

PARAPROFESSIONALS AT ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS: PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT NEEDS FOR INCLUSIVE SETTINGS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION
COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

BY

SYRINITHNIA JONES MANN B.A., M.A

DENTON, TEXAS

DECEMBER 2015

Copyright © Syrinithnia Jones Mann, 2015 all rights reserved.

DEDICATION

For my mother, Ella, thank you for the financial, emotional, and spiritual support you provided to help me accomplish my dream. You are truly the wind beneath my wings.

For my siblings: Yolanda, Theophilus, Nadine, and Kevin, I am only as strong as we are together. A special note to my brother, “Danny”, you are by far the most intelligent man I know.

For my husband, Ben, thank you for your unconditional love and support. I am honored to be your wife and blessed to have you in my life.

Smooches to you all!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first acknowledge God, for without Him, I can do nothing. I would like to thank my committee chair Dr. Jerry Whitworth for the numerous hours he invested in this dissertation. He patiently and gently guided me throughout this process; and I am forever grateful. I hope to someday “pay it forward” in his honor. I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. David Marshall for helping me to analyze my data and for always giving me encouraging words. Thank you to Dr. Jane Pemberton for providing support throughout this journey and for sparking a desire in me to pursue teaching at the college level. I would like to thank someone that will remain anonymous, but without her, I could have never registered for the right courses. You were there when I began this journey and you Rule. Thank you to the graduate school angel for assisting me with formatting this dissertation. Finally I would like to thank all my family and friends for your prayers and support.

ABSTRACT

SYRINITHNIA JONES MANN

PARAPROFESSIONALS AT ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS FOR INCLUSIVE SETTINGS

DECEMBER 2015

There are unique challenges to providing special education services in alternative schools, such as managing student behavior and implementing modifications and accommodations in general education classrooms. Teachers of students with disabilities need specialized knowledge and skills to address these challenges (Benedict, Park, Bettini, & Lauterbach, 2014). The same can be inferred for paraprofessionals working in alternative schools. In general, the use of paraprofessional support for students with disabilities in inclusive settings has increased over the years (Cobb, 2007; Giangreco, 2013). Often times these students exhibit academic and behavioral challenges. There have been studies that report paraprofessionals working with students with academic and behavioral challenges have little training to do so effectively (Breton, 2010; Giangreco, 2013). The purpose of this study was to examine the classroom management responsibilities and professional development needs of paraprofessionals working with secondary students with disabilities in inclusive settings at alternative schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COPYRIGHT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Alternative Schools.....	2
Statement of Purpose	3
Research Questions.....	5
Significance.....	5
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
Paraprofessionals in Special Education	7
Professional Development for Inclusive Settings.....	13
Alternative Schools.....	20
III. METHODOLOGY	29
Research Approach and Design	29
Sampling	30
Alternative School Characteristics.....	30
Participant Characteristics	30
Data Collection Instruments	31
Procedures.....	34
Data Analysis	36
Limitations	36
Ethical Considerations	37

Conclusion	38
IV. RESULTS	39
Response Rate	39
Description of Population Sample	40
Results and Discussion	46
Supporting Research Question 1	46
Supporting Research Question 2	52
Supporting Research Question 3	56
Summary of Results	57
V. CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	61
Conclusions	62
Supporting Research Questions 1 and 2	62
Supporting Research Question 3	67
Implications and Recommendations for Practice	68
Recommendations for Future Research	71
Limitations	72
Concluding Remarks	72
REFERENCES	74
APPENDICES	
A. Paraprofessional Survey	79
B. Teacher Survey	85
C. Principal/Administrator Survey	90
D. Cover Letter	96
E. Invitation to Participate	98
F. Tables	101
G. IRB Approval Letter	143

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Descriptive Characteristics: Principals/Administrators	43
2. Descriptive Characteristics: Teachers	44
3. Descriptive Characteristics: Paraprofessionals	45
4. Overall Domain Means: Principals/Administrators	47
5. Overall Domain Means: Teachers	50
6. Overall Domain Means: Paraprofessionals	53
7. Domain Rankings for Subgroups	63

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The use of paraprofessional support for students with disabilities in inclusive settings has increased over the years (Carter, O'Rourke, Sisco, & Pelsue, 2009; Carter, Sisco, Melekoglu, & Kurkowski, 2007; Cobb, 2007; Giangreco, 2013; Giangreco, Suter, & Doyle, 2010; Malian, 2011; Riggs & Mueller, 2001; Yell & Katsiyannis, 2004). As a result, paraprofessionals have increasing responsibility for providing support to students with and without disabilities. Often times these students exhibit academic and behavioral challenges, yet there have been several studies that report paraprofessionals working with students with academic and behavioral challenges have little training to do so effectively (Breton, 2010; Giangreco, 2013; Lehr, Soon Tan, & Ysseldyke, 2009; Riggs & Mueller, 2001; Wallace, Shin, Bartholomay, & Stahl, 2001).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1997 (IDEA), The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 2004 (IDEIA), and the No Child Left Behind Act, 2001 (NCLB) provide guidelines for the roles and responsibilities, training, and supervision of paraprofessionals (Carter et al., 2009; French, 2003; Lehr et al., 2009; Likins, 2003; Pickett, Likins, & Wallace, 2003; Trautman, 2004). Adequate training and supervision for paraprofessionals have been the focus of many studies (Breton, 2010; Maggin, Wehby, Moore-Partin, Robertson, & Oliver, 2009; Wallace et al., 2001) including research on the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals in inclusive

settings at traditional schools (Causton-Theoharis, Giangreco, Doyle, & Vadasy, 2007; Giangreco, 2013; Malian, 2011; Riggs & Mueller, 2001; Yell & Katsiyannis, 2004). In contrast, little research exist on paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities in secondary inclusive settings at alternative schools.

This gap in the literature raises several questions. What type of support do paraprofessionals provide to students with disabilities at secondary schools? What are the responsibilities and duties of paraprofessionals at alternative schools? What job-specific training, if any, do paraprofessionals receive in order to work with students with disabilities at alternative schools?

Alternative Schools

Alternative schools began in the 1960s as an alternative to public education and have emerged as a way to serve students who have not been successful in the traditional school setting (Foley & Pang, 2006; Hoge, Liaupsin, Umbreit, & Ferro, 2014; Lehr & Lange, 2003; Lehr et al., 2009; Quinn, Poirier, Gable, & Tonelson, 2006; Raywid, 1994, 1999). Students with and without disabilities at alternative schools typically are characterized as having academic or behavioral deficits. These deficits limit their learning and have led to negative and counterproductive experiences in traditional school settings (Foley & Pang, 2006; Lagana-Riordan et al., 2011; Quinn et al., 2006; Raywid, 1994; Van Acker, 2007). In studies that describe the student population, it is reported that alternative schools provide services to a large number of students with disabilities, predominantly students with emotional behavior disorders (EBD) (Foley & Pang, 2006;

Hemmer, Madsen, & Torres, 2013; Hoge et al., 2014; Maggin et al., 2009; Ricard, Lerma, & Heard, 2013).

In Texas, alternative schools may also serve as designated sites for disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) (Lehr et al., 2009; Mitchell, Booker, & Strain, 2011; Ricard et al., 2013). In 1995, following the adoption of the Texas Safe Schools Act, public schools in Texas were required to provide DAEPs. The purpose of DAEPs is to serve students who may be removed from their regular educational settings because of disciplinary reasons (Texas Education Code [TEC] Chapter 37). Like other alternative education programs DAEPs can have a range of instructional and behavioral approaches (Hemmer et al., 2013; Lehr et al., 2009; Mitchell et al., 2011; Wasburn-Moses, 2011). However, the difference between the two is that students attending DAEPs are assigned temporarily because of disciplinary reasons. According to the Comprehensive Biennial Report on Texas Public Schools from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) (2015) in 2012-13, about 17.4 percent of students assigned to DAEPs were receiving special education services. This was compared to 9.5 percent of students receiving special education services statewide. As a result of this overrepresentation, it is important for all staff providing direct services to students in alternative schools to have a firm background in special education.

Statement of Purpose

Well-trained, highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals are critical to both alternative educational programs and to the education process of students with disabilities (Carter et al., 2009; Hemmer et al., 2013; Lehr, Soon Tan, & Ysseldyke, 2009; Quinn,

2006; Ricard et al., 2013; Stockall, 2014). There are unique challenges to providing special education services at alternative schools. In a synthesis of state-level policy and research of alternative schools, Lehr, Soon Tan, and Ysseldyke (2009) reported the availability of qualified staff and the quality of service provided to students with disabilities as challenges. Other challenges presented were managing student behavior, implementing Individual Education Plan (IEPs), and providing modifications and accommodations in inclusive settings.

Teachers of students with disabilities need job-specific training and skills to address the challenges associated with working at alternative schools (Benedict, Park, Bettini, & Lauterbach, 2014). There are many studies focusing on training and professional development of teachers at alternative schools (Benedict et al., 2014; Foley & Pang, 2006; Hemmer et al., 2013; Lehr & Lange, 2003; Quinn et al., 2006; Ricard et al., 2013). However, research focusing on training and professional development of paraprofessionals working at alternative schools is very limited. Research by Bitterman, Gray, and Goldring (as cited in Stockall, 2014) reported that in 2012, in public and charter schools, there were more than 450,000 special education paraprofessionals. Based on these data, it can be inferred that paraprofessionals working with students disabilities at alternative schools need job specific training and professional development as well.

Maggin, Wehby, Moore-Partin, Robertson, and Oliver (2009), ask the question: “How are paraeducators expected to provide quality instruction or support without sufficient training or supervision?” (p. 8). The purpose of this study was to examine the

responsibilities and professional development needs of paraprofessionals working with secondary students with disabilities in inclusive settings at alternative schools designated as DAEPs.

Research Questions

The primary research question of the study is:

How can secondary campus administrators address the professional development needs pertaining to classroom management of paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities in inclusive settings at alternative schools?

There were three supporting research questions, noted below:

1. What responsibilities and duties do administrators and teachers at alternative schools report are important for paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities in inclusive settings?
2. How do paraprofessionals at alternative schools rate their skills and confidence level to perform assigned duties?
3. What are the perceptions of paraprofessionals regarding the effective format and delivery of professional development?

Significance

Recent years have seen an increase in the number of students with disabilities assigned to alternative schools (Mitchell et al., 2011; Lehr & Lange, 2003; Lehr et al., 2009; Wasburn-Moses, 2011). For some students this may be an interim alternative education setting (IAES) placement in which the IEP from the original school must still be implemented. Although students with disabilities are assigned to alternative schools, the legal mandate of Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) still exists. Students with disabilities must still receive instruction in the general education classrooms to the fullest extent possible in accordance with their IEPs. Yell and Katsiyannis (2004) suggest that

LRE can be maintained by using paraprofessionals to provide supplemental services in inclusive settings. Supplemental services such as providing one-to-one tutoring and assisting with classroom management are allowable practices and expectations of NCLB (Pickett et al., 2003; Trautman, 2004).

Despite the increase utilization of paraprofessionals at alternative schools, there is a gap in the literature with regards to their professional development needs. This study addresses the gap in literature and contributes to the existing research regarding the support paraprofessionals provide to students with disabilities in inclusive settings. In addition, this study examines some of the job-specific professional development needs of paraprofessionals working at alternative schools with DAEP designated sites. Data gathered will assist campus administrators in designing professional development based on the needs of the students, the program, and the expressed needs of paraprofessionals.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the literature pertaining to paraprofessionals in special education and alternative schools. Topics covered are: (1) a synthesis of three published literature reviews and two research studies examining paraprofessionals in special education, (2) professional development needs of paraprofessionals working in inclusive settings, and (3) overview of alternative school programs and students with disabilities with an emphasis on disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) and the challenges of providing special education services. The ERIC Search Engine was used to find research spanning the past two decades. Key words such as: paraprofessional, paraeducator, teacher assistant, special education, at-risk students, alternative school, alternative education, and disciplinary alternative education programs were used in the search. There are numerous titles given to paraprofessionals. For this study the title of paraprofessional is used most frequently. However, the title of paraeducator or teacher assistant may be used when the original researcher chose such a term.

Paraprofessionals in Special Education

The titles of paraprofessionals have changed over the years. Today there are many titles used for persons hired to assist certified teachers in providing instruction to students. Some of the names used include: teacher assistant/aide, instructional assistant/aide, paraeducator, and paraprofessional. French (1998) used these terms

interchangeably and referred to them as “noncertified personnel who perform instructional tasks” (p. 357). Cook and Friend (2010) define paraeducators as “individuals who provide instructional and other services to students and who are supervised by licensed professionals who are responsible for student outcomes” (p. 135).

The role of the paraprofessional has changed over the years. Initially in the 1950s, with the end of World War Two (WWII), there was a shortage of certified teachers to properly provide instruction to students with disabilities. To deal with the teacher shortage, teacher aides were hired to assist teachers with clerical and administrative duties, thus freeing time for teachers to provide instruction to students (Cook & Friend, 2010; Pickett, Likins, & Wallace, 2003). However, beginning as early as the 1990s, the roles of paraprofessionals have shifted from mainly performing clerical duties for teachers to providing instructional assistance to students (Carter et al., 2007; Carter et al., 2009; Cook & Friend, 2010; French, 1998; Jones & Bender, 1993; Giangreco, Edleman, & Broer, 2001).

Jones and Bender (1993), Giangreco et al. (2001), and Giangreco et al. (2010) reviewed the literature on the utilization, perceptions, training, and efficacy of paraprofessionals spanning from 1957 to 2007. They reported the need for future research in the areas of specific job related training for paraprofessionals, paraprofessional support at the secondary level, and collaboration among paraprofessionals and special education team members to clarify paraprofessionals’ role in inclusive settings. French (2003) reported on factors that have contributed to the increase in paraprofessional support and provided recommendations on improving

paraprofessional effectiveness. Carter, O'Rourke, Sisco, and Pelsue (2009) study examined the varied responsibilities and professional development needs of paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities in public schools across grade spans.

Jones and Bender (1993) prepared a literature review on the utilization of paraprofessionals in special education focusing on their expanding roles. Their search of the literature included articles written from 1957 to 1993. Some of the expanded roles included using paraprofessionals to conduct formal assessment, provide initial instruction, and other duties that have typically been done by teachers. They concluded that the expanded roles raise questions concerning the preparation and efficacy of paraprofessionals for these roles. Jones and Bender also examined literature on available training models for paraprofessionals. Three types were identified: preservice, inservice, and on-the-job (OJT) training. However, they reported that most paraprofessionals enter the school setting without formal instruction on how to work with students with disabilities. They recommended more empirical research on training models for specific job-related duties.

Giagreco et al. (2001) summarized and analyzed the professional literature pertaining to paraprofessional support for students with disabilities published between 1991 and early 2000. With this review of literature, the authors began where Jones and Bender (1993) left off. Their review of the literature focused on the expanding roles of paraprofessionals assisting in the education of students with disabilities within the general education classes. Legal mandates, such as the Education for All Handicapped

Children Act of 1975 and the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendment of 1997, granted students with disabilities access to general education opportunities. Paraprofessionals who were properly trained were assigned to provide indirect services and support to students with disabilities in the general education classrooms. Indirect services include facilitating interactions with peers who do not have disabilities, providing personal care and mobility supports, and engaging in clerical tasks. Direct services were still the responsibility of licensed teachers and included making important curricular, instructional, and management decisions.

The role expansion of paraprofessionals giving them more responsibilities typically performed by teachers created many questions pertaining to the appropriateness of the roles (Giangreco et al., 2001). Are paraprofessionals adequately trained for these new roles? Are they assisting licensed teachers or functioning as the teachers? Are personnel with the least qualifications being assigned the responsibility of providing instruction to the most challenging students? Giangreco et al. concluded that plans should be established to ensure that paraprofessionals are adequately trained and supervised to carry out these roles. They also suggested that more research was needed on paraprofessional support that addresses the concerns unique to middle and high schools where students have numerous teachers.

Giangreco et al. (2010) summarized the research published about special education paraprofessionals emphasizing inclusive practices between 2000 and 2007. They reported that despite the research in the area of special education paraprofessionals nearly doubling since 2000, collaboration clarifying paraprofessionals' roles in inclusive

setting and the effects on student outcome is understudied. The literature that exists on paraprofessionals in inclusive settings seems to be in disagreement about the appropriate roles regarding primary versus supplemental instruction. They stated that, “defining appropriate roles and skills for paraprofessionals persists as an elusive and unresolved issue in the field” (p. 52). The authors believe that by first focusing on supporting students’ needs and secondly, clarifying the roles of general and special education teachers in the inclusive settings; then the roles and training needs of paraprofessionals will become more clear and better defined. The authors also reported that in alignment with earlier research there is still a need for adequate training of paraprofessionals and support specifically linked to student outcomes. According to Giangreco et al., the recent studies have value but there still are deficiencies in the research regarding the effectiveness of paraprofessional supports for students with disabilities. They concluded that “the research on paraprofessionals remains insufficient to inform policy decisions with a high level of confidence” (p. 50).

French (2003) examined the subject of paraprofessionals in special education and reported special education programs as the largest employer of paraprofessionals. In this research the paraprofessional is described as a lesser trained assistant that provides services to students with disabilities. Five factors are presented as reasons for the increasing number of paraprofessionals in special education: (1) inclusion, (2) high academic standards, (3) legislative changes and litigation, (4) related services, and (5) shortage of fully qualified professionals. With inclusion, French noted special education programs have the responsibility of including students with disabilities in the general

education settings and providing supplemental aids and services. Paraprofessionals are utilized in inclusion to provide more individualized assistance to the students with disabilities (Carter, Sisco, Melekoglu, & Kurkowski, 2007; Cook & Friend, 2010; Giangreco, Suter, & Doyle, 2010). Emphasis on high academic standards for students with disabilities has shifted from access to the general curriculum to now measuring the performance of students with disabilities using the same standards required for all students (Hemmer et al., 2013).

French offered recommendations to improve the effectiveness of paraprofessionals in the special education programs. First, the roles and responsibilities of paraprofessionals must be clearly defined. Then, paraprofessionals must be provided appropriate training to perform their tasks and duties.

Carter et al. (2009) explored paraprofessionals' evaluations of their knowledge and skill levels, training needs, and professional development opportunities. They used a quantitative survey design to query 313 paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities across nine school districts in public elementary, middle, and high schools. The focus was on paraprofessionals' knowledge and confidence level of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) 15 special paraeducator standards. Paraprofessionals reported moderate levels of knowledge and confidence on 14 of the standards and indicated helping students to use assistive technology as the greatest need for professional development. Concerning training opportunities, 47.8 percent of paraprofessionals reported on-the-job training as the most common form of training followed by in-service training. Lastly, Carter et al. reported that previous research has not explored the

responsibilities of paraprofessionals across grade levels. The data indicated that similarities do exist in the tasks, especially with students with high incidence disabilities, however implementation of those task varied. This finding was echoed in a study by Liston, Nevin, and Malian (2009) reporting that in inclusive classrooms there were no “discernable differences” (p.13) in the roles and responsibilities of elementary and secondary paraprofessionals. The study by Carter et al. focused exclusively on paraprofessionals in K-12 public schools and they recommended future studies explore responsibilities and confidence level of paraprofessionals working with students in early childhood programs and alternative school programs.

Professional Development for Inclusive Settings

IDEA and NCLB provide guidelines for the employment, supervision, and training of paraprofessionals. Liston et al. (2009) described paraprofessionals as “reflective practitioners eager to become better at what they do” (p.13) expressing the need for continued professional development. Most researchers agree that although providing professional development to paraprofessionals is a necessity, it can be difficult due to time and money constraints (Ashbaker & Morgan, 2006; Carter et al., 2009; Riggs & Mueller, 2001; Trautman, 2004). Most school districts do not pay paraprofessionals to work beyond normal campus hours, but finding the necessary resources to provide adequate training will maximize their effectiveness. Another difficulty with providing professional development may be due to the fact that most states and local districts have no consistent standard or agreement on what the paraprofessional training should entail (Breton, 2010; Carter et al., 2009; Cook & Friend, 2010; French, 1998; Giangreco et al.,

2010; Milian, 2011; Riggs, 2001). Providing well-designed professional development and training for inclusive settings requires clear delineation of paraprofessionals' roles (Carter et al., 2007) and should be as a result of a needs assessment (Carter et al., 2009; Cobb, 2007; Cook & Friend, 2010; Emery, 1981; French, 1997, 2003; Giangreco et al., 2010). A needs assessment begins with determining the needs of the students, the team and the program. The identified needs will serve as the basis for professional development for paraprofessionals.

Paraprofessional training falls into three categories: preservice, inservice, and on-the-job (OJT) training (Jones & Bender, 1993; Likin, 2003; Trautman, 2004). Preservice training is time set aside to provide initial training to paraprofessionals before they start. According to Riggs and Mueller (2001), paraprofessionals reported receiving very little or no preservice training. Paraprofessionals have also reported that often the preservice training provided is not beneficial or adequate for the specific jobs they are assigned (Benton, 2010; Carter et al., 2009; Cook & Friend, 2010). Inservice training is general training provided to paraprofessionals normally during teacher workdays. A concern with inservice training is it may be geared more towards teachers, or it is too general to meet the needs of paraprofessionals (Carter et al., 2009; Likin, 2004; Trautman, 2001). On-the-job training is training paraprofessionals receive during the duty day. Usually a supervising teacher or a paraprofessional with more experience provides OJT. Carter et al. (2009) reported that paraprofessionals indicated that OJT was the most common form of training they received. Training can be provided to paraprofessionals using many models such as: credit courses via colleges, web-based, peer mentoring, coaching, or

systematic OJT by trained personnel. Whatever the format, training should be continuous, ongoing, and assist the paraprofessional to effectively provide services to the students (Carter et al., 2009; Causton-Theoharis, Giangreco, Doyle, & Vadasy, 2007; Giangreco et al., 2010).

A number of researchers have noted that more job-specific training is a need for paraprofessionals (Carter et al., 2009; Giangreco, 2003; Giangreco et al., 2010; Riggs & Mueller, 2001; Trautman, 2004). A comprehensive study on preparing and managing paraprofessionals conducted by Trautman (2004) suggests that a training plan should cover job specific skills such as behavior management and curriculum management. This is consistent with the findings of other studies on paraprofessionals' perceived needs (Giangreco et al., 2010; Malian, 2011; Riggs, 2001; Riggs & Mueller, 2001).

Studies conducted by Riggs (2001) Breton (2010) reported paraprofessionals expressing training needs in the areas of behavior management and working with other adults as a team. The purpose of the study conducted by Riggs (2001) was to identify the perceived training needs of paraprofessionals in Connecticut. The study used qualitative research methods consisting of a survey, written responses, and interviews. The participants were approximately 200 paraprofessionals from general education and special education from all grade levels. Participants were recruited over a period of two years at workshops and conferences. The data were analyzed using rank order, most frequent categories of responses, and qualitative methods. The results indicated paraprofessionals felt their greatest needs for training were in the areas of: knowledge of specific disabilities, behavior management, working with teams, and inclusive practices.

Although training models were not addressed in this study, lecture, video discussions, small-group discussions and case studies were suggested by the researchers.

A study conducted by Breton (2010) examined the perceptions of paraprofessionals in Maine regarding (1) the adequacy of their past training, (2) the preparation for instruction of current students, (3) the adequacy of their supervision, (4) the effectiveness of that supervision and, (5) their perceived training needs. Quantitative research methods consisted of a 91 item instrument titled *Maine Special Education Technicians Survey (SETS)*. The survey was mailed to a random stratified sample of 750 paraprofessionals. The final study consisted of 258 respondents.

The data were analyzed using percentages presentations, rank ordering, and *ANOVA* to test differences among subgroups. For the question dealing with adequacy of past training, 46.3% of the participants assessed their previous preparation as being only fair or better. In response to their preparation for the instruction of current students, 60.5% of the participants did receive some sort of consultation involving direct instruction from their special education teacher at least weekly. Lastly, the topic of perceived training needs of paraprofessionals, 43.4% of the participants cited most frequently that dealing with student behavior, emotional, and social challenges was their current training need.

Research conducted by French (1998), Giangreco (2003), Giangreco et al. (2010), Liston et al. (2009), Malian (2011) and Riggs and Mueller (2001) reported that the role of the paraprofessional in inclusive classroom is transforming more into a collaborative partnership. There is a shift in the roles of paraprofessionals to a greater responsibility

for instruction. Liston et al. (2009) referred to paraprofessionals as being “active participants in the instructional process” (p. 12) having to be versatile and creative because their responsibilities in inclusive classrooms expose them to numerous academic and behavior challenges.

French (1998) attempted to clarify resource teachers’ perception of the roles, preparation, and performance of paraeducators and to compare those perceptions to self-reports of paraeducators. Reported results were that paraeducators played a crucial role in the delivery of instruction to students with disabilities. Paraeducators stated they had received some on-the-job training and inservice training as preparation for this role, but wanted more. Paraprofessionals also wanted more training in behavior management as a result of increasing instructional responsibilities. This was consistent with the findings of Giangreco (2003), and Liston et al. (2009). Despite the shift of the paraprofessional towards more responsibility for instruction, there is a need for caution when assigning instructional tasks to paraprofessionals. Regardless of this shift, the literature suggests paraprofessionals continue to lack the training and do not have the credentials to perform in instructional roles (Cook & Friend, 2010; French, 1998; Giangreco, 2003; Giangreco et al., 2010).

In a synthesis report on data from a national study of paraeducators, Malian (2011) identified legal mandates to provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) as a factor for the employment of paraeducators in inclusive classrooms. The national survey was disseminated through the National Resource Center for Paraprofessionals Newsletter. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain paraeducators perceptions of their

roles in several areas, with inclusive classes being one of them. The participants who responded were 202 paraeducators from 34 states. Paraeducators responded that in inclusive classrooms they dealt with a wide spectrum of disabilities. As a result, they felt they needed more training in specific disabilities. Paraeducators also reported that in inclusive classrooms, they directed more student behavior. Training in behavior management was expressed as a need. Malian concluded that in inclusive settings, communication between the teachers and paraeducators is essential for consistency in the instruction being delivered to the students with disabilities. Paraeducators want training in working with other adults as a collaborative team.

Riggs and Mueller (2001) conducted a study in Connecticut and Vermont in which they sought paraeducators' perceptions of their specific roles and duties in inclusive settings and their training for this setting. The participants were told the purpose of the research was to find out what it was like to be a paraeducator in inclusive settings. Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies were used. Interviews and surveys were used to gather data. The participants were asked two questions about their duties and responsibilities and their training and professional development. For the qualitative methodology, 23 respondents in Connecticut were asked open-ended questions during an interview. The paraeducators participating in the quantitative methodology in Vermont were mailed surveys. There were a total of 758 respondents that returned the survey.

The findings were that most paraeducators indicated they spent most of their day, about 70%, providing direct instructional services to students. Some of their time was

spent monitoring students during recess or cafeteria duty and managing the behavior of individual students. More than half of the survey participants indicated they attended formal team meetings to discuss student progress. With regards to training and professional development, the paraeducators felt they needed more job specific training. The two most job specific training needs were (a) managing challenging behavior and (b) making curriculum modifications. Few of the participants stated they received introductory or preservice training which was consistent with finding from Carter et al. (2009). The majority of the training was in the form of on-the-job training or advice from other paraeducators.

Over time, the duties and responsibilities of paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities have become more instructional. However, regardless of the professional development provided to paraprofessionals, care should be taken to insure that the increase in direct instructional service is supplemental. Giangreco (2003) and Giangreco et al. (2010) discussed a “training trap” of utilizing teacher assistants in inclusive settings. A training trap happens when certified teachers give too much instructional responsibility for students with disabilities to teacher assistants.

Based on the literature, there are some basic practices to implement when using teacher assistants to support instruction (Causton-Theoharis et al., 2007; Giangreco, 2013). Instruction provided by teacher assistants should not be given without instruction first provided to the student by the teacher. The teacher assistant should use lesson plans and curricular materials developed by general and /or special education teachers. The teacher assistant should be taught how to implement plans with fidelity. Teacher

assistants should be trained specifically on how to manage challenging student behaviors that may occur. Lastly, teacher assistants should be monitored and supervised by qualified professionals. Paraprofessionals are not trained teachers and they should not be assigned the duties and responsibilities of teachers (Giangreco, 2003, 2013; Giangreco et al., 2010).

Many paraprofessionals work in inclusive settings at regular schools and at alternative schools. Yet, alternative schools present unique challenges when it comes to providing special education services. Carter et al. (2010) report little research has been done on paraprofessionals' responsibilities at alternative schools and research is needed to "explore the skills and competencies needed by paraprofessionals within these settings" (p. 357).

Alternative Schools

The alternative education field lacks a common definition and is divided between the differing philosophies of alternative programs (Foley & Pang, 2006; Lehr & Lange, 2003; Lehr et al., 2009; Quinn et al., 2006; Wasburn-Moses, 2011). The U. S. Department of Education (2002) defines alternative education schools as: public elementary/secondary schools that address needs of students that cannot be typically met in a traditional school, provides nontraditional education, serves as an adjunct to regular school, or falls outside the categories of regular, special education or vocational education. There are many types of alternative schools ranging from academic schools of choice to disciplinary schools where students are placed. Alternative education encompasses public alternative schools, charter schools for at-risk youth, programs

within the juvenile detention centers, community- based schools, programs operated by local school districts, and alternative schools with evening and weekend formats.

Most of the studies examined reference Raywid's (1994, 1999) definition of three types of alternative schools (e.g. Foley & Pang, 2006; Hemmer et al., 2013; Lehr & Lange, 2003; Lehr et al., 2009; Mitchell et al., 2011;Quinn et al., 2006; Ricard et al., 2013). According to Raywid (1994) there are three types of alternative schools: Type I- Popular Innovations, Type II- Last Chance Programs, and Type III- Remedial Focus. Type I alternative schools are schools where students choose to attend. They are sometimes referred to as schools of choice which offer different program innovations and organizational and administrative departure from the traditional school offerings of curriculum. Students wanting to accelerate, specialize in a specific skill set, or who may be considered at-risk can choose to enroll. Magnet schools and some charter schools are example of Type I alternative schools.

Type II alternative schools are schools where students are court-ordered or assigned for disciplinary reasons, often referred to as "last chance" schools or "soft jails." The students are often temporarily assigned as a last chance prior to or as a result of expulsion as a mandatory placement. They are required to complete the curriculum from the traditional school from which they were removed and the focus is mainly on behavior modification. Disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) and juvenile justice alternative education programs (JJAEPs) are examples of Type II alternative schools.

Type III alternative schools are schools where students are referred for remediation or rehabilitation. Students can be referred for academic, social/emotional, or

substance abuse reasons. Schools which provide specific counselling or medical services to address these concerns are examples of Type III alternative schools. Some local school districts have campuses offering all three types of alternative schools described.

Characteristics of alternative schools vary depending on the differing philosophies of education and whether enrollment is voluntary or involuntary. According to Quinn et al. (2006), if the philosophy of education of the school is that the student needs to be changed, then the alternative program focuses on reforming the student. If the philosophy of the school is that the system needs to be changed, then the alternative program focuses on curriculum and instructional strategies. Voluntary or involuntary student enrollment also has a direct influence on program approaches (Lehr & Lange, 2003). Most researchers agree that voluntary placement schools tend to offer more flexible scheduling and utilize more innovative teaching and instructional strategies. Involuntary or mandatory placement schools tend to have a more disciplinary approach with a short term placement focusing on skill building (Foley & Pang, 2006; Hodge et al., 2014; Lehr & Lange, 2003; Quinn et al., 2006; Raywid, 1994; Van Acker, 2007).

Raywid (1999) and Wasburn-Moses (2011) present other factors that contribute to the variance in alternative school programs. Alternative school programs can function differently depending on whether the alternative school is in an urban or suburban area. Raywid reported that urban alternative schools focus was on programs for minority and poor students that were not successful at traditional schools; whereas the focus of the suburban alternative schools was on innovative programs to pursue new ways to teach. Wasburn-Moses report definitions can vary based on “location (e.g., separate classroom

or facility), descriptions of curriculum (e.g., student centered or nontraditional), and desired outcomes (e.g., dropout prevention, facilitating receipt of diploma)” (p.247).

Alternative schools have positive and negative effects. A positive feature of alternative schools is that they offer educational opportunities and flexibility in structure that are not available in some traditional schools. They are often characterized as having small student enrollment with a strong connection between students and teachers (Foley & Pang, 2006; Hoge et al., 2014; Quinn et al., 2006; Van Acker, 2007; Wasburn-Moses, 2011) and as creating personalized environments in which the students feel respected and fairly treated. Many alternative schools have also been successful at reducing dropout rates, truancy, and disruptive behavior (Wasburn-Moses, 2011).

A negative feature of alternative schools is that they continue to be characterized as lacking institutional legitimacy and having image problems. The institutional legitimacy concern may be due to limited accessibility to appropriate resources such as libraries and science laboratories (Foley & Pang, 2006), and the lack of licensed and qualified staff (Lehr et al., 2009). Image problems seem to plague alternative schools because the three different types of alternative schools often get combined into a single composite (Van Acker, 2007) termed as dumping grounds for disruptive students (Lehr et al., 2009), and/or schools for “losers” (Raywid, 1994 p. 30; Wasburn-Moses, 2011). Alternative schools have been viewed negatively because it unintentionally segregates the students from the general education setting (Van Acker, 2007; Wasburn-Moses, 2011).

Many students attending alternative schools share behavioral, social, and emotional traits. Students are often characterized as suffering academically, possessing

antisocial attitudes and behaviors, and having problematic relationships. A trend of student enrollment at alternative schools in the 80s and 90s was an increase in students who were “at-risk,” students with disabilities, and students unsuccessful at traditional schools due to academic or behavior issues (Foley & Pang, 2006; Hoge et al., 2014; Lehr & Lange, 2003; Quinn et al., 2006; Van Acker, 2007). Students who have been suspended or expelled, have chronic truancy, exhibit physical aggression, are credit deficient, and who are pregnant or a parenting teen are likely to attend alternative schools. Limited parental involvement is also a characteristic of students attending alternative schools (Foley & Pang, 2006).

There is an increase in the number of students with disabilities attending alternative schools which make it vital that special education services are provided to meet their educational needs (Foley & Pang, 2006; Hoge et al., 2014; Lehr & Lange, 2003; Lehr et al., 2009; Mulcahy et al., 2014; Yell & Katsiyannis, 2004; Wasburn-Moses, 2011). The enrollment of students with Emotional Behavior Disorders (EBD) at alternative schools is increasing (Daniel & Rosenqist, 2014; Hoge et al., 2014; Lehr et al., 2009; Mulcahy et al., 2014). According to Lehr and Lange (2003) and Wasburn-Moses (2011) this increase may be because students with disabilities are often placed because of criminal offenses such as alcohol, drugs, or weapon incidences; these students are sometimes assigned to alternative schools as a “forced” choice resulting from a disciplinary action. The amendment to IDEA which stipulates students who are suspended or expelled must continue to receive education services necessitates the interim alternative education setting (IAES) placement (Lehr et al., 2009).

Hemmer et al. (2013) reports that the expansion of alternative education has led to the shift of greater accountability for ensuring every student has access to the same high standards of learning in accordance with NCLB. Alternative schools must also meet the legal mandates of IDEA and Section 504 which stipulate that if students with disabilities are placed in separate rooms or facilities, these placements must be comparable to those in the general education setting (Yell & Katsiyannis, 2004). Regardless of this expansion, there is still a deficit in the national research documenting special education services at alternative schools pertaining to provision of direct services such IEP implementation (Hemmer et al., 2013; Lehr et al., 2009; Wasburn-Moses, 2011).

Other legal mandates for accountability of alternative schools involve certification and training provided teachers and paraprofessionals. Chapter 37 of TEC (amended by Acts, 2013) stipulates the following: teachers must be provided training in behavior management and safety procedures; and any teacher with a special education assignment must have the appropriate certification for that area. NCLB, as outlined in TEA Letter (2010) regarding Paraprofessional Qualification Requirements, requires that paraprofessionals performing instructional duties have a high school diploma or equivalent. In addition, paraprofessionals must also meet one of three of the following additional requirements: (1) two years of study at an institution of higher education, (2) an associate's degree or higher, or (3) through a formal state or local assessment demonstrate a rigorous standard of knowledge to assist with reading, writing, and mathematics. In addition, the TEA Policy Research of DAEPs (2007) suggests best

practices for teachers and “staff” working at DAEP designated campuses be trained in discipline management, conflict resolution, and anger management.

Although there is continuing research on types of alternative school programs and best practices, Ricard, Lerma, and Heard (2013) report there is a lack of research focusing on disciplinary alternative education programs. The Safe Schools Act of 1995 mandated that Texas public school districts have disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs) which serve as alternative education settings for students temporarily removed from their regular instructional setting for disciplinary reasons (TEA Policy Research, 2007; TEA Comprehensive Biennial Report, 2015). Violating districts’ code of conduct with offenses such as: non-compliance, fighting, substance abuse or possession, misdemeanor or felony acts are examples of disciplinary infractions that could result in discretionary or mandatory placement (Lehr & Lange, 2003; Lehr et al., 2009; Ricard, Lerma, & Heard, 2013; TEC [amended by Acts] 2013; Wasburn-Moses, 2011). Chapter 37 of TEC (amended by Acts, 2013) and TEA’s Policy Research of Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Practices (2007) stipulate the following: placement may not exceed one year unless after a review, the district determines it necessary; and if placement extends pass 60 days or the end of the next grading period, parental notification and the opportunity for an appeal must be granted.

In Texas, placement of a student with disabilities at an alternative school for disciplinary or non-disciplinary reasons may only be made by the student’s admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee; and the student cannot be placed solely for education purposes (TEA, 2007; TEC[amended by Acts], 2013). Understanding the

responsibility of DAEPs regarding the education of students with disabilities is especially important because often times the students' IEPs are modified to reflect the services that are available at the alternative school (Lehr et al., 2009; Wasburn-Moses, 2011); and students assigned to alternative schools typically perform lower on state accountability test than students not assigned to alternative schools (Hemmer et al., 2013; Wasburn-Moses, 2011). In 2012-13, according to TEA Biennial Comprehensive Report (2015), the passing rate on the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR), modified assessments (STAAR Modified), STAAR end-of-course (EOC), and STAAR Modified EOC test were lower for students both with and without disabilities assigned to DAEPs than students statewide.

There is a disparity in the demographic makeup of students attending Texas DAEPs. For example, there is an overrepresentation of students with disabilities which is consistent with studies reporting on large numbers of minority and poor students being assigned to alternative schools (Hemmer et al., 2013; Raywid, 1999; Ricard et al., 2013). During the 2012-13 school year there were nearly 5.1 million students enrolled in public schools in Texas and approximately 1.6 percent (81, 033) was assigned to DAEPs. The Texas Education Agency (2015) reported the following disparities: (a) there were larger percentages of African American and economically disadvantage students assigned than of the total student populations, (b) 74 percent of male students were assigned compared to 51.4 percent of the total student population, and (c) 17.4 percent of students receiving special education services were assigned compared to 9.5 percent of students statewide.

Challenges many alternative schools have with providing special education services are having adequate resources and adequately trained staff to meet the needs of the students with disabilities. Issues such as staffing, implementation of the students' IEPs, quality of instruction, and availability of supplemental services are concerns. Relevant questions posed by Lehr and Lange (2003) include "Can the level of special education services students receive at the traditional schools be replicated at alternative schools?" Are alternative school staff members receiving ongoing professional development and the necessary training to service students with challenging behaviors?

Given the increasing reliance on paraprofessionals to provide instructional and behavior services to students in alternative schools, the current researcher's interests are a variation of Lehr and Lange's (2003) questions. Are paraprofessionals receiving ongoing professional development they need to work with students with disabilities in inclusive settings at alternative schools with designated DAEPs? What tasks and responsibilities do administrators and teachers at alternative schools view as important for paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities? How do paraprofessionals at secondary alternative schools assess their ability to work with students with disabilities and challenging behavior? How can administrators at secondary alternative schools address these needs? These questions do not appear to be adequately addressed in the existing literature. Additional research is needed to more fully understand the professional development needs of paraprofessionals working in inclusive settings at alternative schools.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the quantitative methodology that was used to examine the responsibilities and professional development needs of paraprofessionals working in inclusive settings at secondary alternative schools. The selection criteria for DAEP campuses and participants are described. Also described are the instruments used to collect data and the data collection procedures. Lastly, this chapter summarizes the data analysis procedures.

Research Approach and Design

A descriptive cross-sectional survey design was used to examine the responsibilities and professional needs of paraprofessionals. The survey was designed to have administrators and teachers identify duties and skills that are important for paraprofessionals working in inclusive settings at DAEP campuses. Paraprofessionals were asked to rate their skill and confidence level to perform these duties. The survey was also designed to attain the preferences of paraprofessionals regarding professional development. A descriptive survey was selected because it provides a quantitative representation of behavior, opinions, perceptions, abilities and knowledge of an individual or group (Gall et al., 2010; Gay et al., 2012).

Sampling

A purposive sampling, which is a nonrandom sampling approach, was used. Purposive sampling was most appropriate for the study because it allowed the researcher to deliberately set the criteria for site and participant selection (Gall et al., 2010; Gay et al., 2012). The criteria set for alternative schools and participants were believed to be representative of the population for the purpose of the study.

Alternative School Characteristics

Six alternative schools in Central Texas were invited to participate in the study. The selection process for alternative schools was similar to a process used by Hoge et al., (2014). To qualify for the study, the alternative school had to be a designated site for the Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) for the local educational agency (LEA). In addition to being a DAEP, the following criteria were set: (a) be included in the continuum of service delivery options within the LEA, (b) be a secondary campus or a K – 12 combined campus, (c) provide a curriculum aligned with state standards, (d) provide special education services to students with disabilities in inclusive settings, and (e) be staffed by at least one full-time teacher and one full-time paraprofessional.

Participant Characteristics

The participants for the study were paraprofessionals, teachers, and principals/administrators who provide instruction and/or supervise students with and without disabilities. The participants were divided into three subgroups: Paraprofessionals, Teachers, and Principals/Administrators. The Paraprofessional subgroup was comprised of paraprofessionals who provide support to students in any of

the following settings: self-contained classrooms, resource rooms, general education inclusion classrooms, in-school suspension (ISS), study hall, lunch, or recess. The Teacher subgroup was comprised of special and general education teachers. The Principal/Administrator subgroup was comprised of campus principals and assistant principals. For each subgroup, the following numbers of participants were invited to volunteer: Paraprofessionals, 25; Teachers, 98; and Principals/Administrators, 9, for a total of 132 participants.

Data Collection Instruments

Surveys were used as the data collection instruments for the study for two primary reasons. Surveys offered the possibility of anonymity and the researcher was able to design questions relative to the study (French, 1998; Gay et al., 2012). The three surveys used for the study were adaptations of the needs assessment inventories used by French (1997, 2003) and Emery (1991). Both researchers stressed the importance of a team approach when managing/working with paraprofessionals. Several things must be considered when assigning duties and responsibilities to paraprofessionals. The needs of the students, the needs of the program, and the skill level of the paraprofessionals should all be considered.

The Teacher and Principal/Administrator subgroup were asked questions about task and responsibilities they view as important for paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities in inclusive settings. The Paraprofessional subgroup was asked to rate their skill and confidence level to perform the task and about their preference regarding professional development. Similar to a study conducted by French (1998), the

items on the subgroup surveys are parallel. However the “wording varies slightly to accommodate difference in perspective” (p. 359).

The Paraprofessional Survey (*Appendix A*) was self-administered via the internet using PsychData. It was comprised of closed-ended and open-ended questions for a total of 80 questions. The survey was divided in three sections. The first section contained four questions designed to obtain demographic information about the paraprofessionals. The second section paralleled the second section of the Teacher and Principal/Administrator surveys and consisted of 62 questions. The questions were categorized into seven domains in which the paraprofessionals were asked to rate their skill and confidence level to perform a task. The seven domains were: (1) delivery of instruction, (2) activity preparation/follow-up, (3) supervision of groups of students, (4) behavior management, (5) ethics, (6) team participation/membership, and (7) clerical work. Each domain contained one open-ended question listed as “Other” to provide respondents the opportunity to add a task they feel they may need additional training. A 5-point Likert Scale was used for responding. Response choices ranged from 1-to-5 with 1 being *Not Important* and 5 being *Very Important*.

The Paraprofessional Survey included a third section that was designed to collect data exclusively from the Paraprofessional subgroup. There were two domains in this section: the preferred times for participating in professional development and their preference of delivery model. Each domain contained one open-ended item listed as “Other” to provide paraprofessionals the opportunity to add a preference not listed. This section of the survey was adapted from a survey used at Florida State University (2000).

The paraprofessionals were asked questions about their professional development needs and the delivery model they prefer. The rationale for asking the paraprofessionals their preference was supported by a study conducted by Riggs (2001). There were 12 closed-ended and 2 open-ended questions in this section. The paraprofessionals were provided a range of responses to indicate their priority for a particular activity (Portney & Watkins, 2009). There were three response options ranging from Low to Medium to High.

The Teacher Survey (*See Appendix B*) was self-administered via the internet using PsychData. It was comprised of closed-ended and open-ended questions for a total of 66 questions. The survey was divided in two sections. The first section contained four questions designed to obtain demographic information about the teacher. The second section of the survey is identical to the second section of the Principal/Administrator survey. It consists of 55 closed-ended items and seven open-ended items for a total of 62 items using a 5-point Likert Scale for responding. Response choices range from 1-to-5 with 1 being *Not Important* and 5 being *Very Important*. The items 62 items are categorized into seven domains in which the Teacher subgroup was asked how important it is for paraprofessionals to be able to perform a task. The seven domains are: (1) delivery of instruction, (2) activity preparation/follow-up, (3) supervision of groups of students, (4) behavior management, (5) ethics, (6) team participation/membership, and (7) clerical work. Each domain contains one open-ended item listed as “Other” to provide respondents the opportunity to add a task they feel is important (Gall et al., 2010; Gay et al., 2012; Portney & Watkins, 2009).

The Principal/Administrator Survey (*See Appendix C*) was self-administered via the internet using PsychData. It was comprised of closed-ended and open-ended questions for a total of 76 questions. The survey was divided in two sections. The first section contained 14 questions designed to obtain demographic information about the principal, hours of professional development provided to paraprofessionals and number of students with disabilities enrolled. The second section of the survey is identical to the second section of the Teacher survey. It consists of 55 closed-ended items and seven open-ended items for a total of 62 items using a 5-point Likert Scale for responding. Response choices range from 1-to-5 with 1 being *Not Important* and 5 being *Very Important*. The items 62 items are categorized into seven domains in which the Principal/Administrator subgroup was asked how important it is for paraprofessionals to be able to perform a task. The seven domains are: (1) delivery of instruction, (2) activity preparation/follow-up, (3) supervision of groups of students, (4) behavior management, (5) ethics, (6) team participation/membership, and (7) clerical work. Each domain contains one open-ended item listed as “Other” to provide respondents the opportunity to add a task they feel is important (Gall et al., 2010; Gay et al., 2012; Portney & Watkins, 2009).

Procedures

For this study the surveys were administered via the internet using PsychData software program. Once approval for the study was given by the Internal Review Board (IRB), the participants were sent an *Invitation to Participate* via email that contained a direct link to the website to access the survey (Gall et al., 2012).

A cover letter (*See Appendix D*) was emailed to the principal of each identified DAEP requesting consent to invite volunteers from their campus to participate in the study. The cover letter explained the purpose and significance of the study. The cover letter provided the criteria for participation, stressed participation is voluntary and may be terminated at any time, and included an assurance of confidentiality and anonymity. Lastly, the cover letter included information about an incentive for volunteers to participate. As an incentive to participate, paraprofessionals and teachers who completed the survey were eligible for a drawing for one of four \$50 Visa Gift Cards. Once the survey was submitted, participants' email address was used for the random drawing.

Once consent was obtained, an *Invitation to Participate (Appendix E)* was emailed to the staff of the various campuses. The *Invitation to Participate* also explained the purpose of the study, the participant criteria, and the incentive to volunteer. The *Invitation to Participate* contained instructions for accessing and completing the survey and information on how to receive the results of the study. The participants were given a two week window to access the surveys. One week after receiving the initial invitation, a follow-up email was sent to the participants.

The winners of the gift cards were notified via email. In the *Invitation to Participate*, the participants were informed that winners would need to provide a name and mailing address to which the gift cards can be mailed. The gift cards were mailed using the United States Postal Service with a required signature for receipt. When the gift cards have been distributed to the winners, the information was shredded and deleted.

Once the gift cards were distributed and accounted for, the contact information was deleted and shredded.

Data Analysis

For this study, the data was analyzed and communicated using descriptive statistics. The categories reported were derived from the supporting research questions: (1) tasks teachers and principals feel are important for paraprofessional to perform, (2) paraprofessionals confidence and skills to perform the tasks, and (3) paraprofessional preference for professional development. SPSS, a statistical software package was used to run frequency and comparison tests. Comparisons were made between Teacher and Principal/Administrator subgroups as to what tasks they rate as important. Comparisons will also be made between the tasks rated as important and the paraprofessionals' skills. Data is presented using tables, percentages, and rank orderings. Any open-ended responses were listed in each category and any relevant themes identified.

Limitations

Limitations may be the use of surveys as the only means of data collection. Although, there are many advantages to using surveys, there are a few disadvantages that may affect the validity. For example because a survey is a self-report measure, the participants might not answer truthfully. Also, participants may answer incorrectly because of not having a clear understanding of what is being asked. The lack of a standard definition for alternative schools and consistency across DAEPs may also be limitations to this study. To address this concern, clear criteria was set for DAEP site selection. The small sample size may be another limitation to this study. Small sample

size may generate generalization concerns. Selecting six different campuses from different LEAs was used to address this concern.

Ethical Considerations

For the study procedures were followed to insure the participants' rights of confidentiality and informed consent. Permission to conduct the study and recruit participants at the DAEPs was obtained from the campus principals. The participants were informed of their rights to voluntarily consent or decline to participate, and to withdraw participation at any time without penalty. They were also informed about the purpose of the study and any possible risk involved. The participants were informed that their submission of the survey constituted their informed consent for the study.

The participants were informed their responses would be anonymous. The participants accessed the survey with a direct link to a website using software which did not link them to their individual responses. Confidentiality as it relates to the participating DAEPs was insured by not disclosing the names of the participating sites in any reports.

The gift card incentive added a risk of loss of anonymity for the participants. Once participants submitted their survey, they became eligible for the drawing. Participants were informed that any contact information provided for the drawing would be kept confidential to the extent allowed by the law. The information was safeguarded and securely stored on a password protected computer by the researcher. When the gift cards were distributed to the winners, the information was destroyed. The following

disclaimer statement was included on the survey in the link: there is a potential risk of loss of confidentiality in all email, downloading, and internet transactions.

Conclusion

The study was conducted using a quantitative, descriptive cross-sectional survey design. Three surveys were administered to collect data from six alternative schools with designated DAEP sites. The participants were divided into three sub-groups: Paraprofessional, Teacher, and Principal/Administrator. Access to the alternative schools was obtained from the building principals. Submitted surveys served as informed consent for the participants. The efforts to ensure anonymous responses and confidentiality were explained to the participants.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine classroom management responsibilities and professional development needs of paraprofessionals working with secondary students with disabilities in inclusive settings at alternative schools with designated disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs). The data gathered will assist campus administrators in designing professional development for paraprofessionals based on the needs of the students, the program, and the expressed needs and preferences of paraprofessionals. For the study a descriptive cross-sectional survey design was used to examine the responsibilities and duties administrators and teachers report are important for paraprofessionals working at secondary DAEP designated alternative schools. Paraprofessionals' assessment of their skill level and confidence at performing the tasks, along with their preferences for professional development were also examined. The response rate, description of the population sample, and a descriptive statistical analysis of the data as it relates to each research question are discussed on the following pages.

Response Rate

Six alternative schools with designated DAEP sites initially gave consent to take part in the study. However, one alternative school was not included in the study because it did not meet the selection criteria. Of the five remaining alternative schools a total of 132 faculty divided into three subgroups (Principals/Administrators, Teachers, and

Paraprofessionals) invited to participate. Surveys were emailed to nine campus principals, 98 teachers, and 25 paraprofessionals. Seven administrators submitted completed surveys resulting in a 78% response rate for the Principals/Administrators subgroup. Thirty-eight teachers submitted surveys, but one survey was not considered because it was blank. This left 37 usable surveys legitimate for the study resulting in a 38% response rate for Teachers subgroup. Thirteen paraprofessionals submitted surveys, but one survey was blank and not considered usable, leaving 12 surveys resulting in a 48% response rate for the Paraprofessionals subgroup. Of the total 132 faculty invited to participate, 56 submitted usable surveys resulting in a total response rate of 42%.

Description of Population Sample

To qualify for the study the alternative school had to be a designated DAEP site for a local school district in Texas. In addition to being a DAEP, the following criteria were set: (a) be included in the continuum of service delivery options within the school district (b) be a secondary campus or a K – 12 combined campus, (c) provide a curriculum aligned with state standards, (d) provide special education services to students with disabilities in inclusive settings, and (e) be staffed by at least one full-time teacher and one full-time paraprofessional. The DAEP sample consisted of five alternative schools from four school districts. A description is provided using numbers and letters as pseudonyms for the school districts and alternative schools respectively. There was no correlating or connecting school districts with alternative schools. This was purposefully not done to assist with maintaining confidentiality.

The demographic information and state accountability rating for the school districts were collected from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Annual Reporting of Texas Schools for 2013.

School District One has a “Met Standard” rating with a total student population of more than 52,000 students and 66 schools. The percentages for the sub populations for the students are as follows: Special Education, 9.6%, English Language Learners, 13.7%, and Economically Disadvantaged, 30%.

School District Two has a “Met Standard” rating with a total student population of more than 54,000 students and 73 schools. The percentages for the sub populations for the students are as follows: Special Education, 10%, English Language Learners, 12.7%, and Economically Disadvantaged, 27.5%.

School District Three has a “Met Standard” rating with a total student population of more than 19,000 students and 22 schools. The percentages for the sub populations for the students are as follows: Special Education, 10.6%, English Language Learners, 6.6%, and Economically Disadvantaged, 16.8%.

School District Four has a “Met Standard” rating with a total student population of more than 42,000 students and 53 schools. The percentages for the sub populations for the students are as follows: Special Education, 8.7%, English Language Learners, 4.3%, and Economically Disadvantaged, 12.1%.

The demographic information of the alternative schools was provided by the campus administrators. The study was conducted in the Spring Semester after returning from Spring Break. Student enrollment for DAEPs is very fluid. Principals reported

enrollment ranging from 16 students to 270 students with the percentage of students with disabilities ranging from 3% to 38%.

Alternative School A was a 9-12 high school campus. Alternative School B was a K-8 elementary and middle school campus, but only the middle school teachers and paraprofessionals were invited to participate in the study. Alternative School C was a K-12 campus. Alternative School D was a 1–12 campus and Alternative School Campus E was a 9–12.

The campus administrators were asked to provide the total hours of professional development provided to paraprofessionals at their campuses. They were then given seven domains: (1) delivery of instruction, (2) activity preparation/follow-up; (3) supervision of groups of students; (4) behavior management, (5) ethics, (6) team participation/membership, and (7) clerical work and asked the number of professional development hours devoted to each domain. The majority of campus administrators (42.9%) reported providing 15 to 20 total hours of professional development at the campus level. The hours of professional development along with the percentage of principals reporting for each domain are as follows:

- Delivery of instruction: 0 to 1 hour, 57.2%
- Activity preparation/follow-up: 0 to 1 hour, 71.5%
- Supervision of groups of students: 1 to 2 hours, 57.2%
- Behavior management: 2 to 3 hours, 57.2%
- Ethics: 1 hour, 57.1%
- Team preparation/follow-up: 2 to 4 hours, 71.5%
- Clerical work: 1 hour, 42.9%

The sample participants provided personal demographic information, including current position (principals/administrators and teachers), primary work assignment

(paraprofessionals), years of experience, and highest level of completed education.

Participants were also asked how many years of experience they had in working with students with disabilities.

The Principals/Administrators Subgroup (see Table 1) was comprised of: principals (4), assistant principals (2), or administrator-other (1). All seven reported having master's degrees. The following was reported for years in current position, 28.6% reported 0 to 2 years, 42.9% reported 3 to 6 years, and 28.6% reported 7 to 10 years. For years of experience with students with disabilities, they reported the following: 14.3% reported 3 to 6 years, 14.3% reported 7 to 10 years, and 71.4% reported over 10 years of experience.

Table 1
Descriptive Characteristics Principals/Administrators

Category	Number	Percent age
All Principals/Administrators	7	100%
Current Position		
Principal	4	57.1%
Assistant Principal	2	28.6%
Administrator (Other)	1	14.3%
Years in Position		
0-2	2	28.6%
3-6	3	42.9%
7-10	2	28.6%
Years of Experience with Students w/disabilities		
3-6	1	14.3%
7-10	1	14.3%
Over 10	5	71.4%
Highest Level of Completed Education		
Master's Degree	7	100

The Teachers Subgroup (see Table 2) was comprised of: general education (31) and special education (6). The highest level of education completed by the teachers was: 37.8% held bachelor's degrees, 13.5% completed some graduate courses, 43.2% held master's degrees, and 5.4% held doctoral degrees. For years in current position, 18.9% reported 0 to 2 years, 16.2% reported 3 to 6 years, 21.6% reported 7 to 10 years, and 43.2% reported over 10 years. For years of experience with students with disabilities, the teachers reported the following: 29.7% reported to having 0 to 2 years, 10.8% reported having 3 to 6 years, 24.3% reported having 7 to 10 years, and 35.1% reported having over 10 years of experience.

Table 2
Descriptive Characteristics: Teachers

Category	Number	Percent age
All Teachers	37	100%
Current Position		
Special Education Teacher	6	16.2%
General Education Teacher	31	83.3%
Years in Position		
0-2	7	18.9%
3-6	6	16.2%
7-10	8	21.6%
Over 10	16	43.2%
Years of Experience with Students w/disabilities		
0-2	11	29.7%
3-6	4	10.8%
7-10	9	24.3%
Over 10	13	35.1%
Highest Level of Completed Education		
Bachelor's Degree	14	37.8%
Graduate Courses	5	13.5%
Master's Degree	16	43.2%
Doctoral Degree	2	5.4%

The Paraprofessional Subgroup (see Table 3) was comprised of: special education resource room (1), general education inclusive room (5), in-school suspension (ISS) room (1), and other (behavior room, computer lab, secretary, GED, middle school) (5). The highest level of education completed by the paraprofessionals was: 8.3% completed some college courses, 16.7% held associate's degrees, 58.3% held bachelor's degrees, and 16.7% had graduate degrees. For years as a paraprofessional, 8.3% reported 0 to 2 years, 16.7% reported 3 to 6 years, 33.3% reported 7 to 10 years, and 41.7% reported over 10 years. Paraprofessionals reported having the following years of experience with students with disabilities: they reported the following: 25% reported having 0 to 2 years, 25% reported having 3 to 6 years, 16.7% reported having 7 to 10 years, and 33.3% reported having over 10 years of experience.

Table 3
Descriptive Characteristics: Paraprofessionals

Category	Number	Percent age
All Paraprofessionals	12	100%
Primary Work Assignment		
Special Education Resource Room	1	8.3%
General Education Inclusive Classroom	5	41.7%
Supervise In-School Suspension (ISS)	1	8.3%
Other (Behavior room, computer lab, secretary, GED)	5	41.7%
Years as a Paraprofessional		
0-2	1	8.3%
3-6	2	16.7%
7-10	4	33.3%
Over 10	5	41.7%
Years of Classroom Experience with Students w/disabilities		
0-2	3	25%

3-6	3	25%
7-10	2	16.7%
Over 10	4	33.3%
Highest Level of Completed Education		
Some College Courses	1	8.3%
Associate's Degree	2	16.7%
Bachelor's Degree	7	58.3%
Graduate Degree	2	16.7%

Results and Discussion

Descriptive statistics software, Statistical Package for the Social Science was used to summarize the participants' item-level responses for each section of the survey. All three subgroups completed the domain sections consisting of tasks/duties administrators and teachers feel are important for paraprofessionals working in inclusive settings, and paraprofessionals' skill level/confidence performing those duties. The paraprofessionals completed an additional section about their preferences regarding professional development. The analysis was organized according to the supporting research questions and domains for each subgroup.

Supporting Research Question 1

What Responsibilities and Duties do Administrators and Teachers at Alternative Schools Report are Important for Paraprofessionals Working with Students with Disabilities in Inclusive Settings?

Principals/administrators. The responsibilities and duties in all seven of the domains were reported as being of moderate importance or above (i.e., ratings of 3, 4, or 5) by the majority of the administrators as evident by the overall domain means being 3.0 or higher (See Table 4). Administrators reported the Ethics Domain, which had an

overall mean of 4.7(.26), as having the highest average of tasks and duties rated as important for paraprofessionals, followed by the Behavior Management Domain with an overall mean of 4.4(.59). The Supervision of Groups of Students Domain and Team Participation/Membership Domains were tied with overall means of 4.1. The Delivery of Instruction Domain and Clerical Work Domains overall means were 3.9(.29) and 3.6(1.4) respectively, followed by the Activity Preparation/Follow-up Domain with the lowest overall mean of 3.0(.67). Although the majority of the task items in the domains were reported by administrators as being of moderate importance, there were two domains, Activity Preparation/Follow-up and Clerical, in which some tasks were reported as being not important to somewhat important (i.e., ratings of 1 or 2), (see Table F2 and Table F7).

Table 4
Overall Domain Means: Principals/Administrators

Domains	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean(SD)
Delivery of Instruction	7	3.40	4.20	3.9(.29)
Activity Preparation/Follow-up	7	2.11	3.78	3.0(.67)
Supervision of Groups of Students	7	3.29	4.83	4.1(.59)
Behavior Management	5	3.50	5.00	4.4(.59)
Ethics	5	4.40	5.00	4.7(.26)
Team Participation/Membership	5	3.00	5.00	4.1(.80)
Clerical Work	5	1.00	4.56	3.6(1.4)

Delivery of instruction domain. (see Table F1): Of the 10 tasks in this domain, observe and record student progress in academic areas was the only task reported as very important by the majority of the administrators (71.4%), thus having the highest item

mean of 4.5(.78) in the domain. The task, help students in drill and practice lesson, was reported as being somewhat important by 28.6% of the administrators, thus having the lowest item mean of 3.4(1.1).

Activity preparation/follow-up domain. (see Table F2): Administrators reported six of the nine task and duties as being at least of moderate importance. Three of the tasks reported as being not important, or somewhat important were: schedule guest speakers/visitors as directed (M = 1.7, SD = .95; 71.4%); order materials and supplies (M = 2.2, SD = .75; 52.2%); and prepare classroom displays (M = 2.5, SD = .78; 28.6%). The two task items tied for being above moderate importance, or very important were: modify/adapt materials/equipment for a particular student and collect completed work from students.

Supervision of groups of students domain. (see Table F3): All the items in domain were reported as being of moderate importance or above. Accompany students to therapy sessions/individual appointments was the only task in this domain in which none of the administrators reported as being very important.

Behavior management domain. (see Table F4): Nine of the ten task and duties as being very important. Give positive reinforcement and support as directed by plans/IEP received the highest overall item mean of 4.8(.44). The two tasks that were tied for the second highest overall item mean were circulate in classrooms to provide behavioral supports where needed and facilitate appropriate social interactions among students with means of 4.7(.50).

Ethics domain. (see Table F5): All five tasks and duties in this domain were reported by the administrators as being moderate important or above. Respect the dignity and rights of every child at all times and report suspected child abuse according to the law/local procedures were reported as very important by all the administrators that responded to the task item.

Team participation/membership domain. (see Table F6): All five tasks and duties in this domain were reported by more than half of the administrators as being of moderate importance or above. However the tasks of attend parent-teacher conferences and attend ARD/IEP meetings were reported as not important (1) or only somewhat important (2) by 28.6% of the administrators.

Clerical work domain. (see Table F7): Administrators reported seven of the nine task and duties as being at least of moderate importance. The two task items with overall means below the midpoint of moderate importance were collect fees ($M = 2.6, SD = 1.5$; 28.6%); and make arrangements for field trips ($M = 2.4, SD, 1.3$; 28.6%). Prepare paperwork to facilitate parent-teacher conferences was the task item with the highest overall mean of 4.9(1.7).

Teachers. The responsibilities and duties in all seven domains were reported as being of moderate importance or above (i.e., ratings of 3, 4, or 5) by the majority of the teachers as evident by the overall domain means being 3.0 or higher (see Table 5). Teachers reported the Ethics Domain, which had an overall mean of 4.9(.18), having the most task items rated as very important, followed by the Behavior Management Domain with an overall mean of 4.5(.41). The other domains with overall means of 4.0 or higher

were Team Participation/Membership and Delivery of Instruction. Based on the overall domain means for Supervision of Groups of Students, Activity Preparation/Follow-up, and Clerical Work, the majority of teachers did not rate many of the items in these domains as being above moderate importance.

Table 5
Overall Domain Means: Teachers

Domains	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean(SD)
Delivery of Instruction	37	2.80	5.00	4.1(.47)
Activity Preparation/Follow-up	36	1.89	5.00	3.4(.96)
Supervision of Groups of Students	37	1.71	5.00	3.7(.79)
Behavior Management	37	3.50	5.00	4.5(.41)
Ethics	35	4.40	5.00	4.9(.18)
Team Participation/Membership	34	2.60	5.00	4.2(.68)
Clerical Work	35	1.44	5.00	3.4(1.0)

Delivery of instruction domain. (see Table F8): The majority of teachers reported all 10 of the tasks in this domain as being above moderate importance or very important. The five tasks that the majority of the teachers reported as being very important for paraprofessionals to perform were: facilitate students' active participation in cooperative groups (M = 4.6, SD = .69; 56.8%); observe and record student progress in academic areas (M = 4.5, SD = .83; 67.9%); help students in drill and practice lesson (M = 4.3, SD = .82; 54.1%); read/repeat test or directions to students (M = 4.3, SD = .86; 59.5%); and modify instructional material according to directions (M = 3.7, SD = 1.5; 51.4%).

Activity preparation/follow-up domain. (see Table F9): Teachers reported many of the task items in this domain as not important or somewhat important. Of the nine task items, only seven had overall item means above the midpoint scale of moderate importance. The two task items with lowest overall item means were order material and supplies with a mean of 2.8(1.4) and schedule guest speakers/visitors as directed with a mean of 2.8(1.3). The majority of the teachers (54.9%) reported modify/adapt materials/equipment as being above moderate importance or higher which resulted in it being the task item with highest overall mean of 3.8(1.3).

Supervision of groups of students domain. (see Table F10): The majority of teachers reported all the tasks in this domain as being of moderate importance or above. Although only one task, supervise groups of students on arrival or departure, was voted as very important by the majority of the teachers (45.9%).

Behavior management domain. (see Table F11): The majority of teachers rated the task in this domain as above moderate importance or higher. The one task reported as being very important by the largest percentage of teachers, 83.3%, was give positive reinforcement and support as directed by plans/IEP. Over 70% of teachers rated enforce class and school rules and circulate in classrooms to provide behavioral supports where need as very important tasks.

Ethics domain. (see Table F12): All the items in this domain were rated as above moderate or very important by the teachers. Two tasks reported as being very important by 100% of the teachers that responded were, maintain confidentiality of all information regarding students and report suspected child abuse according to the law/local

procedures. Communicate with parents to the extent indicated by the team was the only task that received ratings below moderate importance by 8.1% of the teachers.

Team participation/membership domain. (see Table F13): The majority of teachers rated the tasks in this domain as above moderate importance or higher. The three tasks the majority of teachers (62.2% for all three items) reported as very important for paraprofessionals were: (1) meet with team as scheduled/directed, (2) participate in team meetings contributing information, and (3) participate in team meetings by listening to ideas of others.

Clerical work domain. (see Table F14): Teachers reported many of the tasks in this domain as being not important or only somewhat important. More than 25% of the responding teachers rated collect fees and make arrangements for field trips below moderate importance. Two task items reported as very important for paraprofessionals to perform by more than half of the teachers were: prepare paperwork to facilitate parent-teacher conferences, and maintain files for IEPs, assessment reports, and other reports.

Supporting Research Question 2

How do paraprofessionals at alternative schools rate their skills and confidence level to perform assigned duties?

The majority of paraprofessionals reported they were well-prepared and confident to perform their assigned duties as indicated by the overall domain means being above the moderate level (i.e., ratings of 4 or 5) for each of the seven domains (see Table 6). The three domains with the highest overall ratings were: Supervision of Groups of

Students ($M = 4.9$, $SD = .19$); Ethics ($M = 4.7$, $SD = .31$); and Behavior Management ($M = 4.5$, $SD = .39$). The Ethics Domain was the only domain where all the paraprofessionals reported at least moderate levels (i.e., ratings of 3, 4, or 5) of preparedness and confidence for each item task.

Table 6
Overall Domain Means: Paraprofessionals

Domains	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean(SD)
Delivery of Instruction	12	2.90	5.00	4.3(.71)
Activity Preparation/Follow-up	12	3.0	5.00	4.3(.61)
Supervision of Groups of Students	12	4.43	5.00	4.9(.19)
Behavior Management	12	4.00	5.00	4.5(.39)
Ethics	12	4.00	5.00	4.7(.31)
Team Participation/Membership	12	3.00	5.00	4.4(.54)
Clerical Work	12	3.50	5.00	4.4(.56)

Delivery of instruction domain. (see Table F15): The paraprofessionals reported above moderate levels of skills and confidence to perform each of the tasks in this domain, with the overall item means being on the higher end of the scale. The areas with the largest percentage of paraprofessionals reporting the highest level of preparedness and skill were: observe and record student progress in academic areas (58.3%); read/repeat test or directions to students (83.3%); listen to students read orally (83.3%); help students with workbooks/other written assignments (58.3%); and monitor student performance in community-based settings (66.7%). The area in which the largest number of paraprofessionals reported being able to begin the task, but need

instruction to perform the task (rating of 2) was modify instructional material according to directions (16.7%). There were no tasks in this domain that paraprofessionals reported being unprepared and needing training to begin (rating of 1).

Activity preparation/follow-up domain. (see Table F16): The paraprofessionals reported above moderate levels of skills and confidence to perform each of the tasks in this domain, with the overall item means exceeding the midpoint of the scale. The areas with the largest percentage of paraprofessionals reporting the highest level of preparedness and skill were: prepare classroom displays (58.3%); order materials and supplies (58.3%); organize supplies/materials (83.3%); schedule guest speakers/visitors as directed (58.3%); distribute supplies/materials (91.7%); and collect completed work from students (91.7%). The area in which the largest number of paraprofessionals reported being unprepared to begin or could begin but need instruction (i.e., ratings of 1 or 2) to perform the task was construct learning material (16.6%).

Supervision of groups of students domain. (see Table F17): The paraprofessionals reported above moderate levels of skills and confidence to perform each of the tasks in this domain, with the overall item means being on the higher end of the scale. The areas with the largest percentage of paraprofessionals reporting the highest level of preparedness and skill were: supervise groups of students on arrival or departure (100%); supervise groups of students during lunch (100%); supervise groups of students during study hall classes (100%); monitor students during passing periods (100%), and escort groups of students to bathrooms, library, gym, etc. (100%). The area in which the largest number of paraprofessionals reported being able to begin the task, but need

instruction to perform the task was accompany students to therapy sessions/individual appointments (8.3%). There were no tasks in this domain that paraprofessionals reported being unprepared and needing training to begin.

Behavior management domain. (see Table F18): The paraprofessionals reported above moderate levels of skills and confidence to perform each of the tasks in this domain, with the overall item means being on the higher end of the scale. The areas with the largest percentage of paraprofessionals reporting the highest level of preparedness and skill were: supervise time-out or in-school suspension rooms (83.3%); observe and chart student behavior (58.3%); circulate in classrooms to provide behavioral supports where needed (66.7%); enforce class and school rules (83.3%); and assist students who are self-managing behaviors (53.3%). The area in which the largest number of paraprofessionals reported being able to begin the task but need instruction to perform the task was assist other students in coping with behaviors of specific students (8.3%). There were no items in this domain that paraprofessionals reported being unprepared and needing training to begin.

Ethics domain. (see Table F19): The majority of paraprofessionals reported above moderate levels of skills and confidence to perform each of the tasks in this domain, with the overall item means being on the higher end of the scale. The one task item with the largest percentage of paraprofessional reporting the highest level of preparedness and skill was maintain confidentiality of all information regarding students (91.7%). There were no tasks in this domain that paraprofessionals reported being unprepared to begin or could begin but need instruction.

Team participation/follow-up. (see Table F20): The paraprofessionals reported above moderate levels of skills and confidence to perform each of the tasks in this domain, with the overall item means exceeding the midpoint of the scale. The one task item with the largest percentage of paraprofessionals reporting the highest level of preparedness and skill was meet with team as scheduled/directed (91.7%). The area in which the largest number of paraprofessionals reported being unprepared to begin or could begin but need instruction to perform the task was attend ARD/IEP meetings (25%).

Clerical work domain. (see Table F21): The majority of paraprofessionals reported above moderate levels of skills and confidence to perform each of the tasks in this domain, with the overall item means being on the higher end of the scale. Three tasks with the largest percentage of paraprofessionals reporting the highest level of preparedness and skill were take attendance (75%), correct assigned student lessons/homework (75%), and grade tests (75%). The area in which the largest number of paraprofessionals reported being unprepared to begin or could begin but need instruction to perform the task was record grades (16.6%).

Supporting Research Question 3

What are the perceptions of paraprofessionals regarding the effective format and delivery of professional development?

Overall the time paraprofessionals most preferred to participate in professional development was during school hours/release time (67.7%), followed by after school

(33.3%) (see Table F22). Paraprofessional preferred participating in professional development on Saturday/weekends the least (83.3%) followed by during the summer/vacation time (66.7%).

Overall the majority of paraprofessionals' delivery preference for professional development was tied between small group training/single day workshop and computer-based/internet, each with 50%. The least preferred delivery format of professional development was large group training/multiple day workshops (conferences) (50%).

Summary of Results

The results reported in this study may be summarized as follows:

1. The majority of campus administrators (42.9%) reported providing 15 to 20 total hours of professional development at the campus level. The two domains with the most professional development hours were: Team Preparation/Follow-up (2 to 4 hours, 71.5%) and Behavior Management (2 to 3, 57.2%).
2. The overall means for the domains for each subgroup, Principal/Administrators, Teachers, and Paraprofessionals, were at the midpoint scale of moderate importance or above ($M= 3.0$).
3. The majority of administrators and teachers reported the responsibilities and duties in each domains as being of moderate importance or above (i.e., 3, 4, or 5); and the majority of the paraprofessionals reported having above moderate levels of skills and confidence (i.e., 4 or 5) to perform to the responsibilities and duties.

4. Ethics and Behavior Management were the domains with the highest overall mean for the administrators and teachers; and Supervision of Groups of students and Ethics were the two domains with the highest overall mean for paraprofessionals.

5. Activity Preparation/Follow-up and Clerical Work were domains with the lowest overall mean for administrators and teachers; and Activity Preparations/Follow-up and Delivery of Instruction were the domains with the lowest overall means for paraprofessionals.

6. In the Ethics Domain the items with the highest overall rating for all three subgroups were respect the dignity and rights of every child at all times and report suspected child abuse according to the law/local procedures.

7. For the Delivery of Instruction Domain the principals/administrators and teachers were in agreement with these task items, and although the majority of paraprofessionals reported being well-prepared and highly skilled with performing these task items, this was the domain with their lowest overall mean.

8. For the Supervision of Groups of Students Domain teachers placed less importance on these task items than administrators. The data indicates these are the task items paraprofessionals felt most prepared and highly skilled at performing as reflected by this domain having the highest overall mean of the seven.

9. The Behavior Management Domain emerged as the domain with the second highest overall mean for both principals/administrators and teachers, and the domain with the third highest overall mean for paraprofessionals. While the task of give positive reinforcement and support as directed by plans/IEP had the highest overall item

mean for administrators and teachers, only a third of the paraprofessionals gave themselves the top rating of being well-prepared and highly skilled to perform this task (5). Another task item of agreement with principals and teachers with half of them reporting it as very important for paraprofessionals to perform was assist other students in coping with behaviors of specific students. However, only a fourth of the paraprofessionals gave themselves the highest rating for this task.

10. Activity Preparation/Follow-up was the domain with the lowest and second lowest overall mean for all three subgroups. The item, construct learning materials, was not reported as being very important by any of the principals/administrators, but over a third of the teachers reported it as very important. Only a fourth of the paraprofessionals gave themselves the top rating of well-prepared and highly skilled to perform this task.

11. The Team Participation/Membership Domain was one of the top three and four domains with the highest overall mean for administrators and teachers and the domain with the fourth highest overall mean for paraprofessionals. The two items in this domain with the lowest overall item means for administrators and teachers were attend parent-teachers conferences and attend ARD/IEP meetings; and these were the two task items that over 15% of the paraprofessionals gave themselves the lowest rating of unprepared and not able to begin, or can begin, but need instruction on how to perform.

12. Clerical Work was the domain with the lowest overall mean and tied for the lowest overall domain mean for the principals and teachers respectively. However for paraprofessionals, this domain was tied as having the fourth highest overall domain

mean. Two task items that the majority of principals and teachers reported as being above moderate importance or higher were prepare paperwork to facilitate parent- teachers conferences and maintain files for IEPs, assessment reports, and other reports. These were all so the two task items that the majority of paraprofessionals gave themselves the higher ratings (i.e., ratings of 4 or 5) of being prepared and confident at performing.

13. The majority of paraprofessionals preferred to participate in professional development during school hours/release time. The most preferred method for delivery was tied between small group training/single day workshop and computer based/internet.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the responsibilities and professional development needs of paraprofessionals working in inclusive secondary classrooms at alternative schools with disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEP). A quantitative descriptive cross-sectional survey design was used to address the primary research question: How can secondary campus administrators address the professional development needs pertaining to classroom management of paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities in inclusive settings at alternative schools? The supporting research questions were:

1. What responsibilities and duties do administrators and teachers at alternative schools report are important for paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities in inclusive settings?
2. How do paraprofessionals at alternative schools rate their skills and confidence level to perform assigned duties?
3. What are the perceptions of paraprofessionals regarding the effective format and delivery of professional development?

The participants were divided into three subgroups: Principals/Administrators, Teachers, and Paraprofessionals. The Teacher and Principal/Administrator subgroup were asked questions about task and responsibilities they view as important for paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities in inclusive settings. The Paraprofessional subgroup was asked to rate their skill and confidence level to perform the task. The task and responsibilities were categorized into seven domains: (1) delivery

of instruction, (2) activity preparation/follow-up, (3) supervision of groups of students, (4) behavior management, (5) ethics, (6) team participation/membership, and (7) clerical work. In addition, paraprofessionals were asked about their preferences regarding professional development. This study extends research on the responsibilities and professional development needs of paraprofessionals in inclusive settings by examining the perspectives of administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals at disciplinary alternative schools. Conclusions from the summary of results, relationships of findings to previous research, implications for practice, recommendations for research, and concluding remarks highlighting the significance of this study are presented in this chapter.

Conclusions

Supporting Research Questions 1 and 2

(1) What responsibilities and duties do administrators and teachers at alternative schools report are important for paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities in inclusive settings? (2) How do paraprofessionals at alternative schools rate their skills and confidence level to perform assigned duties?

Overall campus administrators and teachers were in agreement that the majority of tasks in each of the domains were of moderate importance or above; and the majority of paraprofessionals reported having above moderate skills and confidence to perform the tasks. The data indicated that the domains in which paraprofessionals' responsibilities mainly involved providing support directly to students were rated as being of most importance by administrators and teachers (see Table 7 for domain rankings for

subgroups). These results support the existing literature which indicates that special education support provided by paraprofessionals is shifting away from being teacher directed to being more student directed (Carter et al., 2007; Carter et al., 2009; Cook & Friend, 2010; French, 1998; French, 2001; Giangreco et al., 2001; Giangreco et al., 2010; Jones & Bender, 1993; Riggs & Mueller, 2001). French (2003) reported that paraprofessionals “frequently provide instructional services alongside the student rather than alongside the teacher” (p. 1). Carter et al. (2009) reported that 97% of paraprofessionals stated they provided one-on-one instruction and instructional support in small groups most frequently.

Table 7
Domain Rankings for Subgroups

Administrators/Principals	Teachers	Paraprofessionals
Ethics	Ethics	Supervision of Groups of Students
Behavior Management	Behavior Management	Ethics
Supervision of Groups of Students	Team Preparation/membership	Behavior Management
Team Preparation/membership	Delivery of Instruction	Team Preparation/membership
Delivery of Instruction	Supervision of Groups of Students	Clerical Work
Clerical Work	Activity Preparation/follow-up	Activity Preparation/follow-up
Activity Preparation/follow-up	Clerical Work	Delivery of Instruction

Although the overall results of the present study do support a shift toward paraprofessionals’ responsibilities being more instructional, there appears to be some

discrepancies among the subgroups. For example, clerical work and activity preparation were the domains with the lowest overall means for administrators and teachers. But, for paraprofessionals the clerical work domain had an overall mean higher than the delivery of instruction domain.

The Ethics Domain emerged as being the domain with the most task items rated as very important for paraprofessionals by principals and teachers; and the second highest domain in which paraprofessionals reported being highly skilled and very confident at performing. This was of particular surprise to the present researcher because, with the exception of the ethical practices of hiring and supervising paraprofessionals as outlined by IDEA and NCLB (Ashbaker & Morgan, 2006; French, 2001; Giangreco, 2013; Giangreco et al., 2010; Lehr et al., 2009; Likins, 2003; Pickett et al., 2003; Trautman, 2004; Washburn-Moses, 2011), research on the training provided to paraprofessionals pertaining to ethical duties and responsibilities seems to be limited.

However, in a study by Carter et al. (2009) paraprofessionals reported they received training on ethical practices for confidential communication about students with disabilities. It can be concluded from the present study that paraprofessionals are provided professional development regarding ethics as paraprofessionals reported being highly skilled with the responsibility of maintaining confidentially regarding student information.

Behavior Management and Supervision of Groups of Students were in the top domains of importance for all three subgroups. This result tends to corroborate the prevalent literature that paraprofessionals are increasingly being given the task of

managing the behaviors and supervising students with the most challenging behaviors (Breton, 2010; Giangreco, 2013; Lehr et al., 2009; Wallace et al., 2001). However, the majority of paraprofessionals in the present study reported being highly skilled and confident in managing the challenging behaviors of students. This result contradicts the findings of Giangreco (2013) in which he reports paraprofessionals are the least qualified or have little training to effectively manage students who exhibit challenging behaviors.

Although paraprofessionals reported being well-prepared and highly confident with behavior management, professional development is still needed in area of providing behavioral support according to students' IEPs. Two specific task items in the Behavior Management Domain that administrators and teachers reported as being very important for paraprofessionals were: give positive support as directed by plans/IEPs, and assist other students in coping with behaviors of specific students. However, less than a third of paraprofessionals reported being well-prepared and highly skilled at performing these tasks.

Supervision of Groups of Students was the domain in which the majority of paraprofessionals reported being well-prepared and highly confident to perform. It should be noted that all the paraprofessionals gave themselves the highest rating on the task items requiring supervision in nonacademic areas (e.g., supervise during arrival and departure, lunch, passing periods). This is of interest to the present researcher, because this result could be viewed as a contradiction to the prevalent literature which indicates a shift towards more instructional responsibilities. The contributing factor to the high ratings of supervision in nonacademic areas cannot be determined in this study. However

if paraprofessionals rated this area highly because of being assigned to supervise students in nonacademic settings for the majority of their work day, this would contradict the prevalent literature. But, it would be consistent with the findings of Wallace et al. (2001) in which it was reported that paraprofessionals spent the majority of their day monitoring students in nonacademic settings (e.g., lunch rooms, study halls, playgrounds).

Delivery of Instruction was the domain with the noticeable difference among the subgroups. For the administrators and teachers, delivery of instruction was about midpoint of the other domains with responsibilities they considered very important for paraprofessionals. Surprisingly, of all the domains, paraprofessionals reported being the least prepared and confident at performing these duties. These results support the contentions of Cook and Friend (2010) and Giangreco (2013) that despite the shift of paraprofessionals towards more responsibility for instruction, paraprofessionals continue to lack the training and the credentials to perform effectively in instructional roles. Based on the contentions of these writers, it can be concluded that the paraprofessionals in the present study lack the necessary training to perform their instructional responsibilities confidently.

In addition, the lack of role clarification regarding instructional responsibilities in the inclusive setting may have also contributed to the paraprofessionals in the present study reporting not being well-prepared to perform instructional duties. Role delineation of paraprofessionals regarding the increasing responsibility given to them for delivery of instructions has been the focus of a number of studies. For example, Giangreco (2010) referred to defining appropriate roles for paraprofessionals as “an elusive and unresolved

issue” (p. 52). Carter et al. (2007) suggested that direct support of students with disabilities “will require clear delineation of paraprofessional roles within the inclusive classroom coupled with well-designed training” (p. 224).

Multiple researchers agree that the instructional process in inclusive classrooms is transforming into a collaborative partnership between teachers and paraprofessionals (Breton, 2010; French, 2003; Giangreco, 2003; Giangreco et al., 2010; Liston et al., 2009; Malian, 2011; Riggs and Mueller, 2001). This is supported by the results of the present study. Principals and teachers reported the majority of the duties in the Team Preparation/follow-up Domain as being very important. However, there appeared to be a conflict of perceptions with administrators on the importance of paraprofessionals attending parent conferences and IEP meetings versus preparing the paperwork and maintaining the files for the meetings. Almost a third of principals in the present study rated paraprofessionals’ attendance at meetings as not important or only somewhat important. But, over half of the principals reported preparing paperwork and maintaining IEP files for the meetings as very important. This researcher concludes that in order for paraprofessionals to be more effective at preparing and maintaining the files for these meetings, their attendance at these meetings is just as important.

Supporting Research Question 3

What are the perceptions of paraprofessionals regarding the effective format and delivery of professional development?

The majority of paraprofessionals most preferred to participate in professional development during school hours and during release time with teachers. Their least

preferred time was during the summer or vacation time. For the present study the preferred times for professional development were matched with Trautman's (2003) three types of training (i.e., preservice, on-the-job, and inservice). The following pairs were made: (a) during school hours = on-the-job training (OJT), (b) during release time with teachers = inservice training, and (c) during summer or vacation time = preservice training. When paired in this manner, OJT is most preferred by paraprofessionals in the present study, which agrees with the findings of Carter et al. (2009) where paraprofessionals reported the most common form of school provided training was OJT.

Liston et al. (2009) reported that paraprofessionals wanted professional development to be structured so that all staff supporting the same students could collaborate; they wanted reflective coaching from supervisors; and they wanted time during the work day to access resource materials. Similar results were reported by paraprofessionals in the present study. The paraprofessionals' preferences were divided evenly between small group training, individual mentoring/consultation, and computer based/internet training. Large group training was the least preferred.

Implications and Recommendations for Practice

A number of implications and recommendations for practice that may be beneficial to alternative school campus administrators and other professionals can be made from the present study.

1. Implication: There is a noticeable difference between the subgroups regarding clerical work and delivery of instruction responsibilities. For principals and teachers, clerical work and activity preparation domains were reported as having

the items of least importance, and ranked below delivery of instruction. Yet, paraprofessionals reported being more prepared and confident performing clerical duties than instructional duties.

Recommendation: Provide professional development on curriculum and instructional strategies to increase paraprofessionals' effectiveness and confidence when providing instructional support to students.

2. Implication: Paraprofessionals reported being well-prepared and highly confident regarding their ethical responsibilities. However, about a fourth of paraprofessionals were not skilled or confident regarding procedures for reporting suspected child abuse.

Recommendation: Professional development regarding ethical responsibilities need to be focused more towards district and campus policy regarding procedures for reporting suspected child abuse and neglect.

3. Implication: At alternative schools, behavior management and supervision of students are among the top responsibilities of paraprofessionals.

Paraprofessionals reported being well-prepared to handle the responsibilities of supervision in non-academic settings. Regarding behavior management, paraprofessionals were least prepared and confident at providing support as directed by students' IEPs.

Recommendation: Professional development needs to be geared towards modeling what supervision of students looks like in academic settings and on

implementing behavior management plans and providing behavior support in accordance with the procedures outlined in IEPs.

4. Implication: Role clarification is needed to effectively support students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms.

Recommendation: Principals need to work with general education and special education teachers to clarify their responsibilities for providing instruction in inclusive classrooms; then establish appropriate responsibilities for paraprofessionals. Also, campus and district administrators need to work with state administrators to develop standardized competencies for assessing paraprofessionals' performance in inclusive settings.

5. Implication: There is a disconnection between principals' perceptions as to the importance of paraprofessionals actually attending parent conferences/IEP meetings versus only preparing the necessary paperwork for these meetings.

Recommendation: Paraprofessionals should attend the parent conferences/IEP meetings of the students for which they provide special education services.

Instruction on effectively communicating appropriate information about students' performance and abilities should be the focus of professional development.

6. Implication: Paraprofessionals indicated they most preferred to participate in professional development during school hours or during release time with teachers. The preferred methods were individual mentoring/consultation, small group training, computer/internet training.

Recommendation: The following suggestions for providing professional development may be useful in addressing this implication:

- Use OJT in the form of modeling and coaching paraprofessionals on how to implement instructional strategies in academic settings;
- provide inservice on curriculum and instructional methodology during team meetings;
- Provide mini-preservice prior to students' arrival about behavior plans or assignment modifications outlined by IEPs.

It is also recommended that campus administrators work with district level administrators with regard to finding ways to compensate paraprofessionals for participating in professional development opportunities that extend past normal duty hours.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research needs to explore efficient and effective ways to provide professional development to paraprofessionals at disciplinary alternative schools. Some suggestions include: consultation model, team-based trainings, web-based trainings, and university partnerships. Experimental or quasi-experimental research needs to be conducted at alternative schools to determine the best ways to equip paraprofessionals to provide instructional support in inclusive classrooms. Also, although the supervision of paraprofessionals at alternative schools was beyond the scope of the present study, future research is recommended in this area. Doing so may lead to district and state

administrators developing basic core standards to better prepare paraprofessionals to effectively provide special education services to students with disabilities.

Limitations

There are several limitations to the present study. Self-report surveys as the only means for data collection was a limitation of the study. Not having other data collection instruments, such as direct observation and interviews, did not allow for triangulation of data. The survey instrument used in the study was also a limitation because of confusing wording and too many rating choices. For example, OJT, preservice, and inservice should have been used for paraprofessionals to indicate their preference for professional development because this verbiage is more consistent with what is prevalent in existing literature. Lastly, the small sample size may limit the generalization and application of the results. However, to assist with the generalization of the results, alternative schools from multiple districts were sampled. Despite these limitations, campus administrators at alternative schools and other readers may consider the present study as a valuable resource for providing more effective professional development to paraprofessionals.

Concluding Remarks

This study supports the prevalent literature that the increasing number of students with disabilities attending alternative schools creates a demand for qualified staff to provide special education services to meet the students' needs (Foley & Pang, 2006; Hoge et al., 2014; Lehr et al., 2009; Ricard et al., 2013; Washburn-Moses, 2011). As with traditional campuses, principals and administrators at alternative schools have a responsibility to ensure staff members are qualified to perform their assigned tasks

(Ashbaker & Morgan, 2006). This will require that paraprofessionals receive appropriate and effective professional development to improve their knowledge and skills. The quality of that professional development can ultimately impact the quality of service they provide to students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms.

Campus administrators should conduct a needs assessment to determine the needs of the students and the program; then use the data to identify and prioritize training needs. In the present study it was determined that paraprofessionals needed professional development in the area of providing instructional support to students, with OJT being the preferred delivery method. This study is not an all-inclusive guide for providing professional development for paraprofessionals in disciplinary alternative schools; it is a resource that can be used to augment the process.

REFERENCES

- Ashbaker, B. Y., Morgan, J. (2006). The role of administrators in paraprofessional supervision to support ethnic minority students with special needs. *Educational Considerations*, 34(1), 16-19.
- Benedict, A. E., Brownwall, M. T., Park, Y., Bettini, E. A., & Lauterbach, A. A. (2014). Taking charge of your professional learning: Tips for cultivating special educator expertise. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 46(6), 147-157.
- Breton, W. (2010). Special education paraprofessionals: Perceptions of preservice preparation, supervision, and ongoing developmental training. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25(1), 34-45.
- Carter, E., O'Rourke, L., Sisco, L. G., & Pelsue, D. (2009). Knowledge, responsibility, and training needs of paraprofessionals in elementary, and secondary schools. *Remedial and Special Education*, 30(6), 344-359.
- Carter, E. W., Sisco, L. G., Melekoglu, M. A., & Kurkowski, C. (2007). Peer support as an alternative to individually assigned paraprofessionals in inclusive high school classrooms. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 42(4), 213-227.
- Causton-Theoharis, J. N., Giangreco, M. F., Doyle, M. B., & Vadasy, P. F. (2007). Paraprofessionals: The "sous-chefs" of literacy instruction. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 40(1), 56-62.
- Cook, L. & Friend, M. (2010). *Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals 2nd ed.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Cobb, C. (2007). Training paraprofessionals to effectively work with all students. *The Reading Teacher*, 60(7), 686-689. doi:10.1598/RT.60.7.10
- Emery, M. J. (1991). *Building team pride: Teachers and paraprofessionals working together.* Columbia, MO: University of Missouri.
- ESE Para-educator survey. (2000). Retrieved from <http://www.fsu.edu/~cspd/pesurvey.htm>

- French, N. K. (1997). Management of paraprofessionals. In A. L. Pickett, & K. Gerlach (Eds.), *Supervising paraeducators in school settings: A team approach*. (pp. 91-189). Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- French, N. K. (2001). Supervising paraprofessionals: A survey of teacher practices. *The Journal of Special Education*, 35(1), 41-53.
- French, N. K. (2003). Management of paraprofessionals. In A. L. Pickett & K. Gerlach (Eds.), *Supervising paraeducators in school settings: A team approach 2nd ed.* (pp. 97-171). Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- French, N. K. (1998). Working together: Resource teachers and paraeducators. *Remedial And Special Education*. 19(6), 357-368.
- French, N. K. (2003). Paraeducators in special education programs. *Focus On Exceptional Children*, 36(2), 1-16.
- Foley, R. M., & Pang, L. (2006). Alternative education programs: Program and student characteristics. *The High School Journal*, Feb/Mar, 10-21.
- Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods 5th ed.* Massachusetts, Boston: SAGE Publishing.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2010). *Applying Educational Research: How to read, do, and use research to solve problems of practice 6th ed.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application 10th ed.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Giangreco, M. F. (2003). Working with paraprofessionals. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 50-53.
- Giangreco, M. F. (2013). Teacher assistants supports in inclusive schools: Research, practices and alternatives. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 34(2), 1-14.
- Giangreco, M. F., Edelman, S. W., Broer, S. M., & Doyle, M. B. (2001). Paraprofessional support of students with disabilities: Literature from the past decade. *Exceptional Children*, 68(1), 45-63. doi:10.1017/jse.2013.1
- Giangreco, M. F., Suter, J. C., & Doyle, M. B. (2010). Paraprofessionals in inclusive schools: A review of recent research. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20, 41-57.

- Hemmer, L. M., Madsen, J., & Tores, M. S. (2013). Critical analysis of accountability policy in alternative schools: implications for school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(5), 655-679.
- Hoge, M. R., Liaupsin, C. J., Umbreit, J., & Ferro, J. B. (2014). Examining placement considerations for students with emotional disturbance across their alternative schools. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 24(4), 218-226.
- Jones, K. H., & Bender, W. N. (1993). Utilization of paraprofessionals in special education: A review of the literature. *Remedial and Special Education*, 14(1), 7-14.
- Lagana-Riordan, C., Aguilar, J. P., Franklin, C., Streeter, C. L., Kim, J. S., Tripodi, S. J., & Hopson, L. M. (2011). At-risk students' perceptions of traditional schools and a solution-focused public alternative school. *Preventing School Failure*, 55(3), 105-114.
- Lehr, C. A., & Lange, C. M. (2003). Alternative schools serving students with and without disabilities: What are the current issues and challenges? *Preventing School Failure*, 47(2), 59-65.
- Lehr, C. A., Soon Tan, C., & Ysseldkye, J. (2009). Alternative schools: A synthesis of state-level policy and research. *Remedial and Special Education*, 30(1), 19-32.
- Likins, M. (2003). NCLB implications for paraprofessionals. *Principal Leadership*, 10-13.
- Liston, A. G., Nevin, A., and Malian, I. (2009). What do paraprofessionals in inclusive classrooms say about their work? Analysis of national survey data and follow-up interviews in California. *TEACHING Exceptional Children Plus*, 5(5), Article 1. Retrieved June 6, 2014 from <http://escholarshop.bc.edu/education/tecplus/vol5/iss5/art1>
- Maggin, D. M., Wehby, J. H., Moore-Partin, T. C., Robertson, R., & Oliver, R. M. (2009). Supervising paraeducators in classrooms for children with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Beyond Behavior*, 2-9.
- Malian, I. M. (2011). Paraeducators perceptions of their roles in inclusive classrooms: A national study of paraeducators. *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education*, 2(8) [2011], Art. 4.

- Mitchell, A. D., Booker, K. W., & Strain, J. D. (2011). Measuring readiness to respond to intervention in students attending disciplinary alternative schools. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 29(6), 547-558.
- Mulcahy, C. A., Maccini, P., Wright, K., & Miller, J. (2014). An examination of intervention research with secondary students with EBD in light of common core state standards for mathematics. *Behavioral Disorders*, 39(3), 146-164.
- Pickett, A. L., Likins, M., & Wallace, T. (2003). *The employment & preparations of paraeducators: The state-of-the-art – 2003*. National Resource Center for Paraprofessionals. New York: City University.
- Portney, L. G., & Watkins, M. P. (2009). *Foundations of Clinical Research: Applications to practice. 3rd ed.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Quinn, M. M., Poirier, J. M., Faller, S. E., Gable, R. A., & Tonelson, S. W. (2006). An examination of school climate in effective alternative programs. *Preventing School Failure*, 51(1), 11-17.
- Raywid, M. A. (1994). Alternative schools: The state of the art. *Educational Leadership*, 52(1), 26-31.
- Raywid, M. A. (1999). History and issues of alternative schools. *The High School Magazine*, 64(9), 47-51.
- Ricard, R. J., Lerma, E., & Heard, C. C. (2013). Piloting a dialectical behavioral therapy (DBT) infused skills group in a disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP). *The Journal Specialists In Group Work*, 38(4), 285-306. Doi: 10.1080/01933922.2013.834402
- Riggs, C. G. (2001). Ask the paraprofessionals: What are your training needs? *TEACHING Exceptional Children*. 33(3), 78-83.
- Riggs, C. G., & Mueller, P. H. (2001). Employment and utilization of paraeducators in inclusive settings. *The Journal of Special Education*, 35(1), 54-62.
- Stockall, N. (2014). When an aide really becomes an aid: Providing professional development for special education paraprofessionals. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 46(6), 197-205.
- Trautman, M. L. (2004). Preparing and managing paraprofessionals. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 39(3), 131-138.

- Texas Education Code. (2013, amended). *Chapter 37. Discipline; Law And Order*. Retrieved April 10, 2015, from <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.37.htm>
- Texas Education Agency. (2007). *Disciplinary alternative education program practices*. Policy Research Report No. 17 (Document No. GE07 601 11). Austin, TX: Author.
- Texas Education Agency. (2015). *2014 comprehensive biennial report on Texas public schools* (Document No. GE15 601 04). Austin, TX: Author.
- Texas Education Agency. (2010). Paraprofessional Requirements Under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, To the Administrator Addressed letter dated August 10, 2010. Retrieved April 10, 2015, <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/taa/nclb082410.html>
- Van Acker, R. (2007). Antisocial, aggressive, and violent behavior in children and adolescents within alternative education settings: Prevention and intervention. *Preventing School Failure*, 51(2), 5-12.
- Wallace, T., Shin, J., Bartholomay, T., & Stahl, B. J. (2001). Knowledge and skills for teachers supervising the work of paraprofessionals. *The Council for Exceptional Children*, 67(4), 520-533.
- Wasburn-Moses, L. (2011). An investigation of alternative schools in one state: Implications for students with disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education*, 44(4), 247-255.
- Yell, M. L., & Katsiyannis, A. (2004). Placing students with disabilities in inclusive settings: Legal guidelines and preferred practices. *Preventing School Failure*, 49(1), 28-35.

APPENDIX A
Paraprofessional Survey

The return of your completed questionnaire constitutes your informed consent to act as a participant in this research.

Paraprofessional Skills/Confidence Survey

(Adapted From French, 1997; Adapted From Emery, 1991)

This survey is for paraprofessionals working with teachers and administrators as a team in secondary alternative education inclusive settings. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve professional development opportunities for paraprofessionals assigned to alternative education campuses.

What is the primary setting where you are assigned? (Select only one.)

- Special Education Self-contained Classroom
- Special Education Resource Room
- General Education Inclusion Classroom (Academic or Elective)
- Supervise Time-out/In-School Suspension (ISS)
- Supervise Study Hall (Academic or Elective)
- Supervise Lunch/Recess
- Other

How many years total have you worked as a paraprofessional?

- 0-2 years
- 3-6 years
- 7-10 years
- more than 10 years

How many years of experience working with students with disabilities in a classroom setting?

- 0-2 years
- 3-6 years
- 7-10 years
- more than 10 years

What is your highest level of completed education?

- High School
- Some college courses
- Associate's Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Graduate Classes
- Graduate Degrees

For the sections below consider your own skills and confidence to perform each task. Decide how well-prepared and confident you feel on each of the tasks/duties. Scores

may range from 1 to 5. (An optional “Other” space is provided for you to add a task that is not listed.)

Select 1 if you are unprepared to do the task and want/need training in order to begin.

Select 2 if you feel you can begin doing the task but need further instruction on how to do it well.

Select 3 or 4 if you feel you that you are confident enough to do the task but want to improve your skills.

Select 5 if you feel well-prepared and highly skilled to perform that task.

Delivery of Instruction	Unprepared		Highly Skilled		
1. Observe and record student progress in academic areas	1	2	3	4	5
2. Help students in a drill and practice lessons (e.g., vocabulary, math facts)	1	2	3	4	5
3. Read/repeat test or directions to students	1	2	3	4	5
4. Listen to students read orally	1	2	3	4	5
5. Help students with workbooks/other written assignments and projects	1	2	3	4	5
6. Assist students to compose original work (e.g., stories, essays, reports)	1	2	3	4	5
7. Modify instructional materials according to directions (e.g., lesson plans, IEPs)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Facilitate students’ active participation in cooperative groups	1	2	3	4	5
9. Help students use computers	1	2	3	4	5
10. Monitor student performance in community-based settings	1	2	3	4	5
11. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Activity Preparation/Follow-up	Unprepared		Highly Skilled		
1. Find/arrange materials/operate equipment (e.g., overhead projectors, set up lab materials)	1	2	3	4	5
2. Modify or adapt materials/equipment for particular student	1	2	3	4	5
3. Construct learning materials	1	2	3	4	5
4. Prepare classroom displays	1	2	3	4	5
5. Order materials and supplies	1	2	3	4	5
6. Organize classroom supplies/materials	1	2	3	4	5

7. Schedule guest speakers/visitors as directed	1	2	3	4	5
8. Distribute supplies/materials/books to students	1	2	3	4	5
9. Collect completed work from students	1	2	3	4	5
10. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Supervision of Groups of Students	Unprepared		Highly Skilled		
1. Supervise groups of students on arrival or departure	1	2	3	4	5
2. Supervise groups of students during lunch	1	2	3	4	5
3. Supervise groups of students during study hall classes	1	2	3	4	5
4. Supervise groups of students loading/unloading buses	1	2	3	4	5
5. Monitor students during all passing periods	1	2	3	4	5
6. Escorts groups of students to bathroom, library, gym, etc	1	2	3	4	5
7. Accompany students to therapy sessions, individual appointments	1	2	3	4	5
8. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Behavior Management	Unprepared		Highly Skilled		
1. Supervise time-out/in-school suspension room	1	2	3	4	5
2. Observe and chart individual student behavior	1	2	3	4	5
3. Give positive reinforcement and supports as directed by plans/IEPs	1	2	3	4	5
4. Provide physical proximity for students with behavior problems	1	2	3	4	5
5. Circulate in classroom to provide behavioral supports where needed	1	2	3	4	5
6. Enforce class and school rules	1	2	3	4	5
7. Assist students who are self-managing behavior (e.g., provide cues, prompts)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Help students develop/self-monitor organizational skills	1	2	3	4	5
9. Facilitate appropriate social interactions among students	1	2	3	4	5
10. Assist other students in coping with the behaviors of specific students	1	2	3	4	5

11. Other	1	2	3	4	5
-----------	---	---	---	---	---

Ethics	Unprepared		Highly Skilled		
1. Maintain confidentiality of all information regarding students	1	2	3	4	5
2. Respect the dignity and rights of every child at all times	1	2	3	4	5
3. Respect suspected child abuse according to the law and local procedures	1	2	3	4	5
4. Communicate with parents and families to the extent indicated by the team	1	2	3	4	5
5. Provide accurate information about the student with all those who have the right to know (e.g., team members)	1	2	3	4	5
6. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Team Participation/Membership	Unprepared		Highly Skilled		
1. Meet with team as scheduled/directed	1	2	3	4	5
2. Participate in team meetings by contributing information and ideas	1	2	3	4	5
3. Participate in team meetings by listening carefully to the ideas of others	1	2	3	4	5
4. Attend parent-teacher conferences	1	2	3	4	5
5. Attend IEP meetings	1	2	3	4	5
6. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Clerical Work	Unprepared		Highly Skilled		
1. Take attendance	1	2	3	4	5
2. Record grades	1	2	3	4	5
3. Collect fees (e.g., lab, book, activity, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
4. Correct assigned student-lessons/homework	1	2	3	4	5
5. Grade tests	1	2	3	4	5
6. Help paperwork to facilitate parent-teacher conference	1	2	3	4	5
7. Inventory materials and fill out routine forms	1	2	3	4	5
8. Make arrangements for field trips	1	2	3	4	5

9. Maintain files for IEPs, assessment reports, other program reports	1	2	3	4	5
10. Other	1	2	3	4	5

For the questions below please determine the format of professional development activities which best meets your needs. Rate the priority level for each activity. (An optional “Other” space is provided for you to add an activity that is not listed.)

(Adapted From Florida State University ESE Para-educator Survey, 2000)

Please indicate preferred times for participating in professional development activities by marking each as <u>L</u>ow, <u>M</u>edium, or <u>H</u>igh.	Priority Level		
	L	M	H
Saturdays/Weekends	L	M	H
After School	L	M	H
Evenings	L	M	H
During School Hours/Release Time	L	M	H
During the Summer/Vacation Time	L	M	H
Other	L	M	H

Please indicate preferences for the delivery of professional development activities by marking each as <u>L</u>ow, <u>M</u>edium, or <u>H</u>igh.	Priority Level		
	L	M	H
Consultation/Mentoring (individual assistance)	L	M	H
Small Group Training/Single Day Workshop	L	M	H
Small Group Training/Multiple Day Workshop	L	M	H
Large Group Training/Single Day Workshop	L	M	H
Large Group Training/Multiple Day Workshop (i.e., conferences, institutes)	L	M	H
Computer-Based/Internet-Based	L	M	H
Video-Based (i.e., cd/dvd, broadcast)	L	M	H
Other	L	M	H

APPENDIX B
Teacher Survey

The return of your completed survey constitutes your informed consent to act as a participant in this research.

**Teacher
Program/Student Needs Survey**

(Adapted From French, 1997; Adapted From Emery, 1991)

This survey is for teachers working with paraprofessionals as a team in secondary alternative education inclusive settings. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve professional development opportunities for paraprofessionals assigned to alternative education campuses.

Current Position

- Special Education Teacher
- General Education Teacher

How many years total have you worked as a teacher?

- 0-2 years
- 3-6 years
- 7-10 years
- more than 10 years

How many years of experience working with students with disabilities in a classroom setting?

- 0-2 years
- 3-6 years
- 7-10 years
- more than 10 years

What is your highest level of completed education?

- Bachelor's Degree
- Graduate Classes
- Master's Degree
- Doctoral Degree

Consider the needs of students, the team, and the program as a whole. How important is it for paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities to be able to perform the task and duties listed below? Scores may range from 1 to 5, with 1 being "Not

Important” and 5 being “Very Important”. (An optional “Other” space has been provided for you to add a task/duty that is not listed, but you feel is important.)

Delivery of Instruction	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Observe and record student progress in academic areas	1	2	3	4	5
2. Help students in a drill and practice lessons (e.g., vocabulary, math facts)	1	2	3	4	5
3. Read/repeat test or directions to students	1	2	3	4	5
4. Listen to students read orally	1	2	3	4	5
5. Help students with workbooks/other written assignments and projects	1	2	3	4	5
6. Assist students to compose original work (e.g., stories, essays, reports)	1	2	3	4	5
7. Modify instructional materials according to directions (e.g., lesson plans, IEPs)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Facilitate students’ active participation in cooperative groups	1	2	3	4	5
9. Help students use computers	1	2	3	4	5
10. Monitor student performance in community-based settings	1	2	3	4	5
11. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Activity Preparation/Follow-up	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Find/arrange materials/operate equipment (e.g., overhead projectors, set up lab materials)	1	2	3	4	5
2. Modify or adapt materials/equipment for particular student	1	2	3	4	5
3. Construct learning materials	1	2	3	4	5
4. Prepare classroom displays	1	2	3	4	5
5. Order materials and supplies	1	2	3	4	5
6. Organize classroom supplies/materials	1	2	3	4	5
7. Schedule guest speakers/visitors as directed	1	2	3	4	5
8. Distribute supplies/materials/books to students	1	2	3	4	5
9. Collect completed work from students	1	2	3	4	5
10. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Supervision of Groups of Students	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Supervise groups of students on arrival or departure	1	2	3	4	5
2. Supervise groups of students during lunch	1	2	3	4	5
3. Supervise groups of students during study hall classes	1	2	3	4	5
4. Supervise groups of students loading/unloading buses	1	2	3	4	5
5. Monitor students during all passing periods	1	2	3	4	5
6. Escorts groups of students to bathroom, library, gym, etc	1	2	3	4	5
7. Accompany students to therapy sessions, individual appointments	1	2	3	4	5
8. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Behavior Management	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Supervise time-out/in-school suspension room	1	2	3	4	5
2. Observe and chart individual student behavior	1	2	3	4	5
3. Give positive reinforcement and supports as directed by plans/IEPs	1	2	3	4	5
4. Provide physical proximity for students with behavior problems	1	2	3	4	5
5. Circulate in classroom to provide behavioral supports where needed	1	2	3	4	5
6. Enforce class and school rules	1	2	3	4	5
7. Assist students who are self-managing behavior (e.g., provide cues, prompts)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Help students develop/self-monitor organizational skills	1	2	3	4	5
9. Facilitate appropriate social interactions among students	1	2	3	4	5
10. Assist other students in coping with the behaviors of specific students	1	2	3	4	5
11. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Ethics	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Maintain confidentiality of all information regarding students	1	2	3	4	5
2. Respect the dignity and rights of every child at all times	1	2	3	4	5

3. Respect suspected child abuse according to the law and local procedures	1	2	3	4	5
4. Communicate with parents and families to the extent indicated by the team	1	2	3	4	5
5. Provide accurate information about the student with all those who have the right to know (e.g., team members)	1	2	3	4	5
6. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Team Participation/Membership	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Meet with team as scheduled/directed	1	2	3	4	5
2. Participate in team meetings by contributing information and ideas	1	2	3	4	5
3. Participate in team meetings by listening carefully to the ideas of others	1	2	3	4	5
4. Attend parent-teacher conferences	1	2	3	4	5
5. Attend IEP meetings	1	2	3	4	5
6. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Clerical Work	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Take attendance	1	2	3	4	5
2. Record grades	1	2	3	4	5
3. Collect fees (e.g., lab, book, activity, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
4. Correct assigned student-lessons/homework	1	2	3	4	5
5. Grade tests	1	2	3	4	5
6. Help paperwork to facilitate parent-teacher conference	1	2	3	4	5
7. Inventory materials and fill out routine forms	1	2	3	4	5
8. Make arrangements for field trips	1	2	3	4	5
9. Maintain files for IEPs, assessment reports, other reports	1	2	3	4	5
10. Other	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C
Principal/Administrator Survey

The return of your completed survey constitutes your informed consent to act as a participant in this research.

**Principal/Administrator
Program/Student Needs Survey**

(Adapted From French, 1997; Adapted From Emery, 1991)

This survey is for campus administrators working with paraprofessionals as a team in secondary alternative education inclusive settings. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve professional development opportunities for paraprofessionals assigned to alternative education campuses.

Current Position

- Campus Principal
- Administrator

How many years total have you been a principal/administrator?

- 0-2 years
- 3-6 years
- 7-10 years
- more than 10 years

What is your highest level of completed education?

- Bachelor's Degree
- Graduate Classes
- Master's Degree
- Doctoral Degree

On average how many hours of professional development do paraprofessionals receive a year?

- 0-3
- 3-5
- 5-10
- 10-15
- 15-20
- 20-30

On the campus, how many hours of professional development do paraprofessionals receive in the following areas?

- Delivery of Instruction

<input type="checkbox"/> Activity Preparation/Follow-up <input type="checkbox"/> Supervision of Groups of Students <input type="checkbox"/> Behavior Management <input type="checkbox"/> Ethics <input type="checkbox"/> Team Participation/Membership <input type="checkbox"/> Clerical Work
<p>How many students are currently enrolled at the school? _____</p> <p>Of the current total enrollment, what percentage are students with disabilities? _____</p>

Consider the needs of students, the team, and the program as a whole. How important is it for paraprofessionals working with students with disabilities to be able to perform the task and duties listed below? Scores may range from 1 to 5, with 1 being “Not Important” and 5 being “Very Important”. (An optional “Other” space has been provided for you to add a task/duty that is not listed, but you feel is important.)

Delivery of Instruction	Not Important					Very Important				
1. Observe and record student progress in academic areas	1	2	3	4	5					
2. Help students in a drill and practice lessons (e.g., vocabulary, math facts)	1	2	3	4	5					
3. Read/repeat test or directions to students	1	2	3	4	5					
4. Listen to students read orally	1	2	3	4	5					
5. Help students with workbooks/other written assignments and projects	1	2	3	4	5					
6. Assist students to compose original work (e.g., stories, essays, reports)	1	2	3	4	5					
7. Modify instructional materials according to directions (e.g., lesson plans, IEPs)	1	2	3	4	5					
8. Facilitate students’ active participation in cooperative groups	1	2	3	4	5					
9. Help students use computers	1	2	3	4	5					
10. Monitor student performance in community-based settings	1	2	3	4	5					

11. Other	1	2	3	4	5
Activity Preparation/Follow-up	Not Important			Very Important	
1. Find/arrange materials/operate equipment (e.g., overhead projectors, set up lab materials)	1	2	3	4	5
2. Modify or adapt materials/equipment for particular student	1	2	3	4	5
3. Construct learning materials	1	2	3	4	5
4. Prepare classroom displays	1	2	3	4	5
5. Order materials and supplies	1	2	3	4	5
6. Organize classroom supplies/materials	1	2	3	4	5
7. Schedule guest speakers/visitors as directed	1	2	3	4	5
8. Distribute supplies/materials/books to students	1	2	3	4	5
9. Collect completed work from students	1	2	3	4	5
10. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Supervision of Groups of Students	Not Important			Very Important	
1. Supervise groups of students on arrival or departure	1	2	3	4	5
2. Supervise groups of students during lunch	1	2	3	4	5
3. Supervise groups of students during study hall classes	1	2	3	4	5
4. Supervise groups of students loading/unloading buses	1	2	3	4	5
5. Monitor students during all passing periods	1	2	3	4	5
6. Escorts groups of students to bathroom, library, gym, etc	1	2	3	4	5
7. Accompany students to therapy sessions, individual appointments	1	2	3	4	5
8. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Behavior Management	Not Important			Very Important	
1. Supervise time-out/in-school suspension room	1	2	3	4	5
2. Observe and chart individual student behavior	1	2	3	4	5
3. Give positive reinforcement and supports as directed by plans/IEPs	1	2	3	4	5

4. Provide physical proximity for students with behavior problems	1	2	3	4	5
5. Circulate in classroom to provide behavioral supports where needed	1	2	3	4	5
6. Enforce class and school rules	1	2	3	4	5
7. Assist students who are self-managing behavior (e.g., provide cues, prompts)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Help students develop/self-monitor organizational skills	1	2	3	4	5
9. Facilitate appropriate social interactions among students	1	2	3	4	5
10. Assist other students in coping with the behaviors of specific students	1	2	3	4	5
11. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Ethics	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Maintain confidentiality of all information regarding students	1	2	3	4	5
2. Respect the dignity and rights of every child at all times	1	2	3	4	5
3. Respect suspected child abuse according to the law and local procedures	1	2	3	4	5
4. Communicate with parents and families to the extent indicated by the team	1	2	3	4	5
5. Provide accurate information about the student with all those who have the right to know (e.g., team members)	1	2	3	4	5
6. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Team Participation/Membership	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Meet with team as scheduled/directed	1	2	3	4	5
2. Participate in team meetings by contributing information and ideas	1	2	3	4	5
3. Participate in team meetings by listening carefully to the ideas of others	1	2	3	4	5
4. Attend parent-teacher conferences	1	2	3	4	5
5. Attend IEP meetings	1	2	3	4	5
6. Other	1	2	3	4	5

Clerical Work	Not Important		Very Important		
1. Take attendance	1	2	3	4	5
2. Record grades	1	2	3	4	5
3. Collect fees (e.g., lab, book, activity, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
4. Correct assigned student-lessons/homework	1	2	3	4	5
5. Grade tests	1	2	3	4	5
6. Help paperwork to facilitate parent-teacher conference	1	2	3	4	5
7. Inventory materials and fill out routine forms	1	2	3	4	5
8. Make arrangements for field trips	1	2	3	4	5
9. Maintain files for IEPs, assessment reports, other reports	1	2	3	4	5
10. Other	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D
Cover Letter

COVER LETTER

Dear Principal,

You are being sent this email to request permission to invite paraprofessionals, teachers, and administrators to complete an on-line questionnaire. The questionnaire is designed to obtain information about the responsibilities and training needs of paraprofessionals and will require 15 minutes to complete. The responses will be anonymous and considered when developing professional development opportunities for paraprofessionals.

The study is titled *Paraprofessionals at Alternative Schools: Professional Development Needs for Inclusive Settings*. The purpose of this study is to examine the responsibilities and professional development needs of paraprofessionals working with secondary students with and without disabilities at alternative schools, specifically DAEP campuses.

Once I receive your consent letter I will email the Invitation To Participate to your staff. The invitation will explain the purpose of the study, volunteer participant criteria, anonymity and confidentiality statements, potential risk, and directions on how to complete the survey.

I realize you that your schedule is busy and your staff's time is valuable. As an incentive to volunteer, teachers and paraprofessionals who complete the survey, if they elect, will be entered into a drawing for one of four \$50 Visa Gift Cards. Once the questionnaire is submitted, volunteers may enter an email address which will be used for the random drawing.

Thank you in advance for your participation. If you have question about the study, you can contact me at 469-xxx-xxxx

Respectfully,

Syrinithnia Jones Mann

APPENDIX E
Invitation to Participate

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

You are asked to participate in this study for Syrithnia Jones' dissertation at Texas Woman's University. This study has been approved by the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Please note the information below for your records:

Investigator: Syrithnia Jones..... sjones17@twu.edu 469/xxx-xxxx

Faculty Advisor: Jerry Whitworth, Pd.D... ..jwhitworth@twu.edu 940/xxx-xxxx

I am seeking volunteers to participate in a survey research study titled *Paraprofessionals at Alternative Schools: Professional Development Needs for Inclusive Settings*. The purpose of this study is to examine the classroom management responsibilities and training needs of paraprofessionals working with secondary students with disabilities in inclusive settings at alternative schools.

The study will be conducted on-line via the internet. Paraprofessionals, teachers, and principals/administrators that work at secondary DAEP campuses and provide instruction or supervise students with and without disabilities are asked to volunteer. Participants will be asked to complete a 15 minute questionnaire on the tasks, responsibilities, and training needs of paraprofessionals working at alternative schools.

Completing the survey which is attached to the website link below is voluntary. Select the appropriate questionnaire for the position you are assigned. All responses will remain anonymous and be considered in developing future professional development opportunities for paraprofessionals. To ensure that anonymity will be protected at all times, the link to the survey is in this email. The link is connected to PsychData.com, a secured internal TWU site. The only known risk associated with this study is there is a potential risk of loss of confidentiality in all email, downloading, and internet transactions.

If you choose to participate in this study please click on the appropriate link to begin. Please respond any time during the next two weeks, but no later than March 1st, 2015. **I realize your schedule is busy. As an incentive to participate, paraprofessionals and teachers who complete the survey, if they elect, will be entered into a drawing for one of four \$50 Visa Gift Cards.** Once the questionnaire is submitted, participants may enter an email address which will be used for the random drawing. If notified as a winner, the participant will need to provide a name and mailing address to which the gift card can be mailed using the United States Postal Service with a required signature for receipt. When the gift cards have been distributed to the winners, the information will be shredded and deleted.

The benefits of participating in this study is that you will be contributing information that will assist in designing professional development specifically for paraprofessionals at alternative schools. Regardless of whether you participate in this study, if you will like to know the results, email me requesting the results. The results will be emailed to you. Your participation is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely,

Syrinithnia Jones

APPENDIX F
Tables

Table F1 Principals/Administrators: Delivery of Instruction (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Means(SD)
All Principals/Administrators	7	100%	
Observe and record student progress in academic areas			4.5(.78)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	1	14.3%	
5	5	71.4%	
Help students in drill and practice lesson			3.4(1.1)
1	0	0.0	
2	2	28.6%	
3	1	14.3%	
4	3	42.9%	
5	1	14.3%	
Read/repeat test or directions to students			4.0(.57)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	5	71.4%	
5	1	14.3%	
Listen to students read orally			3.8(.37)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	6	85.7%	
5	0	0.0	
Help students with workbooks/other written assignments			4.0(.81)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	28.6%	
4	3	42.9%	
5	2	28.6%	

Assist students to compose original work			4.0(.81)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	28.6%	
4	3	42.9%	
5	2	28.6%	
Modify instructional material according to directions			4.0(1.1)
1	0	0	
2	1	14.3%	
3	1	14.3%	
4	2	28.6%	
5	3	42.9%	
Facilitate students' active participation in cooperative groups			4.1(.69)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	4	57.1%	
5	2	28.6%	
Help students use computers			4.0(.81)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	28.6%	
4	3	42.9%	
5	2	28.6%	
Monitor student performance in community-based settings			3.8(.90)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	14.3%	
3	0	0.0	
4	5	71.4%	
5	1	14.3%	
Other			
Implement effective classroom management	1	14.3%	

Table F2 Principals/Administrators: Activity Preparation/Follow-up (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Means(SD)
All Principals/Administrators	7	100%	
Find/arrange materials/operate equipment			3.5(.97)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	2.7%	
3	2	28.6%	
4	3	42.9%	
5	1	14.3%	
Modify/adapt materials/equipment for a particular student			3.8(1.3)
1	0	0.0	
2	2	28.6%	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	28.6%	
5	3	42.9%	
Construct learning materials			3.1(.98)
1	0	0.0	
2	2	28.6%	
3	1	14.3%	
4	3	42.9%	
5	0	0.0	
Missing system	1	14.3%	
Prepare classroom displays			2.5(.78)
1	1	14.3%	
2	1	14.3%	
3	5	71.4%	
4	0	0.0	
5	0	0.0	
Order materials and supplies			2.2(.75)
1	1	14.3%	
2	3	42.9%	
3	3	42.9%	
4	0	0.0	
5	0	0.0	
Organize classroom supplies/materials			3.1(1.3)

1	1	14.35	
2	1	14.3%	
3	2	28.6%	
4	2	28.6%	
5	1	14.3%	
Schedule guest speakers/visitors as directed			1.7(.95)
1	4	57.1%	
2	1	14.3%	
3	2	28.6%	
4	0	0.0	
5	0	0.0	
Distribute supplies/materials to students			3.9(1.2)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	3	42.9%	
4	2	28.6%	
5	1	14.3%	
Collect completed work from students			3.8(1.0)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	14.3%	
3	1	14.3%	
4	3	42.9%	
5	2	28.6%	

Table F3 Principals/Administrators: Supervision of Groups of Students (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Means(SD)
All Principals/Administrators	7	100%	
Supervise groups of students on arrival or departure			4.2(.95)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	28.6%	
4	1	14.3%	
5	4	57.1%	
Supervise groups of students during lunch			4.0(1.5)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	1	14.3%	
5	4	57.1%	
Supervise groups of students during study hall classes			4.4(.78)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	2	28.6%	
5	4	57.1%	
Supervise groups of students loading/unloading buses			4.0(1.1)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	14.3%	
3	1	14.3%	
4	2	28.6%	
5	3	42.9%	
Monitor students during passing periods			4.2(1.4)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	14.3%	
5	5	71.4%	

Escort groups of students to bathrooms, library, gym, etc.			4.3(.81)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	2	28.65	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	1	14.3%	
Accompany students to therapy sessions, individual appointments			3.4(1.1)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	5	71.4%	
5	0	0.0	

Table F4 Principals/Administrators: Behavior Management (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Means(SD)
All Principals/Administrators	7	100%	
Supervise time-out or in-school suspension rooms			4.2(1.0)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	28.6%	
4	0	0.0	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Observe and chart student behavior			3.8(1.0)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	3	42.9%	
4	0	0.0	
5	2	28.6%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Give positive reinforcement and support as directed by plans/IEP			4.8(.44)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	14.3%	
5	4	57.1%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Provide physical proximity for students with behavior problems			4.6(.54)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	28.6%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Circulate in classrooms to provide behavioral supports where needed			4.7(.50)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	

3	0	0.0	
4	1	14.3%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	3	42.9%	
Enforce class and school rules			4.6(.89)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	0	0.0	
5	4	57.1%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Assist students who are self-managing behaviors			4.4(.89)
1	0	0	
2	0	0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	1	14.3%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Help students develop self- monitor organizational skills			4.5(1.0)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	0	0.0	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	3	42.9%	
Facilitate appropriate social interactions among students			4.7(.50)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	14.3%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	3	42.9%	
Assist other students in coping with behaviors of specific students			4.2(1.0)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	28.6%	
4	0	0.0	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	

Table F5 Principals/Administrators: Ethics (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Means(SD)
All Principals/Administrators	7	100%	
Maintain confidentiality of all information regarding students			4.8(.44)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	14.3%	
5	4	57.1%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Respect the dignity and rights of every child at all times			5.0(.00)
1	0	0	
2	0	0	
3	0	0	
4	0	0.0	
5	5	71.4%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Report suspected child abuse according to the law/local procedure			5.0(.00)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	5	71.4%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Communicate w/parents to the extent indicated by the team			4.6(.54)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	28.6%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	

Provide information about the student to those w/right to know			4.2(.83)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	2	28.6%	
5	2	28.6%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	

Table F6 Principals/Administrators: Team Participation/Membership (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Means(SD)
All Principals/Administrators	7	100%	
Meet with team as scheduled/directed			4.6(.54)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	28.6%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Participate in team meetings contributing information and ideas			4.6(.54)
1	0	0	
2	0	0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	28.6%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Participate in team meetings by listening to ideas of others			4.6(.54)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	28.6%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Attend parent-teacher conferences			3.6(1.5)
1	0	0	
2	2	28.6%	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	14.3%	
5	2	28.6%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	

Attend ARD/IEP meetings			3.2(1.6)
1	1	14.3%	
2	1	14.3%	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	28.6%	
5	1	14.3%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Other			
Work as a team to prepare curriculum	1	14.3%	

Table F7 Principals/Administrators: Clerical Work (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Means(SD)
All Principals/Administrators	7	100%	
Take attendance			4.2(1.7)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	4	57.1%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Record grades			4.2(1.7)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	4	57.1%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Collect fees			2.6(1.5)
1	2	28.6%	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	14.3%	
4	2	28.6%	
5	0	0.0	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Correct assigned student lessons/homework			4.0(1.7)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	14.3%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Grade tests			4.2(1.7)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	4	57.1%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	

Prepare paperwork to facilitate parent-teacher conferences			4.9(1.7)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	14.3%	
5	3	42.9%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Inventory materials and fill out routine forms			3.0(1.4)
1	1	14.3%	
2	1	14.3%	
3	0	0.0	
4	3	42.9%	
5	0	0.0	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Make arrangements for field trips			2.4(1.3)
1	2	28.6%	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	28.6%	
4	1	14.3%	
5	0	0.0	
Missing system	2	28.6%	
Maintain files for IEPs, assessment reports, other reports			4.2(1.7)
1	1	14.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	4	57.1%	
Missing system	2	28.6%	

Table F8 Teachers: Delivery of Instruction (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean (SD)
All Teachers	37	100%	
Observe and record student progress in academic areas			4.5(.83)
1	1	2.7%	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	5.4%	
4	9	24.3%	
5	25	67.6%	
Help students in drill and practice lesson			4.3(.82)
1	0	0.0	
2	2	5.4%	
3	2	5.4%	
4	13	35.1%	
5	20	54.1%	
Read/repeat test or directions to students			4.3(.86)
1	0	0	
2	1	2.7%	
3	6	16.2%	
4	8	21.6%	
5	22	59.5%	
Listen to students read orally			4.0(.82)
1	0	0.0	
2	2	5.4%	
3	6	16.2%	
4	18	48.6%	
5	10	27.0%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Help students with workbooks/other written assignments			4.2(.76)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	2.7%	
3	4	10.8%	
4	17	45.9%	
5	15	40.5%	
Assist students to compose original work			4.0(.93)
1	0	0.0	

2	3	8.1%	
3	7	18.9	
4	14	37.8%	
5	13	35.1%	
Modify instructional material according to directions			3.7(1.56)
1	5	13.5%	
2	6	16.2%	
3	3	8.1%	
4	4	10.8%	
5	19	51.4%	
Facilitate students' active participation in cooperative groups			4.6(.69)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	4	10.8%	
4	12	32.4%	
5	21	56.8%	
Help students use computers			3.9(.89)
1	0	0.0	
2	2	5.4%	
3	10	27.0%	
4	14	37.8%	
5	11	29.7%	
Monitor student performance in community-based settings			3.5(1.2)
1	2	5.4%	
2	7	18.9%	
3	9	24.3%	
4	8	21.6%	
5	11	29.7%	
Other			
Classroom management	1	2.7%	
Clarify and check for understanding of directions and concepts	1	2.7%	
Evaluate language barriers and ensure students understand English	1	2.7%	
Adapt instructions to each individual student	1	2.7%	
Paraprofessionals need working knowledge of content	1	2.7%	
Keep students on task with the lesson	1	2.7%	
Use multiple approaches to accommodate learning styles	1	2.7%	

Table F9			
Teacher: Activity Preparation/Follow-up (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean (SD)
All Teachers	37	100%	
Find/arrange materials/operate equipment			3.7(1.1)
1	1	2.7%	
2	3	8.1%	
3	12	32.4%	
4	8	21.6%	
5	11	29.7%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Modify/adapt materials/equipment for a particular student			3.8(1.3)
1	3	8.1%	
2	3	8.1%	
3	8	21.6%	
4	6	16.2%	
5	16	43.2%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Construct learning materials			3.4(1.4)
1	4	10.8%	
2	8	21.6%	
3	4	10.8%	
4	8	21.6%	
5	12	32.4%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Prepare classroom displays			3.1(1.2)
1	4	10.8%	
2	7	18.9%	
3	8	21.6%	
4	12	32.4%	
5	5	13.5%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Order materials and supplies			2.8(1.4)
1	7	18.9%	
2	9	24.3%	
3	8	21.6%	
4	5	13.5%	
5	7	18.9%	

Missing system	1	2.7%	
Organize classroom supplies/materials			3.3(1.2)
1	4	10.8%	
2	6	16.2%	
3	8	21.6%	
4	11	29.7%	
5	7	18.9%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Schedule guest speakers/visitors as directed			2.8(1.3)
1	7	18.9%	
2	7	18.9%	
3	12	32.4%	
4	4	10.8%	
5	6	16.2%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Distribute supplies/materials to students			3.6(1.2)
1	4	10.8%	
2	2	5.4%	
3	6	16.2%	
4	13	35.1%	
5	10	27.0 %	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Collect completed work from students			3.9(1.0)
1	1	2.7%	
2	2	5.4%	
3	9	24.3%	
4	10	27.0%	
5	14	37.8%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Other			
Document data about progress on appropriate forms	1	2.7%	
Provide feedback on completed assignments	1	2.7%	

Table F10 Teachers: Supervision of Groups of Students (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Teachers	37	100%	
Supervise groups of students on arrival or departure			4.3(.71)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	5	13.5%	
4	14	37.8%	
5	17	45.9%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Supervise groups of students during lunch			3.9(1.1)
1	3	8.1%	
2	0	0.0	
3	7	18.9%	
4	13	35.1%	
5	13	35.1%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Supervise groups of students during study hall classes			3.9(.97)
1	0	0	
2	4	10.8%	
3	5	13.5%	
4	15	40.5%	
5	12	32.4%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Supervise groups of students loading/unloading buses			3.3(1.2)
1	3	8.1%	
2	3	8.1%	
3	7	18.9%	
4	12	32.4%	
5	12	32.4%	
Monitor students during passing periods			3.9(.96)
1	0	0.0	
2	4	10.8%	
3	6	16.2%	
4	15	40.5%	
5	11	29.7%	

Missing system	1	2.7%	
Escort groups of students to bathrooms, library, gym, etc.			3.7(1.1)
1	2	5.4%	
2	3	8.1%	
3	8	21.6%	
4	12	32.4%	
5	11	29.7%	
Missing system	1	2.7%	
Accompany students to therapy sessions, individual appointments			3.0(1.3)
1	5	13.5%	
2	8	21.6%	
3	12	32.4%	
4	5	13.5%	
5	7	18.9%	
Other			
Give students time to socialize and observe behavior with peers	1	2.7%	
Paraprofessionals are as valuable as teachers at all the above	1	2.7%	
Students need close supervision	1	2.7%	

Table F11 Teachers: Behavior Management (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Teachers	37	100%	
Supervise time-out or in-school suspension rooms			3.8(1.1)
1	2	5.4%	
2	3	8.1%	
3	6	16.2%	
4	11	29.7%	
5	13	35.1%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Observe and chart student behavior			4.4(.73)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	5	13.5%	
4	9	24.3%	
5	23	62.2%	
Give positive reinforcement and support as directed by plans/IEP			4.8(.46)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	2.7%	
4	5	13.5%	
5	31	83.3%	
Provide physical proximity for students with behavior problems			4.6(.53)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	2.7%	
4	11	29.7%	
5	25	67.6%	
Circulate in classrooms to provide behavioral supports where needed			4.7(.43)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	9	24.3%	
5	28	75.7%	

Enforce class and school rules			4.7(.49)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	2.7%	
4	7	18.9%	
5	29	78.4%	
Assist students who are self-managing behaviors			4.6(.53)
1	0	0	
2	0	0	
3	1	2.7%	
4	11	29.7%	
5	25	67.6%	
Help students develop self-monitor organizational skills			4.5(.59)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	5.4%	
4	11	29.7%	
5	24	64.9%	
Facilitate appropriate social interactions among students			4.3(.75)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	2.7%	
3	3	8.1%	
4	15	40.5%	
5	18	48.6%	
Assist other students in coping with behaviors of specific students			4.3(.70)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	2.7%	
3	2	5.4%	
4	18	48.6%	
5	16	43.2%	
Other			
Being good at behavior management	1	2.7%	
Create reward system based on IEPs	1	2.7%	
Note good behavior, address inappropriate behavior	1	2.7%	

Table F12 Teachers: Perceptions About Ethics (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Teachers	37	100%	
Maintain confidentiality of all information regarding students			5.0(.00)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	35	94.6%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Respect the dignity and rights of every child at all times			4.9(.17)
1	0	0	
2	0	0	
3	0	0	
4	1	2.7%	
5	33	89.2%	
Missing system	3	8.1%	
Report suspected child abuse according to the law/local procedure			5.0(.00)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	34	91.9%	
Missing system	3	8.1%	
Communicate w/parents to the extent indicated by the team			4.7(.70)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	2.7%	
3	2	5.4%	
4	2	5.4%	
5	30	81.1%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Provide information about the student to those w/right to know			4.8(.32)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	4	10.8%	

5	31	83.8%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Other			
Give positive feedback to parents often	1	2.7%	
Document interactions with parents if failing	1	2.7%	

Table F13 Teachers: Team Participation/Membership (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Teachers	37	100%	
Meet with team as scheduled/directed			4.6(.60)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	5.4%	
4	9	24.3%	
5	23	62.2%	
Missing system	3	8.1%	
Participate in team meetings contributing information and ideas			4.5(.70)
1	0	0	
2	0	0	
3	4	10.8%	
4	7	18.9%	
5	23	62.2%	
Missing system	3	8.1%	
Participate in team meetings by listening to ideas of others			4.5(.65)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	3	8.1%	
4	8	21.6%	
5	23	62.2%	
Missing system	3	8.1%	
Attend parent-teacher conferences			3.9(1.1)
1	1	2.7%	
2	3	8.1%	
3	8	21.6%	
4	6	16.2%	
5	16	43.2%	
Missing system	3	8.1%	
Attend ARD/IEP meetings			3.7(1.2)
1	1	2.7%	
2	5	13.5%	
3	8	21.6%	
4	6	16.2%	
5	13	35.1%	
Missing system	4	10.8%	

Table F14 Teachers: Clerical Work (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Teachers	37	100%	
Take attendance			3.9(1.3)
1	4	10.8%	
2	1	2,7%	
3	5	13.5%	
4	7	18.9%	
5	18	48.6%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Record grades			3.4(1.5)
1	6	16.2%	
2	4	10.8%	
3	6	16.2%	
4	6	16.2%	
5	13	35.1%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Collect fees			2.9(1.2)
1	5	13.5%	
2	5	13.5%	
3	15	40.5%	
4	4	10.8%	
5	5	13.5%	
Missing system	3	8.1%	
Correct assigned student lessons/homework			3.3(1.4)
1	4	10.8%	
2	6	16,2%	
3	10	27%	
4	3	8.1%	
5	11	29.7%	
Missing system	3	8.1%	
Grade tests			3.3(1.4)
1	4	10.8%	
2	7	18,9%	
3	8	21.6%	
4	3	8.1%	
5	12	32.4%	
Missing system	3	8.1%	

Prepare paperwork to facilitate parent-teacher conferences			3.6(1.3)
1	3	8.1%	
2	3	8.1%	
3	12	32.4%	
4	2	5.4%	
5	15	40.5%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Inventory materials and fill out routine forms			3.6(1.1)
1	1	2.7%	
2	5	13.5%	
3	9	24.3%	
4	9	24.3%	
5	9	24.3%	
Missing system	4	10.8%	
Make arrangements for field trips			2.9(1.3)
1	6	16.2%	
2	8	21.6%	
3	9	24.3%	
4	7	18.9%	
5	5	13.5%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Maintain files for IEPs, assessment reports, other reports			4.0(1.2)
1	3	8.1%	
2	1	2.7%	
3	5	13.5%	
4	6	16.2%	
5	18	48.6%	
Missing system	2	5.4%	
Other			
Accurate collection of work samples	1	2.7%	
All ways take care of paperwork	1	2.7%	

Table F15 Paraprofessionals: Delivery of Instruction (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Paraprofessionals	12	100%	
Observe and record student progress in academic areas			4.4(.79)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	16.7%	
4	3	25.0%	
5	7	58.3%	
Help students in drill and practice lesson			4.1(.93)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	8.3%	
3	1	8.3%	
4	5	41.7%	
5	5	41.7%	
Read/repeat test or directions to students			4.7(.62)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	8.3%	
4	1	8.3%	
5	10	83.3%	
Listen to students read orally			4.6(.77)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	16.7%	
4	0	0.0	
5	10	83.3%	
Help students with workbooks/other written assignments			4.4(.79)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	16.7%	
4	3	25.0%	
5	7	58.3%	
Assist students to compose original work			4.0(.90)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	

3	4	33.3%	
4	3	25.0%	
5	5	41.7%	
Modify instructional material according to directions			4.0(1.0)
1	0	0.0	
2	2	16.7%	
3	0	0.0	
4	5	41.7%	
5	4	33.3%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Facilitate students' active participation in cooperative groups			4.4(.68)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	8.3%	
4	4	33.3%	
5	6	50.0%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Help students use computers			4.2(.96)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	8.3%	
3	1	8.3%	
4	4	33.3%	
5	6	50.0%	
Monitor student performance in community-based settings			4.4(.99)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	8.3%	
3	1	8.3%	
4	2	16.7%	
5	8	66.7%	
Other			
How to maintain positive attitude and control your own behavior	1	8.3%	

Table F16 Paraprofessionals: Activity Preparation/Follow-up (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Paraprofessionals	12	100%	
Find/arrange materials/operate equipment			3.9(.99)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	8.3%	
3	3	25%	
4	4	33.3%	
5	4	33.3%	
Modify/adapt materials/equipment for a particular student			4.0(.83)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	3	25%	
4	4	33.3%	
5	4	33.3%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Construct learning materials			3.5(1.2)
1	1	8.3%	
2	1	8.3%	
3	3	25%	
4	3	25%	
5	3	25%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Prepare classroom displays			4.3(.88)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	3	25%	
4	2	16.7%	
5	7	58.3%	
Order materials and supplies			4.2(1.2)
1	1	8.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	8.3%	
4	3	25%	
5	7	58.3%	
Organize classroom supplies/materials			4.8(.38)

1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	16.7%	
5	10	83.3%	
Schedule guest speakers/visitors as directed			4.3(1.2)
1	1	8.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	3	25%	
5	7	58.3%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Distribute supplies/materials to students			4.9(.28)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	8.3%	
5	11	91.7%	
Collect completed work from students			4.9(.28)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	8.3%	
5	11	91.7%	
Other			
Assist in completing school assignments as needed	1	8.3%	

Table F17 Paraprofessionals: Supervision of Groups of Students (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Paraprofessionals	12	100%	
Supervise groups of students on arrival or departure			5.0(.00)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	12	100%	
Supervise groups of students during lunch			5.0(.00)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	12	100%	
Supervise groups of students during study hall classes			5.0(.00)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	12	100%	
Supervise groups of students loading/unloading buses			4.8(.38)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	16.7%	
5	10	83.3%	
Monitor students during passing periods			5.0(.00)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	12	100%	
Escort groups of students to bathrooms, library, gym, etc.			5.0(.00)

1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	0	0.0	
5	12	100%	
Accompany students to therapy sessions, individual appointments			4.5(.99)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	8.3%	
3	1	8.3%	
4	0	0.0	
5	10	83.3%	
Other			
Supervise students on field trips	1	8.3%	

Table F18 Paraprofessionals: Behavior Management (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Paraprofessionals	12	100%	
Supervise time-out or in-school suspension rooms			4.8(.38)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	16.7%	
5	10	83.3%	
Observe and chart student behavior			4.5(.51)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	5	41.7%	
5	7	58.3%	
Give positive reinforcement and support as directed by plans/IEP			4.3(.49)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	8	66.7%	
5	4	33.3%	
Provide physical proximity for students with behavior problems			4.5(.52)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	5	41.7%	
5	6	50%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Circulate in classrooms to provide behavioral supports where needed			4.6(.49)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	4	33.3%	
5	8	66.7%	
Enforce class and school rules			4.9(.30)

1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	8.3%	
5	10	83.3%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Assist students who are self-managing behaviors			4.5(.51)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	5	41.7%	
5	7	58.3%	
Help students develop self-monitor organizational skills			4.4(.51)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	7	58.3%	
5	5	41.7%	
Facilitate appropriate social interactions among students			4.5(.52)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	6	50%	
5	6	50%	
Assist other students in coping with behaviors of specific students			4.0(.83)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	8.3%	
3	0	0.0	
4	7	58.3%	
5	3	25%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Other			
Facilitate with life skills/social groups in at-risk centers	1	8.3%	

Table F19 Paraprofessionals: Ethics (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Paraprofessionals	12	100%	
Maintain confidentiality of all information regarding students			4.9(.28)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	8.3%	
5	11	91.7%	
Respect the dignity and rights of every child at all times			4.9(.30)
1	0	0	
2	0	0	
3	0	0	
4	1	8.3%	
5	10	83.3%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Report suspected child abuse according to the law/local procedure			4.8(.38)
1	0	0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	16.7%	
5	10	83.3%	
Communicate w/parents to the extent indicated by the team			4.5(.67)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	8.3%	
4	4	33.3%	
5	7	58.3%	
Provide information about the student to those w/right to know			4.8(.40)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	16.7%	
5	9	75.0%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Other			
Provide information on how to become successful	1	8.3%	

Table F20 Paraprofessionals: Team Participation/Membership (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Paraprofessionals	12	100%	
Meet with team as scheduled/directed			4.9(.28)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	1	8.3%	
5	11	91.7%	
Participate in team meetings contributing information and ideas			4.5(.51)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	5	41.7%	
5	7	58.3%	
Participate in team meetings by listening to ideas of others			4.6(.49)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	4	33.3%	
5	8	66.7%	
Attend parent-teacher conferences			4.3(1.1)
1	1	8.3%	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	4	33.3%	
5	7	58.3%	
Attend ARD/IEP meetings			3.5(1.5)
1	2	16.7%	
2	1	8.3%	
3	2	16.7%	
4	2	16.7%	
5	5	41.7%	

Table F21 Paraprofessionals: Clerical Work (Item-level Data)			
Category	Number	Percentage	Item Mean(SD)
All Paraprofessionals	12	100%	
Take attendance			4.8(.40)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	16.7%	
5	9	75.0%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Record grades			4.1(1.4)
1	1	8.3%	
2	1	8.3%	
3	1	8.3%	
4	1	8.3%	
5	8	66.7%	
Collect fees			4.8(.42)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	16.7%	
5	8	66.7%	
Missing system	2	16.7%	
Correct assigned student lessons/homework			4.8(.40)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	0	0.0	
4	2	16.7%	
5	9	75.0%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Grade tests			4.7(.64)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	1	8.3%	
4	1	8.3%	
5	9	75.0%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	

Prepare paperwork to facilitate parent-teacher conferences			4.3(.80)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	16.7%	
4	3	25.0%	
5	6	50.0%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Inventory materials and fill out routine forms			4.5(.82)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	16.7%	
4	1	8.3%	
5	8	66.7%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Make arrangements for field trips			4.1(1.1)
1	0	0.0	
2	1	8.3%	
3	2	16.7%	
4	2	16.7%	
5	5	41.7%	
Missing system	2	16.7%	
Maintain files for IEPs, assessment reports, other reports			4.3(.80)
1	0	0.0	
2	0	0.0	
3	2	16.7%	
4	3	25.0%	
5	6	50.0%	
Missing system	1	8.3%	
Other			
Assist in preparing students for testing	1	8.3%	
Translating	1	8.3%	

Table F22 Paraprofessionals: Professional Development Preference		
Category	Number	Percentage
All Paraprofessionals	12	100%
Preferred time for participating in professional development		
Saturdays/Weekends		
L	10	83.3%
M	2	16.7%
H	0	0.0
After school		
L	4	33.3%
M	4	33.3%
H	4	33.3%
Evenings		
L	6	50%
M	4	33.3%
H	1	8.3%
Missing system	1	8.3%
During school hours/Release time		
L	0	0.0
M	3	25%
H	8	66.7%
Missing system	1	8.3%
During the Summer/Vacation time		
L	8	66.7%
M	3	25%
H	1	8.3%
Other		
During school hours/mornings	1	8.3%
Student early release or teacher workday	1	8.3%
Preferred format for delivery of professional development		
Consultation /Mentoring (individual assistance)		
L	4	33.3%
M	4	33.3%
H	4	33.3%

Small Group Training/Single Day Workshop		
L	1	8.3%
M	3	25%
H	6	50%
Missing system	2	16.7%
Small Group Training/Multiple Day Workshops		
L	3	25%
M	8	66.7%
H	1	8.3%
Large Group Training/Single Day Workshop		
L	5	41.7%
M	5	41.7%
H	2	16.7%
Large Group Training/Multiple Day Workshop (conferences)		
L	6	50%
M	4	33.3%
H	2	16.7%
Computer-based/Internet		
L	0	0.0
M	5	41.7%
H	6	50%
Missing system	1	8.3%
Video-based (cd/dvd, broadcast)		
L	1	8.3%
M	7	58.3%
H	3	25%
Missing system	1	8.3%
Other		
Teacher and staff meeting to give input to each other	1	8.3%
Study guide with multiple choice questions	1	8.3%

APPEDIX G

IRB Approval Letter



Institutional Review Board
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
P.O. Box 425619, Denton, TX 76204-5619
940-898-3378
email: IRB@twu.edu
<http://www.twu.edu/irb.html>

DATE: February 25, 2015

TO: Ms. Syrinithnia Jones
Teacher Education

FROM: Institutional Review Board - Denton

Re: Exemption for Paraprofessionals at Alternative Schools: Professional Development Needs for Inclusive Settings (Protocol #: 18057)

The above referenced study has been reviewed by the TWU Institutional Review Board (IRB) and was determined to be exempt from further review.

If applicable, agency approval letters must be submitted to the IRB upon receipt PRIOR to any data collection at that agency. Because a signed consent form is not required for exempt studies, the filing of signatures of participants with the TWU IRB is not necessary.

Although your protocol has been exempted from further IRB review and your protocol file has been closed, any modifications to this study must be submitted for review to the IRB using the Modification Request Form. Additionally, the IRB must be notified immediately of any adverse events or unanticipated problems. All forms are located on the IRB website. If you have any questions, please contact the TWU IRB.

cc. Dr. Jane Pemberton, Teacher Education
Dr. Jerry Whitworth, Teacher Education
Graduate School