A DETERMINATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS RECEIVING FULL BENEFIT OF THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT CLAUSE OF P.L. 94-142 IN WYOMING SECONDARY INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

Kenneth Wayne Eggleston

A professional paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Science

in

Industrial Arts Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

May 1986

P378
Eg 375
Cop. 2

APPROVAL

of a professional paper submitted by

Kenneth Wayne Eggleston

This professional paper has been read by each member of the paper committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for admission to the College of Graduate Studies.

May. 27, 1986.
Date

Kenneth L. Bullock
Chairperson,
Graduate Committee

Approved for the Major Department

May 29, 1986
Date

Mark S. Anderson
Head,
Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

May 29, 1986
Date

Glenn L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this paper are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgments of source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this paper may be granted by my major professor, or in his/her absense, by the Director of Libraries when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this paper for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Kenneth W. Eggleston

Date May 24, 1986.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank those instructors and friends who helped me pursue this work to completion. Dr. Kenneth Bruwelheide, my major advisor whose professional expertice proved invaluable, I appreciated your personal support and encouragaement. Thanks go to my committee members, Dr. Doug Polette, the main reason I chose to come to Montana State University, and Dr. Diane Peters, who gave special meaning to my program. A special thanks to two friends, Mr. Bill Edwards and Mr. Ike Strayer, who made this goal come to fruition. To my family: Sandi, my wife, Donnie and Matt, my sons, for without you there would be no meaning to this process.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this writing in memory of my grandfather, Kenneth Y. Eggleston. Thanks, Pop.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL	ii
STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE DATA	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	ix
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Need for the Study	4
Specific Objectives	5
Definition of Terms	6
Assumptions	9
Limitations	10
Method of Investigation	10
Survey Development Phase	10
Survey Delivery Phase	11
Data Analysis	12
Reporting Phase	12
Summary	13
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
Legal Origin	14
The Education for All Handicapped Children Act	17
The Individualized Educational Program	19
Teacher Involvement in the IEP	20
Summary	22
III. METHODOLOGY	24
Introduction	24
Review of Literature	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

		Page
	Description of Procedure	25
	Description of the Population	26
	Description of Survey Instrument	27
	Data Collection	28
	Analysis of Data	29
	Summary	29
IV.	PRESENTATION OF THE DATA	31
	Introduction	31
	Industrial Education Programs	31
	Wyoming Industrial Education Programs Information	33
	Enrollment Information	39
	Instructor Background	43
	Program Implementation	47
	Review/Evaluation	50
	Findings	55
	Summary	58
V.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	59
	Objectives	59
	Conclusions	60
	Recommendations	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY		63
APPENDICES		66
	Appendix A. Cover Letter	67
	Appendix B. Survey Questionnaire	70
	Appendix C. Follow Up Letter	77

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1. Letters And Numbers Used To Identify The Data.....	32
2. Total Number Of Study Participants Responding.....	32
3. Wyoming Industrial Education Programs.....	33
4. Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Ouestion 1: How Many Students Are Enrolled In Your Overall Industrial Education Classes?.....	34
5. Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Question 2: Have You Taken Course Work In Teaching Students With Special Needs?.....	35
6. Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Question 3a: During The Last Five Years, Have You Participated In Any Workshop Designed To Improve Industrial Education (Vocational) Instruction For The Special Needs Students?.....	36
7. Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Question 3b: If You Answered Yes To Question 3a, Please Indicate Which Group Organized These Workshops.....	37
8. Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Question 4a: Have You Had Previous Experience Working With Handicapped Individuals In The Classroom Setting?.....	38
9. Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Question 4b: At What Level Of Education Was Your Experience With The Handicapped Student?.....	39
10. Questionnaire Section B. Enrollment Information.....	41
11. Questionnaire Section C. Instructor Background. Question 1: Experience In Education.....	43
12. Questionnaire Section C. Instructor Background. Question 2: Experience In Industry.....	44
13. Questionnaire Section C. Instructor Background. Question 3: Primary Area Of Specialization.....	45

Tables

Page

14. Questionnaire Section C. Instructor Background. Question 4: Levels of Grades Taught..... 46

15. Questionnaire Section C. Instructor Background. Question 5: Levels Of Responsibility..... 46

16. Questionnaire Section C. Instructor Background. Question 6: Levels of Education..... 47

17. Questionnaire Section D. Program Implementation. Questions 1-9: As An Industrial Education Instructor, What Has Been Your Role In Placing Special Needs Students In Your Class?..... 48

18. Questionnaire Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 1: Do You Or School Personnel Assess Student Performance In Accordance With His/Her IEP?... 50

19. Questionnaire Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 2a: Is All Evaluation Information Documented?..... 51

20. Questionnaire Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 2b: If The Answer Is Yes, By Whom?..... 51

21. Questionnaire Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 3: What Information Do You Provide The IEP Team During And At The End Of The Year?..... 52

22. Questionnaire Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 4: If The Above Information Is Provided, It Is:..... 53

23. Questionnaire Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 5: If You Have A Student Who Is On An IEP And Is Not Performing Well In Your Class And You Feel Other Program Options Should Be Considered, Do You Have Contact With The IEP Team To Discuss Your Concerns?..... 53

24. Questionnaire Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 6: When Do You Have Contact During The Year With Parents Of The Handicapped Students In Your Class?..... 53

ABSTRACT

November, 1975, saw Congress pass the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, PL94-142. One of the most quoted and used part of this legislation used by educators is the Indvidualized Educational Program (IEP). The IEP is most closely linked with the mainstreaming concept which is to accommodate the handicapped child through the provisions of the least restrictive environment component of PL94-142.

It has been ten years since the passage of Public Law 94-142. The intent of the present study was to determine if special education students in Wyoming secondary industrial education programs were receiving full benefit of the least restrictive environment clause of PL94-142.

Analysis of survey data revealed that, of the industrial education instructors responding, a total handicapped enrollment of 525 students was identified. Grades 6-12 in industrial education were included in the data. Wyoming industrial education teachers in the study revealed that 71% had experience working with handicapped students in the classroom. Experiences working with handicapped students were mostly at the secondary level with 71% of the instructors indicating contact at that level. The data indicated that 58% of the handicapped students in industrial education classes were identified with written IEPs.

Survey data also revealed only 11% of the industrial education instructors had been involved in handicapped students' initial IEP meeting. Annual vocational goals and short-term instructional objectives for the handicapped students' IEPs had only 13.4% of the industrial educators' assistance. When asked about identifying special support services for accommodating handicapped students, 8.9% of the industrial education instructors indicated some type of involvement. Of the industrial educators responding to the survey, 4.4% had been assigned to the handicapped students' IEP team. Following the initial development of the handicapped students'IEP, 8.9% of the instructors stated they had examined the handicapped students' IEP and were able to make suggestions prior to final formulation and parental approval. No involvement at all in the IEP development process was reported by 17.9% of the surveyed industrial education instructors.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the late 1970s mainstreaming, a term stemming from Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, was the prime force that focused attention on handicapped students in public education. This act, and parallel state and federal legislation, has been supported by educators who believe that positive values are derived by handicapped students who are educated in the regular classroom. (Lilly, 1970, 37, p.43-48). PL94-142 assures by federal mandate that all handicapped students have available to them a free and appropriate public education.

One of the main concepts brought about by the passing of the PL94-142 legislation was the so-called least restrictive environment component. School administrators and teachers were faced with placing handicapped students with non-handicapped students in a regular classroom setting. This least restrictive environment component, or mainstreaming, refers to the inclusion of handicapped students in the regular educational processes or routines of the public schools with non-handicapped students.

PL94-142 has changed the procedures and processes by which public education must deal with handicapped students. The procedural guidelines of PL94-142 are subject to interpretation by state and local educational agencies, and these interpretations differ. Nonetheless, PL94-142 provides several procedural guidelines designed to bring into alignment all state educational agencies so that the state standards comply with the intent of federal mandate. This mandate states that:

> Public Law 94-142 sets forth procedures to ensure that due process is afforded each handicapped child at every point where educational decisions are made. As soon as a child is referred for potential special education and related services, parents and teachers must be involved. Another procedural safeguard ensures the confidentiality of all the reports and records pertinent to the education of each handicapped child. A third provision of PL94-142 has direct implications for every regular and special educator working with handicapped children. Each local education agency must specify in writing the procedures to be used in the local implementation of the comprehensive system of personnel development established by the state education agency. (Public Law 94-142 Final Regulations, Sec. 121a. 380, 1977)

The tool for attaining the major purpose of PL94-142 is the written Individualized Educational Program (IEP). An IEP is written for each handicapped student to meet that student's special educational needs and related services. Each handicapped student has educational needs that require specially designed instruction to meet unique needs. These educational needs are best met in a least restrictive enviromental setting, or a setting most like a

non-handicapped student. It is important for the IEP to be formulated and designed from input obtained from all members of the IEP committee, including teachers, special education staff, administrators and parents. All IEP committee members should participate throughout the entire time frame of each student's IEP to ensure that all provisions designed to meet the unique needs of the handicapped student are satisfied.

Even though there are procedures and processes for accommodating the handicapped student, the degree of successful implementation of the mandate relies to a great extent on teacher attitudes. There is question, however, as to whether or not legislation has changed teacher attitudes. According to Marilyn Fender, a noted researcher on the handicapped:

> Positive attitudes are a prerequisite to a teacher being willing to modify curriculum presentations, to facilitating a positive group climate in the classroom, and to having positive expectations of behavior and achievement for the handicapped student. (Fender, 1972, p. 2)

Statement of the Problem

The successful mainstreaming of handicapped students into a regular classroom setting depends on many factors. Among these factors are the development of the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) and its use as a process instrument for the cooperation between regular

teachers and the special education staff. The extent of the involvement of industrial education teachers in formulating the IEP and in providing the least restrictive environmental education opportunities in Wyoming secondary schools for handicapped students is not known.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent of involvement of Wyoming secondary industrial education teachers in providing the least restrictive environment for handicapped students in accordance with PL94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.

Need for the Study

Two of the major concerns of PL94-142 that are important to Wyoming industrial education teachers are: (1) that students will be provided a free and appropriate education and (2) that this educational opportunity will be in the least restrictive environment. These concepts also form the basis for the handicapped student's IEP, and "This management tool is a major responsibility of the special-needs teacher, but input from the student, parents or guardian, mainstream teacher, counselor, and administrator should be included to make the IEP as effective as possible." (Lee, 1981, p. 32)

The educational process of accommodating the handicapped student in the least restrictive environment is a very complex issue. The major concerns are the role of the administration in providing services, the preparation of regular classroom teachers in working with the handicapped students and the cooperation between special education staff and subject matter specialists. All of these issues contribute to how well the IEP process is being carried out.

All parties who participate in the IEP process view and contribute to the process from different perspectives. These differences in perspective contribute to the level of effectiveness of the IEP process. As pointed out by Harrington, "Differences in perceptions of IEP program effectiveness and preparation of staff exist between administration and industrial education teachers." (1983, p. 48-49)

Specific Objectives

The objectives of this study were:

1. To determine which secondary industrial education programs in Wyoming are available to handicapped students, and the number of identified handicapped students who are enrolled in industrial education programs for the 1983-1984 school year.

2. To determine the role of Wyoming secondary industrial education teachers in the design, delivery and review of Individualized Educational Programs (IEP) for handicapped students enrolled in their classes.

Definition of Terms

Handicapped Students- Those who are deaf and/or hearing impaired, blind or severely visually impaired, learning disabled, mentally retarded, health impaired, emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, or multiple handicapped. (Fender, 1979, p. 3)

Non-handicapped Students- All who do not fall under the definition of handicapped. (Fender, 1979, p. 3)

Industrial Education- Industrial arts education, trade and industrial education, technical education, or a combination of these programs for junior-senior high school. (Harrington, 1983, p.4)

The following definitions have been taken from the Handbook of Special Vocational Needs Education. (Meers, 1980, p. 341-350)

Due Process- The process through which the child and parents are informed of the pending educational placement and, so, either agree in writing or appeal the placement based upon their rights in Public Law 94-142, Subpart E.

Free, Appropriate Public Education- Special education and related services that are provided at public expense, including pre-school, elementary school or secondary school education.

Individualized Educational Program (IEP)- A written statement for a handicapped child that includes the child's level of educational performances, a statement of annual goals, short-term objectives, specific and related service to be provided, projected dates for initiation of services, deliveries of the services, and the evaluation procedures to be used.

Least Restrictive Environment- A setting in which handicapped students in public or private schools or care facilities are placed to maximize the possibility of an appropriate educational environment for their needs.

Resource Teacher- A specialist who works with children with special learning needs and who acts as a consultant to other teachers, providing materials and methods to help children who are having difficulty in the regular classroom.

The following definitions are taken from a research report by Albright, L. and Preskill, H., (1981), for the Vermont State Department of Education, Montpelier, Division of Vocational-Technical Education.

Development- Those activities and interactions that occur between the vocational educator and IEP team prior to and during the preparation of the IEP document.

Implementation- Activities and interactions occurring between the vocational educator and IEP team during the delivery of the student's program.

Review/Evaluation- Activities and interactions that take place between the vocational educator and IEP team near or at the end of the school year. Student performance in relation to the IEP document is reviewed and evaluated, with a focus on determining the future education and employment needs of the handicapped student.

The following definitions are taken from Exceptional Children (Heward and Orlansky, 1975, p. 174) and serve to clarify the concept of mainstreaming.

Mainstreaming is:

- providing the most appropriate education for each student in the least restrictive setting;

- looking at the educational needs of the students instead of clinical or diagnostic labels such as mentally handicapped, learning disabled, physically handicapped or hearing impaired;

- looking for and creating alternatives that will help academic and vocational educators serve students with learning or adjustment problems in the regular setting;

- uniting the skills of academic, vocational and special education so that all students may have equal educational opportunity.

Mainstreaming is not:

- wholesale return of all exceptional students in special classes or programs to regular classes;

-permitting students with special needs to remain in regular classrooms without the support services that they need;

- ignoring the need of some students for a more specialized program that can be provided in the regular vocational education program;

- less costly than serving students in special self-contained classrooms or programs.

Assumptions

The researcher accepted the view that (a) all high schools in Wyoming are in compliance with the intent of Public Law 94-142; and (b) that all handicapped students in Wyoming have some type of Individualized Educational Program developed for them.

Additional assumptions were the following:

1. The involvement of the handicapped student in an industrial education program is an integral part of his/her education.

2. The resource teacher or special education teacher has the responsibility for the development of the IEP for the handicapped students under administrative direction.

3. All high schools surveyed in Wyoming have either a resource teacher or special education department available to the handicapped student.

4. All handicapped students cannot be successfully mainstreamed into the regular classrooom.

Limitations

1. The respondents will be limited to junior high and senior high school industrial education teachers in Wyoming.

2. Attitudes will not be measured; only the involvement of the secondary industrial education teacher will be reported.

Method of Investigation

A survey research method was utilized in conducting this study. Within this descriptive research framework, the project was organized into four phases: (1) survey development; (2) survey delivery; (3) synthesis of data; and (4) reporting.

Survey Development Phase

Procedures in this phase were directed toward developing a complete state-of-the-art perspective on

industrial education teachers' involvement in developing handicapped students' Individualized Educational Programs in Wyoming. Industrial education programs included in the population were industrial arts education, trade and industrial education, and technical education.

Development of the survey questionnaire was specifically related to objectives of the study. The questionnaire incorporated (a) a structured alternative response form and (b) a limited open-response section.

The survey questionnaires were reviewed and evaluated for clarity and purpose by three (3) faculty members of the Department of Agricultural and Industrial Education at Montana State University. Corrections were made on the questionnaires based upon suggestions provided by the Montana State University group.

Survey Delivery Phase

Questionnaires were sent to 104 industrial education teachers who teach industrial education courses in grades 7-12 in Wyoming. The sample was drawn from 209 industrial education teachers who currently teach in the classroom. The population of instructors was given a number using a random selection method. The Wyoming State Department of Education, Department of Vocational Education, supplied the researcher with a current list of all active industrial education teachers who were in grades 7-12. One hundred and

four numbers were randomly selected from a population of 209 by an Apple IIe computer.

The actual questionnaire, cover letter and self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to the selected sample on April 15, 1984. June 1, 1984, was selected as the final cut-off date for all returns. To ensure the highest possible return, an additional follow-up letter was prepared, but because 75 of the 104 questionnaires were returned by mid-May, the follow-up procedure was not utilized. The final procedure used to increase the return rate was personal telephone calls from the researcher.

Data Analysis

The procedures in this phase included a presentation of data and respective explanation of tables. The structured alternative response categories of the questionnaire provided the data base from which to identify program characteristics. The open-form section of the instrument provided the information for suggested recommendations and general comments.

Reporting Phase

This latter category of the research study was devised to develop and report the final results of the study. The findings derived from the analysis of data provided the information for making conclusions regarding the extent of involvement of industrial education teachers in the IEP process for their handicapped students. Finally,

recommendations were offered concerning the plans and modifications required to integrate the industrial education teacher in the IEP process of accommodating handicapped students in the industrial education classroom.

Summary

An Individualized Education Program (IEP) is a process that demands coordination and participation throughout the entire IEP time frame by all members of an IEP team. The IEP team is mandated by PL94-142 to include a resource teacher, an administrator, a parent(s), a classroom teacher and, if desired, the student. The process of the IEP is broken into three parts: development, implementation and review/evaluation. The deletion of a step could mean the failure of a handicapped student to receive specially designed instruction to meet his or her unique needs. Just as the handicapped student is unique, so is the IEP developed for the student. It is important that the IEP be formulated and designed from input obtained from all members of the IEP team, including teachers, special education staff, administration and parents. It is the purpose of this study, therefore, to see if one member of the team--the industrial education teacher--is involved in the total process of handicapped students' IEPs in Wyoming secondary industrial education programs.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents a review of literature and research since 1978 pertinent to industrial education teachers' active invovement in the design, delivery and review of handicapped students' Individualized Educational Program (IEP), and how that involvement affects industrial education teachers' participation in mainstreaming handicapped students.

Legal Origin

The legal origin for the IEP process is included in several federal legislative bills and amendments that have stemmed from court cases at all levels of the judicial system. In his book, The Impact of Federal Legislation on Special Vocational Needs Programming, John D. Bies points out the importance of federal legislation upon the education of handicapped children when he states:

> Funding for vocational education, specifically for both disadvantaged and handicapped students, was first made available with the passage in 1968 of amendments of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. In these amendments,

> Congress clearly identified the special needs population and authorized specific funding for that group. It should not be assumed, however, that vocational education funding for the special needs population began in 1968. In fact, the special needs group has been provided with federal government assistance and training for over 100 years. (Bies, 1980, p. 29-30)

If this is the case with funding for the disadvantaged and handicapped, one has to question the reasons for the court cases claiming unequal and unfair education for the handicapped student. Dr. Bies explains some of the problems when he states the following:

> Under the Constitution of the United States, Congress and the federal government do not have responsibility for providing public education. By omitting such constitutional provision, education was left as a responsibility of the individual states (at times referred to as states' rights). Following the strictest interpretation of this delegation of power, Congress was reluctant to usurp the powers of the states in regulating educational services.
>
> It was not until the Continental Congress adopted the Ordinance of 1785 that a cooperative relationship between the federal government and education services at the state level was established. Under the ordinance, one section of land was to be set aside for the support of schools within each township. Though the ordinance did not give direct support to schools, it did establish the precedent-setting principle of assisting education at the state level.
>
> The first major legislative assistance that Congress gave to public education and specifically vocational education was provided by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and other subsequent acts. The Smith-Hughes Act was the first to give direct funding to education at less than a collegiate level for the training and upgrading of students in agriculture, home economics, and trade and industries occupations. As vocational education funding was increased, so were the service areas included in subsequent legislation (i.e., distributive education, health occupations, technical education, office education, and industrial education). (Bies, 1980, p. 30)

Vocational training for the handicapped began formally with the passage of the 1963 Vocational Education Act. This legislation had little or no effect on individual states in terms of their involvement in educating handicapped students. The 1963 Vocational Education Act mainly defined special needs terms as individuals, but it did not mandate or earmark the use of funds for a special population. Thus, little was done to serve the group. As a result, programs were randomly selected and haphazardly organized. Because the special population was not being served by vocational education, Congress passed (Public Law 90-576) 1968 amendments to the 1963 Vocational Education Act. These amendments were the first to earmark a portion of the federal funding specifically to special needs students. Another concern during this period was the civil rights of the special needs students. The following excerpt from researchers Tindall and Gugerty (1979) reflects the introduction of civil rights and due process in educating of handicapped student:

> The principles of equal opportunity and due process expressed in the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution and affirmed by Brown v. Board of Education (1954) have also reinforced the philosophical foundation upon which efforts to improve the quality of educational services to handicapped students were built. For many years, the least restrictive alternative did not exist as an option in the design and implementation of educational programs for people with handicaps. These constitutional principles have become fully operational for handicapped individuals only at the insistence of

> concerned parent groups, advocacy agencies and professionals. (p. 2)

Federal legislation and amendments direct and regulate funds for handicapped students. The courts have mandated equal rights for handicapped students, but the most important results of the laws and court decisions have been that handicapped students are in our public schools and assured a free and appropriate education.

Other legal sources that extended educational programs to handicapped children were found in such court cases as Diana v. State Board of Education in California, 1970; Colorado Associaton for Retarded Citizens v. State of Colorado, 1972; and Panitch v. State of Wisconsin, 1974. Toward the latter part of 1972, 43 states had legislation requiring some services for handicapped children. Congress later enacted landmark legislation reinforcing and extending the constitutional rights of handicapped persons: the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Section 504 of Public Law 93-112 (1977). (Shrybman, 1982; p. 5, Harrington, 1983, p.13)

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act

Federal legislation tried to address the problems associated with educating the handicapped. In 1968, amendments to the 1963 Vocational Education Act were passed, requiring that a percentage of federal money be spent on

educating the handicapped. As a result, court cases were filed by or on behalf of handicapped persons seeking the right to free and appropriate education as stated in the law. Not until November of 1975, when President Gerald Ford signed into law the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL94-142), did federal legislation affect the total spectrum of education, especially the classroom teacher.

Public Law 94-142 establishes as a matter of national policy the right of handicapped children and youth to a free, appropriate education in the least restrictive educational setting. The intent of this policy is to provide individual handicapped students with a meaningful education in a setting that is as close to normal as possible, thus ending any unnecessary isolation of the handicapped from their peers and, hopefully, facilitating their post-school adjustment to mainstream American life. (Hughes, 1978, p.76)

As researchers Heward and Orlansky (1980) found in their study on special population in the regular classroom:

> One of the more ambiguous concepts generated from Public Law 94-142 has been the term and concept of mainstreaming. Many vocal supporters of the mainstreaming effort read PL 94-142 to mean that mainstreaming had become the law of the land, when in fact, the law's provision for placing handicapped children in the least restrictive environment was never meant as an order to relocate every handicapped child in a regular classroom. (p.29)

The legislation provided by PL 94-142 establishes the mechanism for selecting and implementing the most appropriate educational program setting for the handicapped student, and that mechanism or process is the IEP.

The Individualized Educational Program (IEP)

In a research report for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University, researchers (1979) reported:

> The tool for attaining the major purposes of PL 94-142 is the written individualized education program (IEP). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL94-142) establishes the requirement to provide each handicapped child (ages 3 to 18 by September 1978, and 3 to 21 by September 1980) in need of special education and related services with a written individualized education program. Important concepts of the IEP should be clarified. "Individualized" means that the written program is related to the educational needs of one person, not a class or group of students. "Education" specifically refers to special education and related services--those elements of the handicapped child's education that require specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of the handicapped person. "Program" means a written statement of what educationally is to be provided the individual who is handicapped; it is not a plan or set of several guidelines upon which a program will be developed. Four components that must be included in the IEP are:
>
> 1. A statement of the present levels of educational performance of such child.
> 2. A statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objectives.
> 3. A statement of the specific educational services to be provided to such child, and the extent to which such child will be able to participate in regular educational programs.

4. The projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services. (McKinney and Seay, 1979, p.3)

As the adage states, use the correct tool for the task and the task will be done correctly. It is viewed by many that the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) is the major tool of PL 94-142, and if the full intent of the law is to be fulfilled, all components of the handicapped student's IEP must be completed. Using the previous definition for program, the only way the IEP process can be successful is to have all parties associated with the handicapped student involved in the student's IEP.

Teacher Involvement in the IEP

Involvement is the key word in the success or failure of the mainstreaming concept. To some, involvement means to inform; to others, involvement is part of a process. In an article written for the American Vocational Association, researcher Leonard Albright reported:

> Unfortunately, students with handicaps have sometimes been placed in vocational programs without the involvement of vocational teachers in the IEP development. In some cases they were totally unaware of the IEP process. A good rule of thumb is that when a student is considered for placement in a vocational program, vocational teachers should be involved in the meeting. Some administrators question the recommendation that the vocational teacher play an active role in the identification and individualized planning phases of programming for the handicapped student on the ground that this involvement requires a substantial investment of teacher time. Though this

> concern is legitimate and an important one, remember that such involvement is a priceless opportunity for teachers to acquire greater understanding of student needs, an opportunity for meaningful input into the program planning process and increased communication with educational specialist and parents. If the teacher is excluded from these activities, on the other hand, he/she may feel a lack of obligation to work with the student and the IEP team, resentment of being dumped on, or fear of the unknown in terms of student needs, interest and performance levels. (Albright, 1979, p.25)

These feelings by teachers of being foisted and the need by most teachers to have knowledge or background about student needs are important considerations. As noted researcher Marilyn Fender (1979) indicates:

> Positive attitudes are the key to the classroom teacher effectively teaching the handicapped. (p.11)

In an article in School Shop, April, 1978, J. H. Hughes came to the same determination:

> Positive attitudes are considered key since they are a prerequisite to being willing to change curriculum and environment in the classroom, to creating a constructive classroom climate, to having positive expectations of the student labeled handicapped, and to working effectively with parents of handicapped students. (p.76)

In support of this theme about positive attitudes, Richard R. Rumble, in a study of Portland, Oregon, public schools, indicated that: "Involvement of more vocational teachers has the potential for enhancing the quality of both the IEP and the vocational program." (1979, p.54)

Continuing the thought on improvement in IEP development being keyed to teacher involvement reseachers at Ohio State University concluded that:

> Vocational instructors will be somewhat limited in making informational contributions to the initial development of the IEP, since they have only recently begun to work with the students. The more experience vocational educators have working cooperatively with parents and special education teachers, identifying individual needs, and analyzing interest, strengths, and weaknesses, the more significant contributions they can make to IEP development. (McKinney and Seay, 1979, p.2)

Procedures and methods "for developing IEPs for handicapped students should be improved, especially with more involvement of the vocational instructor." (Rumble, 1979, p. 54)

Concerning instructor involvement, McKinney, Seay, indicated:

> Additional services and resources from the federal level which may supplement those provided by public education are available through the Rehabilitation Services Commission and under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1975 (PL93-203). Vocational educators are compelled, therefore, to become qualified contributors to the development and implementation of IEPs. They are also obligated to be capable monitors and evaluators of IEP results. (1979, p.2)

Summary

Laws, regulations and rules are in place to guarantee that all handicapped students ages 3-21 receive a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive educational

environment. As mainstreaming receives increasing emphasis in the delivery of vocational education services to handicapped students, "the success of its implementation will depend on the preparedness and receptiveness of the vocational education teachers." (Hughes, 1978, p.76)

One of the keys to teachers' receptiveness to mainstreaming handicapped students is the degree of their involvement in the design, delivery and review of the handicapped student's IEP. Only when total teacher involvement is accomplished will the full effect and meaning of PL 94-142 be realized.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this survey was to collect and analyze data from randomly selected secondary industrial education teachers of grades 7-12 in the state of Wyoming regarding the extent to which those teachers were involved in the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) process of the special needs students enrolled in those programs. Other considerations were the extent of the instructors' involvement in the IEP process, professional preparation of instructors working with special needs students, and educational preparation in course work dealing with special needs students. This chapter identifies the procedures used to obtain and disseminate the information derived from the investigation.

Review of Literature

The review of literature employed for this project facilitated the methodology of the study. In addition to the conventional document retrieval mechanisms, a computerized

bibliographic search from the ERIC data base was utilized to identify the most significant and timely research dealing with special needs vocational education. Vocational special needs surveys were reviewed to assist in designing the format and organization of the questionnaire.

Description of Procedure

Is the full intent of Public Law 94-142 being followed within the secondary public schools in the industrial education classes, grades 7-12 in Wyoming? The survey questionnaire was constructed and presented to selected staff in the Department of Agricultural and Industrial Arts Education in the College of Agriculture at Montana State University for review and recommendations. After the review process, the researcher made the recommended changes and constructed the final draft of the survey. It was determined that a sample of half (50%) of the industrial education teachers in grades 7-12 in Wyoming would be sent a survey instrument. The instrument was mailed April 15, 1984, with a return deadline date of June 1, 1984. A follow-up letter was mailed to all selected teachers in the sample on May 1, 1984. A 68% return was collected by May 11, 1984. Because of the high return percentage of surveys returned the researcher made a determination not to send a follow-up survey instrument.

Description of the Population

A list of all active industrial education teachers in grades 7-12 was obtained for 1983-84 from the State Department of Education, State of Wyoming. The Wyoming certification standards for industrial education teachers were used to construct this list.

Because of the rural nature of Wyoming, the administrative structure of grade levels in schools varies greatly. Therefore, grades 7-12 were considered to be secondary school classes for the purpose of this study. From this list it was determined by the researcher that there were 209 active industrial education teachers in grades 7-12. The sample was 50% for the study, which meant 104 would be sent a survey. The active industrial education teachers in grades 7-12 in Wyoming were randomly assigned a number between 1 and 209. One hundred and four numbers were selected in random order from a total number of 209 numbers by a program (Random Numbers Program) used on an Apple IIe computer. The numbers randomly selected by the computer were then matched with the numbers randomly assigned the industrial education teachers. Those selected industrial education teachers in Wyoming were then sent a survey. These teachers were sent a copy of the cover letter (Appendix A), survey (Appendix B) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope on April 15, 1984.

Description of Survey Instrument

The survey instrument contained five parts: part A, demographic information; part B, enrollment information; part C, instructor background; part D, program implementation; part E, review/ evaluation.

Part A: Demographic Information. This section consisted of four questions that were designed to obtain information on how many total students the industrial education instructors had in their programs, and what training or experience in special education those same industrial education instructors had.

Part B: Enrollment Information. The second part of the survey was designed to obtain information of a very specific nature concerning what categories of handicapped students were enrolled in the programs. A list of seven different categories of handicapped conditions that the students might be identified under was presented. Instructors also were asked what level of IEP involvement they had with these students.

Part C: Instructor Background. Six questions were designed for this section to obtain information about the number of years the instructors had been teaching, type of degree held by the instructor, and the type and level of courses the instructors taught.

Part D: Program Implementation. This section contained questions about the instructors' involvement in identification and placement of the handicapped students in their programs, at what levels of the IEP process there was involvement, and to what degree. This section contained nine questions.

Part E: Review/Evaluation. The last section had six questions about teacher performance expectations of the handicapped student, and how that information is associated with the IEP process in that school or program. Questions asking how information is disseminated to members of the IEP team, or other persons concerned with the IEP process were presented. This entire questionnaire appears in Appendix B.

Data Collection

A cover letter, survey and a stamped, self-addressed envelope were sent on April 15, 1984, to each of the 104 persons in the randomly selected sample. After a three-week period ending May 1, 1984, a follow-up letter was sent to all the selected instructors in the study. June 1, 1984, was the end of the time period allowed to respond to the survey, and the acceptance of returned surveys ended.

Analysis of Data

1. Descriptive data pertaining to the schools surveyed, their size and type of program were obtained from the Wyoming State Department of Education.

2. Additional information concerning special needs student accommodation was obtained from the review of literature.

These data are presented in tables and listings in Chapter IV to permit an overall description of the schools and programs studied.

The data gathered through the survey were tabulated and presented in percentage form. The findings and resultant tabulations are presented in Chapter IV.

Summary

The population of this study consisted of industrial education teachers in Wyoming secondary public schools who teach industrial education in grades 7-12. An instrument was constructed to meet the needs of the study. A random sample was selected, and a survey, accompanying cover letter and self-addressed, stamped envelope were sent out April 15, 1984. The return rate was determined sufficient that a second survey was not sent, but a second letter was sent on May 1, 1984, to the sample requesting the return of the

surveys by June 1, 1984. The data are presented in percentage form in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

The data presented in this chapter follow the same sequential order as the sections that appear in the survey questionnaire (see Appendix B). The presentation of this information will begin with Table 1, which is data collected from section A of the questionnaire survey.

It should be noted that the findings and conclusions of this study were based solely upon the information supplied by the industrial education teachers surveyed. In addition to specific special needs considerations, the information given also reflects on the type of industrial education programs that exist.

As was outlined in Chapter III, Methodology, each major section of the questionnaire corresponds to one of the two objectives of the research project.

Industrial Education Programs

In presenting the data collected via the survey questionnaires, several tables will be utilized. The

letters and numbers used to identify the data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Letters And Numbers Used To Identify The Data

Notation	Category of Program
A	Demographic Information
B	Enrollment Information
C	Instructor Background
D	Program Implementation
E	Review/Evaluation
Question	No. of questions in each category
a,b,c,d	Sub-section of each question
I.E.	Industrial Education Teacher

The total number of survey questionnaires sent out was 104; a breakdown of respondents appears in Table 2.

Table 2. Total Number Of Study Participants Responding

Notation	No. Sent	No. of Responses	% of Responses
I.E.	104	75	72.1

As indicated in Table 2, the total number of responses to the 104 questionnaires was 75. This represents a 72.1% return on one mailing of the questionnaire. Category E of the questionnaire requests data on the IEP Review/Evaluation participation of the industrial education teacher. This review and evaluation meeting of the special needs student's IEP is held in April or May in most Wyoming schools.

Because of this time frame of the IEP process, the questionnaire was sent on April 15, 1984. It was determined by the researcher that on May 1, 1984, a follow-up letter would be sent. The researcher determined that most schools terminate the last week of May, so a second mailing of the questionnaire would not increase the number of returns.

Wyoming Industrial Education Programs Information

With information from the Wyoming State Department of Education, Vocational Education Division, it was determined by the researcher that the number of industrial education programs in Wyoming was 209. The breakdown of data is displayed in Table 3.

It should be noted that the number (N) in the following tables varies because not all respondents answered all sections of the questionnaire, and some questions necessitated more than one response, thus resulting in more responses than respondents.

Table 3. Wyoming Industrial Education Programs (N=209).

No. of Teachers	High School Grade Inclusion of Industrial Education Program
43	I.E. Programs Including Grades 10-12
86	I.E. Programs Including Grades 9-12
23	I.E. Programs Including Grades 7-12
36	I.E. Programs Including Grades 7-9
21	I.E. Programs Including Grades 7-8
Total 209	

Because of the rural nature of Wyoming, the majority of the high schools in the state have enrollments of less than 500. Small high school enrollments force industrial education programs to involve multi-grade levels. As indicated in Table 4, many industrial education teachers teach many grade levels and, as indicated in Table 3, many industrial education programs in Wyoming include grades 7-12 with one teacher covering all levels.

Table 4. Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Question 1: How Many Students Are Enrolled In Your Overall Industrial Education Classes? (N=68)*

Total No. of Classes Reported With:		Total No. of Students in Those Classes
Freshmen	39	1125
Sophomores	45	906
Juniors	45	804
Seniors	46	715
Grades 6-8	3	400
Grades 7-9	6	620
Grades 7-8	7	726
Grades 5-12	1	116
Grades 7-12	3	163
Total	195	5575

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

Wyoming has small populations of students in schools, so most industrial education teachers are involved in instruction of multi-level classes. As indicated in Table 4, 68 teachers responded to their class enrollment. Those 68 teachers were involved in industrial education classes from grades 5-12.

The question posed in Table 5 asks for data on instructor participation in course work in teaching students with special needs. The state of Wyoming requires all certified teachers to have at least two hours of credit in this area.

Table 5. Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Question 2: Have You Taken Course Work In Teaching Students With Special Needs? (N=137)*

Level	Response			
	Yes	Percent	No	Percent
1. Undergraduate	19	18.5%	16	47.%
2. Graduate	51	49.5%	8	23.5%
3. Inservice	33	32.0%	10	29.5%
Total	103	100%	34	100%

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

Data in Table 5 reveals that 49.5% of industrial education instructors took course work directed toward working with special needs students. Another 32% had inservice. This is understandable because of a mandate by the Wyoming State Department of Education that all teachers have at least two semester credits in teaching special needs students by September 1, 1984. As can be noted, 34 teachers responded they had no course work. Data from Table 5 also indicate that the highest number (49.5% of the instructors) have taken course work at the graduate level, while 47% of the no responses appeared in the undergraduate column.

The Wyoming State Board of Education set the minimum at two credit hours and a compliance date of September 1, 1984, to meet the requirements. Question 3a, Table 6, was constructed to see if most teachers participated because of the state requirement. Thus, a time frame of five years was established; see data presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Question 3a: During The Last Five Years, Have You Participated In Any Workshops Designed to Improve Industrial Education (Vocational) Instruction For Special Needs Students? (N=73)

Response	Number	Percentage
Yes	34	46.6%
No	39	53.4%
Total	73	100.0%

The data from Table 6 show that 46.6% of the instructors have taken workshops designed to improve instruction for special needs students.

When comparing Part A, Question 2 with Part A, Question 3a of the questionnaire, 46.6% of the responding industrial education instructors have taken course work in teaching special needs students. However, in more than half of the returns, those courses were taken more than five years ago.

Respondents were then asked if they had taken classes which prepared them for working with handicapped students through a university program or through other educational

programs. This information is presented on Table 7 pertaining to Question 3b.

Table 7: Questionnaire Section A. Demographic Information. Question 3b: If You Answered Yes To Question 3, Please Indicate Which Group Organized These Workshops. (N=57)

Organizing Group	Number
University	19
School Inservice	21
Wyoming State Dept. of Ed. Inservice	17
Total	57

According to the data in Table 7, Wyoming industrial education instructors have had access to workshops in at least three levels of the educational system. This would also indicate that instructors desiring some type of inservice or workshop training in working with handicapped students would have been able to obtain it. It also appears that the university system was not the only delivery system of courses on working with handicapped students.

Researchers at Ohio State University stated that:

> Vocational instructors will be somewhat limited in making informational contributions to the initial development of the IEP, since they have only recently begun to work with the students. The more experience vocational educators have working cooperatively with parents and special education teachers, identifying individual needs, and analyzing interests, strengths, and weaknesses, the more significant contributions they can make to IEP development. (McKinney, Seay, 1979, p. 15)

Data in Table 8 indicates the degree to which secondary industrial education instructors in Wyoming have previous experience in working with handicapped students.

Table 8. Section A. Demographic Information.
Question 4a: Have You Had Previous Experience Working With Handicapped Individuals In The Classroom Setting? (N=70)

Number of Responses		Percentage
Yes	50	71.4%
No	20	28.6%
Total	70	100.0%

An examination of the data from Table 8 discloses that the 71.4% respondents have worked with handicapped students in the classroom, 28.6% have not.

The survey was sent to secondary industrial education instructors. Data in Table 9 asks indicates the level of education which the instructors have experience in working with handicapped students.

Table 9. Section A. Demographic Information.
Question 4b: At What Level Of Education Was Your Experience With The Handicapped Student? (N=64)*

Level of Education	No. of Teachers	Percentage
Pre-School	2	3.1%
Secondary Education	45	70.3%
Elementary Education	12	18.8%
Post-Secondary Education	1	1.6%
Other	4	6.2%
Total	64	100.0%

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

In Table 9 the data show that the majority of the reporting teachers, 70.3%, had their experience at the secondary level with the second greatest contact coming at the elementary level, 18.8%.

Enrollment Information

The second part of the survey was designed to obtain information of a very specific nature concerning what categories of handicapped students were enrolled in the programs.

The analysis of data in Table 10 provides: (1) a breakdown of handicapped student enrollment in the reporting industrial education teachers' programs; (2) the type of handicapped condition of the student, which is indicated in one of eight general categories--visually, auditory, mentally, learning disabled, physically, emotionally

disturbed, speech and learning disorders, and multi-handicapped; (3) the number of handicapped students with IEPs; (4) the number of initial IEP meetings of the handicapped students enrolled where the industrial education teachers were involved; (5) the number of support personnel involved in implementing IEP goals for the handicapped students; and (6) the number of handicapped students in the industrial education teachers' programs whose teachers were involved in the IEP review/evaluation meeting. There was also an opportunity for teachers to respond if not enough information was available to answer.

Table 10. Section B. Enrollment Information

Handicapped Conditions	No. Presently Enrolled in Program	No. of Handicapped Students w/IEP	No. Handicapped Enrolled in Your Program Identified with IEP; You Were at Initial IEP Meeting	No. of Support Personnel Involved in Implementing IEP Goals for Handicapped Student	No. of Handicapped Students in Your Program; You Were the IEP Review/ Evaluation Meeting
Visual	6=1.2%	2=0.7%	0=0%	4=2.5%	0=0%
Auditory	39=7.4%	13= 4.2%	1=3%	15=9.3%	2=3.5%
Mental	38=7.2%	21= 6.8%	1=3%	9=5.6%	2=3.5%
Learning Dis.	295=55.5%	202=66%	30=88%	90=55.9%	48=82.7%
Physical	12=2.25%	5=1.6%	0=0%	1= .6%	0=0%
Emotional	69=12.9	35=11.4%	1=3%	18=11.2%	5=8.6%
Speech/Lang.	14=2.6%	9=2.9%	0=0%	4=2.5%	0=0%
Multi-Hand.	58=10.9%	21=6.8%	1=3%	20=12.4%	1=1.7%
	N=531/99.95%	N=308/106.2%	N=34/100%	N=161/100%	N=58/100.3%

Not enough information available to supply this data about handicapped students: 17

The data displayed in Table 10 show that 55.5% of the special needs students are identified as learning disabled. The second-highest handicapped condition of enrolled students in industrial education classes was emotionally disturbed with 12.9% and 10.9% of the handicapped students were classified as multi-handicapped. Students identified with at least one of the eight listed, identifiable handicapped conditions totaled 531. When compared to the total number of students enrolled in the responding industrial education instructors' courses, Table 4, which numbered 5,575, would constitute 9.5% of that total enrollment. The number of students identified as handicapped and who had written IEPs was 308, 58% of the total students identified as handicapped. Of the handicapped students with written IEPs, 65.6% were identified as learning disabled. Other data that are important to observe in Table 10 include: (1) The involvement of teachers in the initial IEP meeting of visually handicapped, physically handicapped, and speech and language disordered students was reported as zero percent. (2) The involvment of teachers in the IEP review/evaluation meeting of the visually and physically handicapped, and speech and language disordered was reported as 0%. The highest teacher involvement in the review/evaluation meeting was 82.7% in the category of learning disabled. (3) 17 industrial education teachers stated they did not have

enough information to report on the condition of their handicapped student enrollment.

Instructor Background

Part C provides information about industrial education instructors' backgrounds in education and industry. Six questions were designed for this section to obtain information about the number of years the instructors had been teaching, type of degree they held, and the type and level of courses they taught. This information may have a direct relationship to the degree of instructor involvement in the IEP process.

Data in Table 11 provides a breakdown of the number of years each of the industrial education instructors had in education.

Table 11. Section C. Instructor Background. Question 1: Experience In Education. (N=71)

Years of Experience	No. of Teachers	Percentage
0- 3 years	1	1.6%
4- 6 years	12	17.9%
7-10 years	10	14.0%
11-15 years	21	29.5%
15 or more	27	38.0%
Total	71	100.0%

As shown in Table 11, 38% of the responding industrial education teachers had 15 or more years of experience in

education. The second highest was 11-15 years with 29.5%. These two groups make up 67.5% of the responding teachers.

Data in Table 12 indicates the number of years of experience the industrial education instructors had in industry.

Table 12. Section C. Instructor Background. Question 2: Experience In Industry. (N=75)

Years in Industry	No. of Teachers	Percentage
1- 3 years	22	29.4%
4- 6 years	22	29.4%
7-10 years	16	21.3%
11-15 years	8	10.6%
15 years or more	3	4.0%
None	4	5.3%
Total	75	100 %

In examining the data in Table 12, it can be noted that teachers with 4-6 years of industrial experience constituted the highest percentage with 29.4%. Instructors with no industrial background accounted for 5.3%. When comparing Tables 11 and 12, the data would indicate an inverse relationship between the number of years the instructors had in education, 67.5% with 11 or more years, and the number they had in industry, 14.6% with 11 or more years.

Because Wyoming is rural, many industrial education instructors may teach multi-grade levels. Table 13 provides data as to primary area of specialization and number of courses in which the instructors are involved.

Table 13. Section C. Instructor Background. Question 3: Primary Area Of Specialization. (N=171)*

Area	No. of Teachers	Percentage
General Shop	3	20.5%
Drafting/Architecture	32	18.7%
Welding	15	8.8%
Auto/Diesel/Small Engine	13	7.6%
Electricity/Electronics	8	4.7%
Metals	18	10.5%
Crafts	9	5.3%
Woodworking/Building Trades	32	18.7%
Graphics	6	3.5%
Other: General Education	1	.58%
Plastics	1	.58%
Machine Shop	1	.58%
Total	171	100.0%

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

With a return of 75 questionnaires and a number of 171, this indicates that many of the industrial education teachers teach more than one subject area.

Data in Table 13 indicates many Wyoming industrial education instructors teach more than one subject area. Data in Table 14 provide information as to the grade levels taught.

Table 14. Section C. Instructor Background. Question 4: Levels of Grades Taught. (N=116)*

Grade Level	No. of Teachers Responses	Percentage
6th	8	6.9%
7th	22	19.0%
8th	32	27.6%
9th	7	6.0%
High School (9-12)	42	36.2%
Other: 10-12	2	1.7%
Adult	1	.86%
5th Grade	1	.86%
11-12	1	.86%
Total	116	99.98%

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

As indicated in Table 14, many of the teachers teach multi-grade levels with the highest percentage, (36%), teaching grades 9-12.

Data in Table 15 provides information on the instructors' level of responsibility, whether or not it is only as an instructor.

Table 15. Section C. Instructor Background. Question 5: Levels Of Responsibility. (N=66)

Level	No. of Teacher Responses	Percentage
Instructor	45	68.2%
Department Head	0	
Instructor & Department Head	21	31.8%
Other	0	
Total	66	100.0%

Teachers with only instructor duties were the highest percentage (68.2%) with some industrial education teachers reporting multi-duties as instructor and department head (31.8%).

Data in Table 16 offers data as to the educational level achieved by the instructors.

Table 16. Section C. Instructor Background. Question 6: Levels Of Education. (N=102)*

Level	No. of Teachers Responses	Percentage
B.S.	28	27.5%
M.S.	29	28.4%
Ed.D.	22	21.6%
Ph.D.	0	
Certificated (College & Industrial Background)	18	17.6%
Certificated (Industry Background Only)	4	3.9%
Other (Educational Specialist)	1	1.0%
Total	102	100.0%

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

The B.S. and M.S. degrees were reported at 27.5% and 28.4%, respectively. Certificated instructors, those with industry background only, was 3.9%.

Program Implementation

The data in Section D of the questionnaire correspond to research study objective number two to determine

industrial educators' involvement level regarding the implementation of Public Law 94-142. Research by Heward and Orlanski (1980, p. 373) states that "the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) is the primary vehicle by which to measure a school district's compliance in meeting the requirements of PL 94-142." These authors suggest that the competency and effectiveness of special needs vocational implementation may be determined by each program's ability to help students meet the goals and objectives set forth in the IEP. Table 17 presents data regarding the involvement of Wyoming industrial educators' role in implementing the handicapped student's IEP.

Table 17. Section D. Program Implementation. Question: As An Industrial Education Instructor, What Has Been Your Role In Placing Special Needs Students In Your Class? (N=178)*

Involvement	No. of Teacher Responses	Percentage
1. I have had no involvement in the IEP development process	32	18.0%
2. I am involved in the development of the initial Individualized Educational Program (IEP) child study team meeting	22	12.4%
3. I assist in describing the annual vocational goals and short-term instructional objectives for a handicapped student participating in my class	24	13.5%
4. I am involved in identifying the special support services that are needed for accommodating the special needs student (e.g., modified shop apparatus, instructional media, materials, teachers' aids, etc.)	16	9.0%

Table 17 continued

Involvement	No. of Teacher Responses	Percentage
5. I examined the IEP following its development and made suggestions prior to final formulation and parental approval	15	8.4%
6. I have not attended child study team meetings, but have worked with the various resource personnel responsible for implementing the IEP	20	11.2%
7. My administrator has assigned me to be an involved member of the IEP team for all students enrolled in my classes who have special needs	8	4.5%
8. Help in determining how and when student progress is to be measured and reported	13	7.3%
9. I have at least one meeting with the IEP team during the school year to determine progress of the handicapped student in relation to the goals established for the IEP	28	15.7%
Total	178	100.0%

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

The most significant data displayed in Table 17 pertain to question one, which reports 18.0% of the industrial education instructors had no involvement in the IEP development process. Only 4.5% were assigned to be involved as a member of the IEP team. Instructors who had at least one meeting with the IEP team during the year to determine progress in relation to goals of the handicapped student's IEP totaled 15.7%. In question five, where instructors were asked if they made suggestions prior to final formulation

and parental approval, only 8.4% responded they had examined the IEP.

Review/Evaluation

The Individualized Educational Program (IEP) is a process that demands coordination and participation throughout the entire IEP time frame by all members of the committee. The process of the IEP is broken into three parts: development, implementation and review/evaluation. Section E presents data from respondents on their involvement in the third part of the IEP process, the review and evaluation.

Table 18. Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 1: Do You Or School Personnel Assess Student Performance In Accordance With His/Her IEP? (N=67)

Assessment	Number	Percentage
Yes	59	88%
No	8	12%
Total	67	100%

The data in Table 18 indicate that 88% of handicapped students' performances are assessed in accordance with their IEP. Table 19 questions if the information is documented.

Table 19. Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 2a: Is All Evaluation Information Documented? (N=62)

Evaluated	Number	Percentage
Yes	53	85.5%
No	9	14.5%
Total	62	100.0%

Table 19 indicates that the information processed for the IEP is documented by 85.5% of the reporting teachers. Table 20 provides data on who does the documentation of the evaluation information.

Table 20. Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 2b. If The Answer Is Yes, By Whom? (N=70)

Documentor	No. of I.E. Teachers	Percentage
Instructor	16	22.9%
Special Services	43	61.4%
Administration	10	14.3%
Other-Special Education Teacher	1	1.4%
Total	70	100.0%

Data in Table 20 shows that 61.4% of the respondents indicate that the Special Services did the documentation of the IEP evaluation and 16 of the instructors reported they did the documentation.

Table 21. Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 3. What Information Do You Provide The IEP Team During And At The End Of The Year? (N=150)*

Information	No. of Teacher Responses	Percentage
1. Student progress on vocational skill development	36	24.0%
2. Recommendations for work placement or training	18	12.0%
3. Student behavior and social status	36	24.0%
4. Student grades	43	28.7%
5. Have not provided information to IEP team	15	10.0%
6. Other (5 1/2-Week Report)	2	1.3%
Total	150	100.0%

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

Data in Table 21 indicate that, of the instructors who provided the IEP team information during and at the end of the year, 24% provided progress on vocational skill development. Another 12% of the instructors provided to the IEP team recommendations for work placement or training. The largest percentage (28.7%) of the instructors provided student grades. Only 1% reported they did not provide information to the IEP team.

Table 22. Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 4: If The Above Information Is Provided, It Is: (N=63)*

Information	No. of Teacher Responses	Percentage
1. Requested by the IEP staffing team.	29	46.0%
2. Initiated by myself.	8	12.7%
3. Both of the above.	23	36.5%
4. Other (Ed. students).	3	4.8%
Totals	63	100.0%

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

Data in Table 22 reveal that if the data are combined from questions one, two and three, the total percentage would be 95.2%, which would indicate that most of the information is requested by the IEP staffing team. Table 23 offers data on the instructors' access to the IEP team to discuss concerns about handicapped students not performing well in class.

Table 23. Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 5: If You Have A Student Who Is On An IEP And Is Not Performing Well In Your Class And You Feel Other Program Options Should Be Considered, Do You Have Contact With The IEP Team To Discuss Your Concerns?
(N=65)

Contact with Team	No. of Teachers	Percentage
Yes	53	81.5%
No	12	18.5%
Total	65	100.0%

Information in Table 23 shows that with an 81.5% positive response to question five, it appears that the vast majority of industrial education teachers have access to the IEP team. Table 24 contains data on instructors' contact with parents of handicapped students during the year.

Table 24. Section E. Review/Evaluation. Question 6: When Do You Have Contact During The Year With Parents Of The Handicapped Students In Your Class? (N=101)*

Time of Contact	No. of Teacher Responses	Percentage
1. During the development of the IEP	16	15.8%
2. During the course of the year	29	28.7%
3. At the annual review of the student's IEP	13	12.9%
4. All of the above	10	9.9%
5. No contact with the parents of the handicapped student	25	24.8%
6. Other (Parent/Teacher Conference)	8	7.9%
Total	101	100.0%

*Total N reporting may not always match the number of teachers represented as some respondents may answer more or less than one category.

Data from Table 24 indicate that during the course of the year, 28.7% of the teachers had contact with parents. There were 24.8% of the reporting teachers who reported no contact with parents of the handicapped student in their program.

Findings

The compiled data and findings of this study warrant the following findings:

1. Wyoming industrial education programs have special needs students enrolled as reported by a sample population of industrial education teachers. Sixty-eight industrial education instructors reported having an average of 82 students served in their programs. Of those, a reported program average of nine students were identified as having a handicapped condition, indicating that handicapped students comprise 11% of the students enrolled in the industrial education programs in Wyoming surveyed by this study.
2. It was found that 25% of the reporting industrial education teachers had taken course work in teaching students with special needs, while 49.5% had taken course work at the graduate level, and 32% had some form of inservice training in teaching students with special needs. The teachers reported that 46.6% had taken this course work within the last five years, and 53.4% reported it had been more than five years since any course work had occurred. These courses or workshops were organized and developed by the following agencies: university, 33%; school inservice,

21%; and Wyoming State Department of Education inservice, 30%.

3. Seventy-one percent of the Wyoming industrial education teachers responding had previous experience working with handicapped individuals in the classroom setting. Those experiences in the classroom setting were 70.3% at the secondary level, with elementary level being second at 18.8%.
4. Regarding enrollment of handicapped students, 56% of the teachers reported having 525 students with handicapped conditions enrolled in these programs. Of those, 308, or 58.6%, were reported to have written IEPs. It was found that 6.4% of the industrial education instructors responding had been involved in the handicapped students' initial IEP meeting. Of those same surveyed instructors, 10.9% had been involved in the handicapped students' IEP review/evaluation meeting. Seventeen, or 23%, of the industrial education instructors responding reported they did not have enough information available to supply data about the handicapped student.
5. When asked about program implementation, the industrial education instructors responding reported they played a minimal role in placing special needs students in their classes. A percentage of 13.5 reported they assisted in describing the annual vocational goals and short-

term instructional objectives for the handicapped student. It was revealed that 9.0% of the responding instructors were involved in identifying special support services needed for accommodating the special needs student (eg., modified shop apparatus, instructional media, materials, teaching aids, etc.) Eight point four percent of the instructors stated that they had examined the handicapped students' IEP following its development and were able to make suggestions prior to final formulation and parental approval. Some of the other data revealed that only 4.5% had been assigned to be involved as a member of the IEP team for all handicapped students enrolled in their classes. The percentage of instructors involved in at least one meeting with the IEP team during the school year to determine progress of the handicapped student in relation to the goals established for the student's IEP was 15.7%. Another 18.0% reported that there was no involvement at all in the IEP development process. Some instructors--11.2%-- did state that they had not attended child study team meetings, but have worked with various resource personnel responsible for implementing the IEP.

6. The data regarding the review/evaluation stage of the IEP process revealed that 88% of the instructors surveyed reported that the handicapped student

performance was assessed in accordance with his/her IEP, and that 85.5% stated that this information was documented, with 61.4% of the documentation done by the special services, 22.9% by the instructor, and 14.3% by the administration. Instructors with access to the IEP team to discuss concerns about handicapped students totaled 81.5%. If information was provided to the IEP team, 46% of the survey instructors stated it was requested by the IEP staffing team.

Summary

Chapter IV offered all the information supplied by the selected industrial education teachers surveyed in Wyoming. Based upon these data, conclusions and recommendations regarding the extent of implementation are discussed in Chapter V of this study.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the survey research to determine if special education students are receiving full benefit of the least restrictive environment clause of PL 94-142 in Wyoming secondary industrial education programs. The conclusions and recommendations are presented.

Objectives

The overall purpose of this study centered around the two major objectives. These were:

1. To determine which secondary industrial education programs in Wyoming are available to the handicapped students, and the number of identified handicapped students enrolled in those industrial education programs for the 1983-1984 school year.
2. To determine the role that Wyoming secondary industrial education teachers have in the design, delivery and review of Individualized Educational Programs of handicapped students enrolled in their classes.

Conclusions

The compiled data and findings of this study warrant the following conclusions:

1. Handicapped students have access to industrial education classes in Wyoming secondary schools.
2. Of the active industrial education instructors, 68% have had undergraduate or graduate courses in working with handicapped students.
3. Only 4.5% of industrial education instructors in Wyoming secondary schools have been assigned as active members of the handicapped student's IEP team.
4. Ten point nine percent of the industrial education instructors have little or no input in the review/evaluation meeting of the handicapped student's IEP.
5. Industrial education instructors with handicapped students in their programs do have access to IEP team members to provide service for the students under the mandate of PL94-142.

Recommendations

On the basis of the data, findings and conclusions of this study, the investigator offers the following recommendations.

1. Inservice programs should be conducted to establish communications between the industrial education instructor and the special education resource teacher. These inservice programs would provide the opportunity for both the industrial education instructor and the special education resource teacher to communicate the importance of their respective roles in the total process of the handicapped student's IEP. This would also act as a state and federal regulations clarifications workshop to identify updated rules and regulations pertaining to industrial education classroom teachers and special education resource teachers. The workshop would remind the participants that all persons responsible for the education of the handicapped student must be totally involved in the IEP process, thus ensuring an equal educational opportunity for those students.
2. School counselors should work jointly with the industrial education instructor and the special education resource teacher to ensure proper educational guidance for the handicapped student.

3. On the state level, rules and regulations regarding handicapped students' involvement in programs that involve either technological or safety considerations should be identified. The instructors of those programs must be identified as members of the handicapped student's IEP process. This would help ensure that laboratory environment capabilities meet the identified needs of the handicapped student and, thus, the objectives of that student's IEP.
4. Research should be conducted by the University of Wyoming on the career goals of the identified handicapped students in Wyoming secondary high schools according to their IEPs. If the research indicates a high level of vocational direction for these students, a series of vocational courses should be included in the undergraduate curriculum for special education majors.
5. Based on this study, the State Department of Education could develop a series of inservice workshops to enable special education instructors to gain knowledge about vocational subjects that are identified in their handicapped students' IEPs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Albright, Leonard and Preskill, Hallie. "An Assessment of Mainstream and Special Vocational Educator Involvement in the IEP Process and Related Inservice Needs." Burlington, Ut: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 206 834, Aug. 1981.

Bies, John D. "The Impact of Federal Legislation on Special Vocational Needs Education Programming" Handbook of Special Vocational Needs Education. Meers, Gary D. Ed., Rockville, Md.: Aspen Systems Corporation, 1980.

Fender, Marilyn J. "Modifying Prospective Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Handicapped in a Secondary Pre-Service Program," Non-Published, Colorado State University, 1979.

Harrington, Donald E. "A Study to Determine the Extent to Which Secondary Industrial and Vocational Teachers in Montana Are Implementing the Least Restrictive Environment Component of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975," Montana State University, 1983.

Heward, William L., Orlansky, Michael D. Exceptional Children, Columbus, Oh. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1980.

Hughes, J.H. "Attitude Is Keystone to Success," School Shop, April (1978):76-80.

Lee, Howard D. "Individualized Educational Program (IEP)," Man Society Technology, December 1981.

Lilly, S.H. "Special Education: A Teapot in a Tempest," Exceptional Children, 37(1970):43-49.

McKinney, L., Seay, D. Development of Individualized Educational Programs (IEPs) for the Handicapped in Vocational Education, Ohio State University, 1979, p. 66.

Meers, Gary D. Handbook of Special Vocational Needs Education. Rockville, Md.: Aspen System Corporation, 1980.

Public Law 94-142, Smith-Hughes, 1963 Vocational Education, NDEA 1958.

Public Law 94-142, Final Regulations, Sec.121a. 380, 1977.

Rumble, Richard R. "A Vocational Educational Research Program in the Portland Public School District: Final Report," Portland Public Schools, Oregon, April, 1978, p. 54.

Schenck, Susan J. "An Analysis of IEPs for L.O. Youngsters," Journal of Learning Disabilities, April (1981):221-222.

Shotel, J.R. et al, "Teacher Attitudes Associated with the Integration of Handicapped Children," Exceptional Children, 36 (1969):91-96.

Shrybman, James A. "Due Process In Special Education," Rockville, Md. Aspen Systems Corporation, 1982.

Tindall, Lloyd, W. and Gugerty, John J. Least Restrictive Alternative for Handicapped Students. The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, No. 143. Columbus, Oh. The Ohio State University, 1979.

1968 Amendment 94-482

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

Dear

In 1975 Congress passed legislation in the form of Public Law 94-142. Many educators have referred to PL94-142 as "mainstreaming." This term was keyed from the legislation because of the fact that PL94-142 tries through its intent to ensure that all handicapped students have an opportunity to enter the mainstream of society by being provided a good public education.

One method of ensuring an appropriate education for the handicapped student is through the Individualized Educational Program (IEP), which is a major part of PL94-142. In relation to the IEP, PL94-142 states that:

> Public Law 94-142 sets forth procedures to ensure that due process is afforded each handicapped child at every point where educational decisions are made. As soon as a child is referred for potential special education and related services, parents and teachers must be involved. Another procedural safeguard ensures the confidentiality of all the reports and records pertinent to the education of each handicapped child. A third provision of PL94-142 has direct implications for every regular and special educator working with handicapped children. Each local education agency must specify in writing the procedures to be used in the local implementation of the comprehensive system of personnel development established by the state education agency. (Public Law 94-142 Final Regulations, Sec. 121a380, 1977).

I am asking that you take a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire so that we may see if the intent of PL94-142 is being complied with in the secondary industrial education programs in Wyoming, and if the secondary industrial education teachers are involved in this process.

This study is part of my master's program at Montana State University in Bozeman. All information collected from this survey will be held in strictest confidence. Respondents will not be identified in the final report.

Some definitions that might help you complete the survey follow:

1. IEP: The IEP is a written statement for a handicapped children that includes the present level of educational performances, a statement of annual goals, short-term objectives, specific and related service to be provided, projected dates for initiation of services, deliveries of the services, and the evaluation procedures to be used.

2. Handicapped Student: Those who are deaf and/or hearing impaired, blind or severely visually impaired, learning disabled, mentally retarded, health impaired, emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, or multiple-handicapped.

3. Mainstreaming: Providing the most appropriate education for each student in the least restrictive setting. Looking for and creating alternatives that will help academic and vocational educators serve students with learning or adjustment problems in the regular setting.

Please complete the questionnaire by answering all sections. Answer the questions by placing the letter from the question in the box provided in the left-hand column. Fill out answers to questions that relate to your program only.

Thank you for your time and effort in completing this survey. Hopefully, your participation in this study will help the handicapped students of Wyoming receive an

appropriate education in the least restrictive environment possible. Please return this by June 1, 1984.

Sincerely,

Ken Eggleston

APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE TO DETERMINE INVOLVEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTORS IN IEP PROCESS OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THEIR PROGRAMS

Part A: Demographic Information

1. How many students are enrolled in your overall industrial education clases?

_____Freshmen _____Sophomores
_____Juniors _____Seniors
_____Post-Graduates (18-21)
_____Others (please specify)

2. Have you taken course work in teaching students with special needs: (Check appropriate responses.)

Undergraduate	Yes	No
Graduate	Yes	No
Inservice	Yes	No

3. During the last five years, have you participated in any workshops designed to improve industrial education (vocational) instruction for special needs students:

Yes No

If you answered yes to question 3, please indicate which group organized these workshops.

1. University or College
2. School District In Service
3. State Department of Education
4. Other (please specify)

4. Have you had previous experience working with handicapped individuals in the classroom setting:

Yes No

The experience was with: (please check)

Pre-school Elementary Education
Secondary Education Post-Secondary Education
Other (please specify)

Part B: Enrollment Information

Please refer to the final page of this questionnaire to fill out the information on your special population enrollment data.

Part B: Enrollment Information

Use classroom enrollment data for the 1983-1984 school year. (Please fill in the numbers and check appropriate space)

Handicapped conditions	Number presently enrolled in program.	Number of handicapped students w/IEP.	Number handicapped enrolled in your program identified w/IEP were you at initial IEP meeting.	Number of support personnel involved in implementing IEP goals for handicapped student.	Number of handicapped students in your program you were at the IEP review/evaluation meeting.
Visually Handicapped	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Auditory Disability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mentally Handicapped	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Learning Disability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Physically Handicapped	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Emotionally Disturbed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Speech & Language Disorder	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Multi-Handicapped	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Not enough information available to supply this data about handicapped students _____

Part C: Instructor Background

1. Experience in education:
   _____0-3 years
   _____4-6 years
   _____7-10 years
   _____11-15 years
   _____more than 15 years

2. Experience in industry:
   _____1-3 years
   _____4-6 years
   _____7-10 years
   _____11-15 years
   _____more than 15 years
   _____none

3. Primary area of specialization:
   _____General Shop
   _____Drafting/Architecture
   _____Welding
   _____Auto/Diesel/Small Engines
   _____Electricity/Electronics
   _____Metals
   _____Crafts
   _____Woodworking/Building Trades
   _____Graphics
   _____Other (please specify courses)

4. Level of grades taught:
   6th_____ 7th_____ 8th_____
   High School (9-10-11-12)_____
   Other (please specify)_____

5. Level of responsibility:
   _____Instructor
   _____Department Head
   _____Instructor and Department Head
   _____Other (please specify)

6. Level of education:
   _____B.S. _____M.S. _____Ed.D. _____Ph.D.
   _____Certificated (College and Industrial Background)
   _____Certificated (Industry Background Only)
   _____Other (please specify)

Part D: Program Implementation

As an industrial education instructor, what has been your role in placing special needs students in your class? (Please check appropriate responses.)

1. _____I have had no involvement in the IEP development process.

2. _____I am involved in the development of the Initial Educational Program (IEP) child study team meeting.

3. _____I assist in describing the annual vocational goals and short-term instructional objectives for a handicapped student participating in my class.

4. _____I am involved in identifying the special support services needed for accommodating the special needs student (e.g., modified shop apparatus, instructional media, materials, teachers' aides, etc.)

5. _____I examined the IEP following its development and made suggestions prior to final formulation and parental approval.

6. _____I have not attended child study team meetings, but have worked with the various resource personnel responsible for implementing the IEP.

7. _____My administrator has assigned me to be an involved member of the IEP team for all students enrolled in my classes who have special needs.

8. _____I help in determining how and when student progress is to be measured and reported.

9. _____I have at least one meeting with the IEP team during the school year to determine progress of the handicapped student in relation to the goals established for the IEP.

Part E: Review/Evaluation

1. Do you or school personnel assess student performance in accordance with his/her IEP? _____yes _____no.

2. Is all evaluation information documented? _____yes
_____ no.

If the answer is yes, by whom?
_____instructor, _____special services, _____administration, _____other (please explain).

3. What information do you provide the IEP team during and at the end of the year? (Check all appropriate responses.)
   1. _____student progress on vocational skill development
   2. _____recommendations for work placement or training
   3. _____student behavior and social status
   4. _____student grades
   5. _____have not provided information to IEP team
   6. _____other (please explain)

4. If the above information is provided, it is:
   1. _____requested by the IEP staffing team
   2. _____initiated by myself
   3. _____both of the above
   4. _____other (please explain)

5. If you have a student who is on an IEP and is not performing well in your class and you feel other program options should be considered, do you have contact with the IEP team to discuss your concerns? _____yes _____no
If no, whom would you contact?

6. When do you have contact during the year with parents of the handicapped students in your classes? (Check all appropriate responses.)
   1. _____during the development of the IEP
   2. _____during the course of the year
   3. _____at the annual review of the student's IEP
   4. _____all of the above
   5. _____no contact with the parents of the handicapped student
   6. _____other (please specify)

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Box 72
Ten Sleep, Wy. 82442
May 1, 1984

Dear Colleague,

A few weeks ago I mailed to you a questionnaire packet regarding the involvement of industrial education instructors in the IEP process of special population-students enrolled in their programs. It is my intent that this project will enable a greater degree of involvement by the industrial education instructors in the IEP process of the special needs students in their programs. With greater involvement by the instructors, it is hoped that there will be improved vocational involvement and greater opportunities for the handicapped student.

Your cooperation in assisting us in this effort is very much appreciated. To enable this study to have an impact, I need your help. At your earliest convenience, please respond to the questionnaire mailed to you on April 15, 1984, and return with the self-addressed envelope that was enclosed. If for some reason you have misplaced the questionnaire, please phone (collect) 366-2441 after 5:00 PM or 366-2223 between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM weekdays.

Your participation in this project is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ken Eggleston