning of this year.	38.8% (54)	38.8% (54)	10.6% (15)	11.5% (16)	139
8. I feel more confident about my writing skills.	26.8% (37)	56.5% (78)	10.9% (15)	5.8% (8)	138
9. I know how to use lots of different programs and tools on my computer to help me learn or show what I'm learning.	41.6% (57)	36.5% (50)	14.6% (20)	7.3% (10)	137
10. My teachers know how to help me use my assigned computer to learn and to show what I'm learning.	42.3% (58)	40.1% (55)	8.8% (12)	8.8% (12)	137
11. My teachers provide me very specific instruction that helps me where I need it most.	35.0% (48)	43.1% (58)	12.4% (17)	9.5% (13)	137
12. My teachers provide more than one way for students to learn and they help me to find the ways that will work for me.	43.4% (59)	41.9% (57)	11.0% (15)	3.7% (5)	136

13. Teachers in my core courses do things in ways that get me excited to learn.	22.1% (30)	49.3% (67)	17.6% (24)	11.0% (15)	136
14. Teachers in my core courses help me to show my learning in different ways (not just written work and tests).	38.8% (52)	39.6% (53)	14.9% (20)	6.7% (9)	134
<i>answered question</i>					142
<i>skipped question</i>					0

Appendix 3

Parent Survey Results

2. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:						
	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Don't know	Response Count
1. I am satisfied with how well my child is doing in core courses.	28.8% (15)	61.5% (32)	3.8% (2)	5.8% (3)	0.0% (0)	52
2. I think my child is doing better in core courses than if he or she was in a class with only one teacher.	53.8% (28)	38.5% (20)	3.8% (2)	3.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	52
3. My child's peers seem to accept him or her.	40.4% (21)	36.5% (19)	15.4% (8)	5.8% (3)	1.9% (1)	52
4. I think my child is more accepted by his or her peers than if they were in a class that was only for students with learning disabilities.	26.9% (14)	34.6% (18)	21.2% (11)	11.5% (6)	5.8% (3)	52
5. I believe my child feels a sense of belonging while at school.	44.2% (23)	40.4% (21)	7.7% (4)	5.8% (3)	1.9% (1)	52
6. My child seems ready for next year.	29.4% (15)	45.1% (23)	15.7% (8)	9.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	51
7. I think my child is more ready for next year than he or she would be had they been in a class with only one teacher.	44.0% (22)	40.0% (20)	4.0% (2)	2.0% (1)	10.0% (5)	50
8. By the time it comes, I expect my child will be as ready for High School as possible.	32.7% (17)	42.3% (22)	11.5% (6)	9.6% (5)	3.8% (2)	52
9. My child will be more ready for High School than if they had been in a class with only one teacher.	44.2% (23)	36.5% (19)	3.8% (2)	3.8% (2)	11.5% (6)	52
10. My child is a better reader now than at the beginning of this year.	53.8% (28)	28.8% (15)	15.4% (8)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	52
11. My child knows how to use lots of different programs and tools on his or her computer and they help him or her to learn and to show what has been learned.	40.4% (21)	50.0% (26)	1.9% (1)	1.9% (1)	5.8% (3)	52
12. My child's teachers provide very specific instruction that helps where it is most needed.	42.3% (22)	48.1% (25)	7.7% (4)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	52

13. Teachers in core courses plan learning, in ways that get my child excited about learning.	36.5% (19)	32.7% (17)	15.4% (8)	7.7% (4)	7.7% (4)	52
14. Teachers in core courses help my child to show learning in different ways (not just written work and tests).	42.3% (22)	42.3% (22)	5.8% (3)	3.8% (2)	5.8% (3)	52
15. I have been provided with the information that I need about both the programming provided for my child and how I can support him or her at home.	36.5% (19)	38.5% (20)	15.4% (8)	7.7% (4)	1.9% (1)	52
					<i>answered question</i>	52
					<i>skipped question</i>	1

Appendix 4 Teacher Survey Results

1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:						
	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Don't know	Response Count
1. L&L placed students are meeting higher standards in core courses because they are in an intergrated team-teaching setting.	17.1% (12)	45.7% (32)	15.7% (11)	15.7% (11)	5.7% (4)	70
2. I think L&L placed students are more accepted by peers than if they were in a congregated special education class.	47.1% (33)	27.1% (19)	20.0% (14)	1.4% (1)	4.3% (3)	70
3. I believe L&L placed students feel a sense of belonging while at school (similar to others at this age/grade level).	52.9% (37)	37.1% (26)	7.1% (5)	1.4% (1)	1.4% (1)	70
4. I think L&L placed students are more ready for next year than they would be had they been in a congregated special education class.	25.7% (18)	31.4% (22)	22.9% (16)	15.7% (11)	4.3% (3)	70
5. By the time it comes, I expect L&L placed students to be as ready for High School as possible.	12.9% (9)	45.7% (32)	24.3% (17)	11.4% (8)	5.7% (4)	70
6. By the time L&L placed students are finished high school they will be well prepared for further learning and/or working in adult life.	7.2% (5)	37.7% (26)	23.2% (16)	13.0% (9)	18.8% (13)	69
7. I have placed a significant emphasis on improving reading skills of my L&L placed students.	45.7% (32)	34.3% (24)	11.4% (8)	5.7% (4)	2.9% (2)	70
8. Relative to their own histories and the nature of their reading disabilities, I believe that the reading skills of L&L placed students have improved to a satisfactory degree over the course of the year.	27.1% (19)	47.1% (33)	14.3% (10)	10.0% (7)	1.4% (1)	70
9. L&L placed students know how to use lots of learning technologies						

(e.g. different programs and tools on their computers) that help them access learning opportunities and show what they have learned.	45.7% (32)	40.0% (28)	11.4% (8)	2.9% (2)	0.0% (0)	70
10. I know how to use learning technologies to help students' access to learning and to allow them to show what they have learned.	38.6% (27)	42.9% (30)	18.6% (13)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	70
11. I provide targeted intensive, extensive, and explicit instruction for L&L placed students.	45.7% (32)	40.0% (28)	10.0% (7)	2.9% (2)	1.4% (1)	70
12. I provide more than one way for students to learn and help to find the ways that will work for individuals.	72.9% (51)	24.3% (17)	2.9% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	70
13. We plan activities, or do things, in ways that provide for multiple means of engagement (choice, interest based activities etc.)	71.4% (50)	27.1% (19)	1.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	70
14. We plan in a way that allows students to learn and to show their learning in different ways (not just reading, written work and tests).	71.4% (50)	24.3% (17)	4.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	70
15. We make sure students have multiple ways to get information. Content and concepts are represented in multiple ways.	55.7% (39)	38.6% (27)	5.7% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	70
16. Goal setting and assessment techniques are personalized for students in my class.	50.0% (35)	38.6% (27)	10.0% (7)	0.0% (0)	1.4% (1)	70
17. I provide the information for parents that they need about programming and supporting their child.	42.9% (30)	42.9% (30)	14.3% (10)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	70
18. I have developed team teaching skills.	62.9% (44)	28.6% (20)	5.7% (4)	1.4% (1)	1.4% (1)	70
19. I am satisfied that team teaching is developing well in my school.	34.3% (24)	40.0% (28)	12.9% (9)	12.9% (9)	0.0% (0)	70
20. I have been assigned joint planning time with my team	17.1% (12)	37.1% (26)	20.0% (14)	25.7% (18)	0.0% (0)	70

teachers.						
21. When planning together, my teammates and I consistently use the principles of UDL.	40.0% (28)	41.4% (29)	12.9% (9)	5.7% (4)	0.0% (0)	70
	<i>answered question</i>					70
	<i>skipped question</i>					0

Appendix 5 Administrator Survey Results

1. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:						
	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Don't know	Response Count
1. L&L placed students are meeting higher standards in core courses because they are in an integrated team teaching settings.	47.1% (8)	41.2% (7)	11.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
2. I think L&L placed students are more accepted by peers than if they were in a congregated special education class.	70.6% (12)	23.5% (4)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
3. I believe L&L placed students feel a sense of belonging while at school (similar to others at this age/grade level).	88.2% (15)	11.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
4. I think L&L placed students are more ready for next year than they would be had they been in a congregated special education class.	76.5% (13)	11.8% (2)	11.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
5. By the time it comes, I expect L&L placed students to be as ready for High School as possible.	70.6% (12)	23.5% (4)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
6. By the time L&L placed students are finished high school they will be well prepared for further learning and/or working in adult life.	29.4% (5)	41.2% (7)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	29.4% (5)	17
7. Through my leadership, I have placed a significant emphasis on improving reading skills of L&L placed students.	58.8% (10)	29.4% (5)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	5.9% (1)	17
8. Relative to their own histories and the nature of their reading disabilities, I believe that the reading skills of L&L placed students have improved to a satisfactory degree over the course of the year.	47.1% (8)	52.9% (9)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
9. L&L placed students know how to use lots of learning technologies						

(e.g. different programs and tools on their computers) that help them access learning opportunities and show what they have learned.	70.6% (12)	29.4% (5)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
10. Teachers working with L&L placed students know how to use learning technologies to help students' access to learning and to allow them to show what they have learned.	70.6% (12)	29.4% (5)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
11. Through my leadership, teachers know they need to provide targeted intensive, extensive, and explicit instruction for L&L placed students.	58.8% (10)	35.3% (6)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5.9% (1)	17
12. Through my leadership, teachers understand that they need to provide more than one way for students to learn and help to find the ways that will work for individuals.	82.4% (14)	11.8% (2)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
13. Teachers in my L&L blended classes plan activities, or do things, in ways that provide for multiple means of engagement (choice, interest based activities etc.)	70.6% (12)	23.5% (4)	0.0% (0)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	17
14. Teachers in my L&L blended classes plan in a way that allows students to learn, and to show their learning, in different ways (not just reading, written work and tests).	70.6% (12)	23.5% (4)	0.0% (0)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	17
15. Teachers in my L&L blended classes use goal setting and assessment techniques that are personalized for the students in their class.	58.8% (10)	29.4% (5)	5.9% (1)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	17
16. Teachers in my L&L blended classes communicate program information and individual student support needs to parents.	82.4% (14)	17.6% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
17. Teachers in my L&L blended classes have developed team teaching skills.	58.8% (10)	35.3% (6)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17

18. I have assigned joint planning time for L&L team teachers.	58.8% (10)	35.3% (6)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	17
19. When planning together, teachers in L&L blended classes consistently use the principles of UDL.	47.1% (8)	41.2% (7)	5.9% (1)	5.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	17
answered question						17
skipped question						0