

Record

370

File Number

10326

Author: Horner, Robert *et al*

Title: Educational support for students with severe problem behaviours in Oregon

Original source: JASH Volume 17 Number 3

Resource type: Written

Publication Date: 01/01/92

Publisher Info: TASH

Abstract

This paper describes a survey of students with very high support needs in regular school settings and the success of the organisational structures which were put in place to support them. Results showed that teachers felt under prepared and recommendations were that much more information and training should be provided. Removing people with severe disabilities from inclusive education settings was not mentioned as a solution by teachers. **Keywords:** Education, School age

Educational Support for Students with Severe Problem Behaviors in Oregon: A Descriptive Analysis from the 1987-1988 School Year

Robert H. Horner and Susan M. Diemer
University of Oregon

Karen C. Brazeau
Oregon Department of Education

Oregon has been identified as a leader in maintaining students with severe disabilities in regular school environments (Danielson & Bellamy, 1989). This paper presents descriptive data from a survey completed by teachers of students with severe disabilities in Oregon during 1988. The survey was designed to determine if students with severe disabilities who engage in problem behaviors are placed in regular school settings in Oregon, and what organizational variables were used to assist such students to be part of regular schools. The survey of teachers working with students with severe disabilities was conducted in collaboration with the Oregon Department of Education. Seventy-five percent of the teachers responded to the survey. They identified 184 students as having severe intellectual disabilities and severe problem behaviors (0.4% of all students in the state receiving special education support). The teachers reported that the major extra support for students with severe problem behaviors was in the form of additional teaching assistants. The teachers reported that they did not feel adequately prepared in their preservice training to deal with students with severe problem behaviors, and did not feel there were adequate resources for supporting such students. When queried about educational outcomes, however, the teachers reported that

over 90% of students with severe problem behavior spent some portion of each school day socially integrated with students who were not disabled, and that over 40% of the students with problem behaviors spent some time each week physically integrated through community-based instruction. The paper discusses the challenge faced by schools as they attempt to build the capacity to support students with more significant behavior problems.

DESCRIPTORS: behavior management, educational placement, excess behavior, supported education

A major challenge for educational reform is the inclusion of all students in their local schools (Brown et al., 1989). Part of this challenge is attention to procedures for including students with severe problem behaviors (Sailor et al., 1989). These procedures include detailed attention to curriculum development, to social integration opportunities, to physical setting variables, to instructional delivery, and to behavioral support strategies (Greenwood, Carta, & Atwater, 1991; Horner et al., 1990; Meyer & Evans, 1989). In addition, however, attention must be given to the administrative structures that may affect successful inclusion of all students.

This paper provides a description of one state's effort to maintain and support students with severe problem behaviors in their regular schools. In their analysis of placement for students with disabilities, Danielson and Bellamy (1989) indicated tremendous variability across states in the extent to which they placed students with disabilities in typical school settings. Oregon was rated as among the states most likely to place students with disabilities in regular school settings. The present study was prompted by the Danielson and Bellamy data, and was designed to assess the extent to which the general pattern of placement in Oregon extended to those students with disabilities who also engage in severe prob-

Preparation of this manuscript was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Education, Cooperative Agreement G0087C023488. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

The authors extend their appreciation to Dr. Dianne Ferguson, Brigid Flannery, Alan Surratt, Lora Tuesday-Heathfield, William Ard, and Dr. Barry Singer for comments on earlier drafts of this paper and to the Oregon Department of Education for their assistance in conducting this study.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Robert H. Horner, Specialized Training Program, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403.

extent to which students with severe problem behaviors were in Oregon's regular schools, (b) to examine the organizational structure used to support students with severe problem behaviors, (c) to gain some index of the successes and difficulties that teachers perceived with the approach used in Oregon, and (d) to examine the recommendations of teachers for how best to organize support for students with severe problem behaviors.

Method

Participants

The Oregon Department of Education and 162 teachers of Oregon's students with severe disabilities (labeled "Trainable Mentally Retarded" [TMR] in Oregon) participated in the study, during the spring of 1988.

Measurement

The variables under consideration in the study related to the distribution of, and support for, students with developmental disabilities who engage in severe problem behaviors in school settings. Two questionnaires were used to obtain the relevant information.

Oregon Student Demographic Questionnaire. The first questionnaire, the Oregon Student Demographic Questionnaire (see Appendix A), was completed by the Coordinator for TMR Programs at the Oregon Department of Education and defined basic student demographic information across the state (e.g., number of students enrolled, number of students with individualized education program [IEP], number of students identified as TMR eligible).

Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire. The Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire (see Appendix B) was completed by the participating teachers. This questionnaire consisted of 17 questions divided into two sections. The first section contained six questions about the status and experience of the teacher. The second section contained 11 questions addressing specific areas of program support used in the classroom.

A student with severe behavior problems was defined as a student with moderate, severe, or profound intellectual disabilities who exhibited one or more of the following behaviors:

1. *Self-injury:* Behavior performed by the students that resulted in tissue damage to themselves (e.g., bruises, cuts, swelling, bleeding).
2. *Injury to others:* Behavior that resulted in tissue damage to other students or adults.
3. *Property damage:* The destruction of nontrivial property (e.g., clothing, windows, desks, walls).

Student placement classification was assessed using the labeling categories conventional to the Oregon Department of Education system:

2. *Resource Room* placement involved a pull-out class in which the majority of the student's day was spent in a classroom designed to provide extra support in specific curricular areas. Part of each day was spent in either regular or self-contained classrooms.
3. *Self-Contained Classroom (non-TMR)* referred to placement in a self-contained special education classroom in which the majority of the day was not spent with nondisabled students, and placement in the classroom was based on diagnostic labels other than moderate to profound intellectual disabilities.
4. *Self-Contained Classroom (TMR)* referred to placement in a special education classroom in which the majority of the day was not spent with nondisabled students, and placement was based on a diagnostic label of moderate to profound intellectual disabilities.
5. *Hospital* placement referred to placement in the state institution (hospital and training center), or a permanent medical facility.
6. *Home* referred to placement in the student's home with education provided by teachers going to the student's home.

Teachers were asked to respond to three questions regarding (a) the types of problem behaviors observed; (b) the type, amount, and adequacy of extra assistance received for the support of the students with severe behavior problems; and (c) the type and frequency of integrated activities included in the program for students with severe problem behaviors. Teachers also responded to questions concerning the basic staffing structure of their classroom, the comparative "difficulty" of problem behaviors, and the adequacy of available support systems. The questionnaire included forced choice, open-ended, and Likert-type questions.

Procedures

Field test. The Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire was field tested by five teachers serving TMR-eligible students in Lane County, Oregon. Each of the field test teachers were given a copy of the questionnaire and a 1-page feedback form. The feedback form asked the teachers to evaluate the questionnaire in terms of its clarity, organization, pertinence, and length. The final form of the questionnaire reflected modifications based on responses from this field test.

Oregon Student Demographic Questionnaire. This four-item questionnaire was completed by the Coordinator for TMR Programs in the Oregon Department of Education.

Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire. Packets of questionnaires were sent to the administrators of each of the 55 school districts in Oregon that serve students

Department of Education to the administrator for the distribution of the questionnaires to teachers, and the questionnaires in envelopes for teachers. The questionnaires were distributed to the teachers with a cover letter from the Oregon Department of Education and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of the questionnaire to the Department of Education. A minimum of five questionnaires were sent to each district. Districts with comparatively large populations were sent 10–15 questionnaires. The administrators were given a telephone number to call if they had any questions, or if they needed more questionnaires.

The questionnaires were coded by district. The administrators were asked to complete and return the form indicating the number of teachers of TMR-eligible students who worked in their district. The form and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were attached to the instruction page in the packet. This form was used to determine the total number of teachers who should have received the questionnaire in each district.

Three weeks after the initial mailing of the questionnaire packets, telephone calls were made by the second author to the administrators who had not returned the form. The information concerning the number of teachers who received the questionnaires was taken over the telephone. The administrators were thanked for cooperating and asked to encourage their teachers to return the questionnaires as soon as possible. General follow-up letters were sent to the administrators 2 weeks after the telephone calls. The administrators were asked to distribute the letters to all the teachers who received a questionnaire. Districts in which the form and all questionnaires had been returned within 5 weeks of the original mailing were not sent follow-up letters.

Results

Oregon Student Demographic Questionnaire

Number of students. Demographic information for students in Oregon is provided in Table 1. A total of 463,767 students were educated in Oregon during the 1987–1988 school year. Of these students, 41,811 (9%) received some form of special education support, and 1,936 (0.42%) were classified as eligible for TMR special education services. The majority of students identified as TMR eligible (1,138) were in middle school or secondary classrooms. An additional 798 TMR-eligible students were in kindergarten and elementary classrooms.

Placement of students with severe disabilities. Placement patterns for 1987–1988 for TMR-eligible students are presented in Table 2. The majority (77.9%) of these students were in self-contained classrooms in regular school settings. An additional 93 students (4.8%) were

placement indicates that 86.9% of all TMR-eligible students were receiving education in the same school buildings as their nondisabled peers. A total of 203 (10.4%) TMR-eligible students were placed in nontypical settings. An additional 51 (2.6%) students were in unspecified settings.

Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire

Information about the teachers. Administrators from all 55 school districts cooperated in the study. A total of 240 questionnaires were distributed and 181 questionnaires were returned (75%). Of these 181 questionnaires, 162 were completed by teachers of TMR-eligible students. The remaining questionnaires were completed by supervisors and consultants and were not included in the summary analysis. The majority of the 162 responding teachers (61%) provided support in self-contained classrooms in regular school buildings. The teachers reported a total of 1,535 TMR-eligible students in their classrooms (representing 75% of all TMR-eligible students in Oregon and 91% of the 1,682 TMR-eligible students served within public school contexts).

Approximately one half of the teachers were in kindergarten and elementary classrooms, and the other half were in middle and secondary classrooms. The student-teacher ratios for the grade levels were reported as 10.6:1; 8.8:1; 10.1:1; and 10.2:1, respectively, for kindergarten, elementary, middle, and secondary classes. The 162 teachers had an average of 6.28 years of teaching experience, with a range of 1–30 years.

Students with severe challenging behavior. A total of 83 of the 162 responding teachers (51%) reported having students with severe problem behaviors. These 83 teachers reported a total of 184 students (12% of all students served by the 162 responding teachers) who engaged in one or more of the three classes of severe challenging behavior. On the average, teachers reported 2.2 students with severe challenging behaviors per classroom, although one teacher reported 8 students with challenging behavior in her class.

Of the 184 students identified as engaging in severe problem behavior, 109 (59%) were reported to engage in more than one of the three classes of severe challenging behavior. Self-injury was reported for 57% of the students; injury to others was reported as a behavior performed by 58% of the students; and 44% of the students were reported to repeatedly destroy property.

Classroom structure and support available to teachers with students with severe problem behaviors. Table 3 defines the distribution of all students and staff across grade levels. The results from Questions 3, 7, 9, and 11 provide a consistent picture in which a classroom with students who engage in problem behaviors was composed of approximately 10 students, two of whom present problem behaviors. Typically, a teacher and

Student type	of students	% of all students	students in special educ.	labeled as TMR eligible
Students in Oregon	463,767	100	—	—
Students in Oregon receiving special education	41,811	9	100	—
Students in elementary special education	22,710	4.9	54	—
Students in middle and secondary special education	19,101	4.1	46	—
TMR-eligible students	1,936	0.42	4.69	100
TMR-eligible students in kindergarten and elementary classrooms	798	0.17	1.91	41.2
TMR-eligible students in middle and secondary classrooms	1,138	0.25	2.7	58.8

* From Questions 1, 2, and 3 of Oregon Student Demographic Questionnaire.

Table 2
Placement of Oregon Students with Severe Disabilities (TMR-Eligible) in 1987-1988*

Placement setting (question number)	No. of TMR-eligible students	% of TMR-eligible students
Regular class (4a)	93	4.8
Resource class (4b)	81	4.2
Self-contained class in regular school (4c & 4d)	1,508	77.9
Home/hospital (4e & 4f)	25	1.3
Specialized school (nonregular) (4g & 4h)	60	3.1
State or private institution (4i)	113	5.8
Specialized setting outside Oregon (4j)	5	0.2
Unknown (4k)	51	2.6
Total	1,936	100

* From Question 4 of Oregon Student Demographic Questionnaire.

Table 3
Distribution by Grade Level of Students with Severe Problem Behaviors and Their Teachers*

Grade level	No. of teachers reporting students w/ severe problem behaviors in their classroom	No. of students w/ severe problem behaviors	Students w/ severe problem behaviors per teacher reporting (range)
Kindergarten/preschool	2	2	1 (1)
Elementary	37	74	2 (1-5)
Middle	16	36	2.3 (1-4)
Secondary	28	72	2.6 (1-8)
All	83	184	2.2 (1-8)

* From Questions 4 and 7 of the Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire.

two teacher aides were available on a full-time basis. In addition, a combined total of 0.20 FTE (Full Time Equivalent) was allocated to the class from therapists, consultants, administrators, and "other" personnel.

This picture of the typical support received by teachers of students with severe problem behaviors was compared with the staffing patterns reported by teachers who did not serve students with severe problem behaviors. Comparisons via *t* tests indicated no statistically significant differences in class size or in years of teaching experience reported by teachers with and without students with severe problem behaviors. When comparisons of responses to Question 11 were made of class

structure, no differences were found in the number of hours per week allocated by administrators, consultants, therapists, or teachers. A statistically significant difference was identified, however, in the number of hours of teaching assistant time available ($t = 4.47; p < .0001$). On the average, teachers without students with problem behaviors received 47.92 hr of teaching assistant support per week. Teachers of students with problem behaviors received an average of 72.07 hr of teaching assistant support per week, an increase of 24.15 hr per week.

When the 83 teachers serving students with severe problem behaviors were asked to indicate the "extra"

from specialists, and access to increased teaching assistant time. Forty of the teachers (48%) indicated that they obtained assistance by attending a conference or in-service program outside their classroom. Forty teachers (48%) also indicated that they received assistance from a specialist in behavioral support. However, the difference in level of specialist support between classes with and without students with problem behaviors was not statistically significant. Nearly all the teachers (82 of 83) with students with severe behavior problems indicated that they received additional teaching assistant time.

When asked to assess the adequacy of support for students with severe problem behaviors (Question 15), 157 of the 162 teachers responded. Of these, 129 teachers (82%) did not agree (i.e., recorded ≤ 5 on a 10-point scale) with the statement, "The resources and procedures currently available are adequate to meet the needs of students with very difficult behavior problems." The average rating was 3.5. When the scores to Question 15 were compared to teacher's years in service (Question 5) a modest, although statistically significant, negative correlation was produced both for those teachers with students with severe problem behaviors ($n = 80, r = -.239, p = .033$), and for those without students with severe problem behavior ($n = 77, r = -.303, p = .007$). This indicates that, although teachers were not convinced that adequate support was available, those teachers with fewer years of experience tended to be more positive about the adequacy of available support. A chi-square comparison did not identify a statistically significant difference between the responses of teachers of students with severe problem behaviors and those without ($\chi^2 = 19.4; p = .62$).

Activity patterns of students with severe challenging behavior. Teachers of students with severe problem behaviors were asked to define the extent to which these students participated in community and integrated activities as a regular part of their school day (Question 10). With 81 of 83 teachers responding, the results in Table 4 indicate that a high proportion of the students spent at least some portion of their school day with nondisabled students. Over 90% had lunch with nondisabled peers, and 79% participated in recess with their nondisabled peers. Only 10% of the students, however, attended academic classes with nondisabled students. Seventy-six of the 184 students with severe problem behavior received instruction in shopping skills in the community (41%), and 87 (47%) of the students received training in recreation skills in community settings.

Identification of the Most Challenging Behaviors

All 162 teachers were asked to identify the five behaviors that were "the most difficult to deal with" from

Activity	No. of students with severe problem behaviors	% of all students identified with severe problem behaviors
In-school activities with nondisabled students		
Lunch	167	91
Recess	144	78
Physical education	96	52
Academic classes	20	10
Activity classes	19	10
School jobs	46	25
Other	53	29
Community activities		
Shopping	76	41
Banking	13	7
Work	46	25
Recreation	87	47
Other	30	15

^a With 81 of 83 teachers reporting.

^b From Question 10 of the Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire.

Table 5
Most Commonly Identified Problem Behaviors^a

	Teachers without students with severe problem behaviors		Teachers with students with severe problem behaviors	
	<i>n</i>	Behavior	<i>n</i>	Behavior
Preschool/elementary	46	Break windows	39	Break windows
		Hit self		Hit self
		Sex with others		Kick others
		Kick others		Sex with others
		Poke eyes		Curse
Middle school	15	Hit self	16	Sex with others
		Curse		Hit self
		Smear feces		Kick others
		Hit others		Poke eyes
		Kick others		Hit others
High school	18	Hit self	28	Hit others
		Break windows		Hit self
		Poke eyes		Poke eyes
		Kick others		Kick others
		Eating inedible objects		Break windows

^a From Questions 4, 7, and 13 of the Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire.

a list of 30 behaviors developed through review of the literature. The list was revised based on feedback from four nationally recognized special education professionals and from the five "field-test" teachers. All 162 teachers responded (Question 13), and Table 5 provides a listing of their responses organized by grade level and presence of a student with severe problem behaviors. Each of the groups rated "hit self" as one of the top two problem behaviors that were most difficult to deal with.

Teacher satisfaction with preservice training. When

problem behaviors, 159 of the 162 teachers responded (Question 14). They were generally unimpressed with the training they had received to assist students with severe problem behaviors. Across all grade levels, 15% of the teachers indicated that they were not prepared "at all" to respond to the needs of challenging students, and 76% of all teachers rated their preservice training preparation for educating students with problem behavior as ≤ 5 on a 10-point Likert scale (1 = not at all prepared; 10 = very well prepared). When these scores were compared with years of teaching experience there was a modest, statistically significant, negative correlation of those teachers with students with severe problem behaviors ($r = -.23, p = .038$) and a negligible correlation for those teachers without students with problem behavior ($r = -.096, p = .398$). A chi-square test comparing the ratings of those teachers with and without students who engage in problem behaviors was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 26.12; p = .25$).

Teacher recommendations for improving support for students with severe challenging behaviors. The final question on the questionnaire (Question 17) was an open-ended request for recommendations for "improving the ability of teachers and districts to respond to the needs of students with severe challenging behaviors." A total of 123 of the 162 teachers responded to this question with 184 statements. Many teachers made more than one recommendation. Teacher responses were transcribed verbatim and organized by the second author into 15 distinct recommendations. To assess the reliability with which comments were assigned to the 15 types of recommendations, a second recorder read each teacher statement and independently assigned it to one of the 15 recommendation categories. Agreement between the researcher and the independent recorder was assessed by taking the number of comments assigned to the same category, divided by the total number of recommendations, and multiplying by 100%. The agreement was 85%.

Table 6 provides a listing of the teacher recommendations and the number of teachers who made each recommendation. The most frequent recommendations were to provide in-service workshops and in-class consultants who directly assist teachers and teaching assistants in the development and implementation of behavior programs. In general, emphasis was given to strategies that would improve the competence of the teacher. Recommendations for external assistance from consultants stressed the need for hands-on, repeated contact from the consultant.

Discussion

Students with developmental disabilities and severe problem behaviors were attending regular schools in

one classroom. The students participated with other students in typical campus activities on a daily basis, and high school and middle school students also were very likely to spend at least some of their day in regular community contexts. Teachers who had a student with severe problem behaviors were likely to receive additional staff support in the form of teaching assistant time, and these teachers had about a 50% chance of also receiving extra assistance from educational/behavioral consultants.

As a group, the 162 teachers averaged slightly more than 6 years of teaching experience. They did not report their preservice training experience to have been adequate in preparing them for supporting students with severe problem behaviors, and they were in clear agreement that there were insufficient procedures and systems in place to meet the needs of students with severe problem behaviors. In general, however, teachers who were newer to the field were more satisfied with their training and available support. The most common recommendations from teachers for improving the current situation were for direct in-service training and workshops. They did not emphasize removal of the students as a solution. The teachers especially voiced an interest in training and technical assistance that occurred in their classroom, that occurred across multiple training sessions, and that involved people who were able to perform hands-on demonstrations.

Taken together, the results from this study are encouraging. They support the position that students with a wide range of disabilities can receive education in regular school contexts (Danielson & Bellamy, 1989; Sailor et al., 1989). Although few of Oregon's students with severe problem behavior were placed in regular classrooms, 184 were in regular school settings. These students experienced regular contact with typical students, and the older students had regular training in community contexts.

University preservice training personnel should take note of the clear message that teachers felt insufficiently trained to deal with severe problem behaviors. Preservice training programs should reexamine the extent to which they deliver the classroom training and practicum experiences needed for teachers who will encounter students with severe problem behaviors. In addition, school districts need to examine the procedures by which classroom assistants are assigned, trained, and supported. If classroom teaching assistants are bearing the major role for direct instructional support for the most demanding students, it may be necessary to include more extensive in-service training opportunities for these paraprofessionals.

At present, there are no cross-state comparisons that

Ranking	Recommendation category	Total teacher comments	Number of comments from teachers with students <i>without</i> severe problem behavior	Number of comments from teachers of students <i>with</i> severe problem behavior
1	In-service workshops	61	31	30
2	Consultant support	30	14	16
3	Increase staff-to-student ratio (e.g., addition teaching assistants)	21	8	13
4	Improve/increase preservice training	12	6	6
5	In-service for administrators and regular education teachers	11	8	3
6	Program and curriculum development	8	3	5
6	Clarify procedures and policies	8	3	5
7	Optional placement outside regular school	7	2	5
7	Increase multidisciplinary team support	7	1	6
8	Change school environment (add timeout room, isolated work area)	6	3	3
9	Work w/ family and others involved with student	4	2	2
9	Visit effective programs	4	2	2
10	Reallocation of resources	2	1	1
10	Supervisor evaluation of programs	2	1	1
11	Team teaching	1	1	0

^a 123 teachers with 184 comments.

^b From Question 17 of the Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire.

look directly at different strategies for assisting students with extreme problem behaviors. It would be fruitful to examine the differences between the administrative structures in states where inclusion is high and those where inclusion is low.

An optimistic message from the present data base is that the teachers we surveyed were more interested in opportunities for improving their own capacity to support these challenging students than in strategies for removing them. In addition, the teachers reported that they were educating students with severe problem behaviors in distributed, regular school settings. It is important to note, however, that teachers did not report that the support they received was "adequate to meet the needs of the students." In addition, we did not assess the *quality* of the education received by the 184 students with severe problem behaviors, beyond documenting that (a) they were in regular school placements, (b) they interacted regularly with typical students, and (c) they were likely to receive training in the community (especially in the upper grades). It would be useful to have more detailed information about the quality and effectiveness of the education received by students who engage in significant problem behaviors.

References

- Brown, L., Long, E., Udvari-Solner, A., Davis, L., Vandeverter, P., Ahlgren, C., Johnson, F., Gruenewald, L., & Jorgensen, J. (1989). The home school: Why students with severe intellectual disabilities must attend the schools of their brothers, sisters, friends, and neighbors. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14*, 1-7.
- Danielson, L. C., & Bellamy, G. T. (1989). State variation in placement of children with handicaps in segregated environments. *Exceptional Children, 55*, 448-455.
- Greenwood, C. R., Carta, J. J., & Atwater, J. (1991). Ecobehavioral analysis in the classroom: Review and implications. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 1*, 59-78.
- Horner, R. H., Dunlap, G., Koegel, R. L., Carr, E. G., Sailor, W., Anderson, J., Albin, R. W., & O'Neill, R. E. (1990). Toward a technology of "nonaversive" behavioral support. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15*, 125-132.
- Meyer, L. H., & Evans, I. M. (1989). *Nonaversive intervention for behavior problems: A manual for home and community*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Sailor, W., Anderson, J. L., Halvorsen, A. T., Doering, K., Filler, J., & Goetz, L. (1989). *The comprehensive local school: Regular education for all students with disabilities*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

received: May 29, 1992

Final Acceptance: May 29, 1992

Editor in Charge: Ann P. Kaiser

Oregon Student Demographics Questionnaire

1. What is the total number of students served by Oregon?

How many ages 5-10 (K - elementary) _____ How many ages 11-14 (Middle) _____

How many ages 15 + (High School) _____ Total number _____

2. How many students are served by some sort of special education program?

How many ages 5-10 (K - elementary) _____ How many ages 11-14 (Middle) _____

How many ages 15 + (High School) _____ Total number _____

3. Of the students in Oregon who are receiving special services how many are classified as TMR eligible students?

How many ages 5-10 (K - elementary) _____ How many ages 11-14 (Middle) _____

How many ages 15 + (High School) _____ Total number _____

4. How many TMR eligible students are educated:

a) in regular classrooms in the regular school

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

b) in resource classes in the regular public school

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

c) in self contained classrooms not specific to TMR in the regular school

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

e) in home study programs

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

f) in medical hospitals

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

g) in specialized segregated schools (e.g. The State School for the Blind)

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

h) in private non-segregated schools (e.g. church affiliated schools)

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15+ ? _____

i) by state or private institutions in Oregon (e.g. Fairview)

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

j) by settings outside of Oregon

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

k) other?(Please specify) _____

5. What definitions or criteria are used to identify students with severe behavior problems?

6. How many TMR eligible students are served in settings other than integrated regular programs due to severe behavior problems?

a) specialized schools in Oregon

b) Institutions in Oregon

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

c) Institutions or schools outside of Oregon

How many ages 5-10 _____ How many ages 11-14 _____ How many ages 15 + _____

d) Other (Please specify) _____

APPENDIX B

The Severe Behavior Support Questionnaire

INFORMATION ABOUT THE TEACHER

1. Are you a teacher of TMR eligible students? Yes ___ No ___

If no, please define your role: _____

2. In which settings do you provide support to TMR eligible students? Please check all that apply.

- a. Regular class _____ c. Self contained not specific to TMR ___ e. Hospital _____
b. Resource room _____ d. Self contained TMR ___ f. Home _____

3. How many students do you serve? _____

4. What is the age range of the students that you serve? _____

What classification? Preschool ___ Elementary ___ Middle ___ Secondary ___

5. How many years have you been a teacher of students with severe disabilities? _____

DEFINITION OF SEVERE BEHAVIOR:

This survey addresses support for students with very severe behavior problems who also have moderate, severe or profound mental retardation. We are interested only in the TMR eligible students currently receiving services who have been identified by their teachers as exhibiting one or more of the following behaviors:

1. Self-Injury: Students who have repeatedly engaged in behavior that resulted in tissue damage to themselves (bruises, cuts, swelling, bleeding, etc).
2. Injury to Others: Students who have repeatedly engaged in behaviors that result in tissue damage to other students or adults.
3. Property Damage: Students who have repeatedly engaged in the destruction of nontrivial property (i.e. destroy clothing, 2 windows, desks, walls). (This would not include paper tearing, pencil breakage).

INFORMATION ABOUT THE STUDENTS:

7. How many students in your class fit one or more of the three classes of severe behavior problems defined above? _____

.....
If you answer "0" or "NONE" to question 7, please skip to question 11. If 1 or more students are listed for question 7, continue with question 8.
.....

8. Given that one student may exhibit more than one of the targeted behaviors and thus may be counted more than once:

- a. How many students engage in self-injury? _____
- b. How many students engage in injury to others? _____
- c. How many students engage in property destruction? _____

9. If you have at least one student with severe behaviors, do you receive "extra" support to respond to this student's need? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please indicate the kind and amount of extra support you receive:

___ teacher total time per week _____
 ___ aide total time per week _____
 ___ behavioral specialist(s) total time per week _____
 ___ autism specialist(s) total time per week _____
 ___ other total time per week _____

(please describe other support) _____

9b. Please check the type(s) of extra training or technical assistance that was provided in response to the needs of current students with severe behavior problems

TYPE OF SUPPORT	PERSON RECEIVING THE SUPPORT			AREA OF SUPPORT	
	TEACHER	AIDE	OTHER	PROGRAM PLANNING	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION
Behavior or Autism Specialist Visit to Classroom					
Contact with Specialist Outside Classroom					
Conference or Inservice Training Outside Classroom					
Other: Please Specify					

9c. Did you receive adequate and timely assistance when it was needed?
 Yes _____ No _____

setting and a crisis situation was left unresolved?

10a. Do the students with severe behavior problems engage in at least one activity per school day with nondisabled peers? Please check all activities which apply.

Activities performed with nondisabled peers in school

Student	Yes	No	-----						
			lunch	recess	P.E.	academic class	activity class	job	other
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									

10b. Do the students with severe behavior problems receive training from school staff at least once per week in the community? Please check all activities which apply.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Student	Yes	No	-----				
			shopping	banking	work	recreation	other
1							

3

4

5

10c. Do other students in your class regularly receive training in the community?

Yes ___ No ___

11. Please indicate the number of staff, and the amount of staff time (other than "extra" support received for students with severe behavior problems) currently allocated to your class of students.

- a. Teachers: Number ___ combined hours per week
- b. Aides/Assistants: Number ___ combined hours per week
- c. Therapist: Number ___ combined hours per week
(speech, OT, PT)
- d. Consultants: Number ___ combined hours per week
- e. Administrators: Number ___ combined hours per week
- f. Other: Number ___ combined hours per week

(please describe) _____

12. In your role as a teacher, have you ever recommended a student be excluded from the regular special education program? Yes ___ No ___

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|
| Hitting others | _____ | Screaming | _____ |
| Crying | _____ | Refusal to respond | _____ |
| Vomiting/rumination | _____ | Hitting self | _____ |
| Grabbing others | _____ | Throwing objects | _____ |
| Cursing/abusive language | _____ | Running away | _____ |
| Pinching/scratching | _____ | Feces smearing | _____ |
| others or self | _____ | Truancy | _____ |
| Setting fires | _____ | Sexual activity with | _____ |
| Biting other or self | _____ | willing partner | _____ |
| Banging head | _____ | Sexual activity with | _____ |
| Public masturbation | _____ | unwilling partner | _____ |
| Poking eyes with fingers | _____ | Beating objects | _____ |
| or sharp objects | _____ | Pulling fire alarms | _____ |
| Pushing others | _____ | Eating inedible objects | _____ |
| Breaking windows | _____ | Pulling own or other's | _____ |
| Taking off clothes in | _____ | hair out | _____ |
| public | _____ | Stealing | _____ |
| Kicking others | _____ | Ripping/tearing clothes | _____ |

14. To what extent do you believe that your university preservice training prepared you to deal with students with severe behavior problems?

- Not at all Very well
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

15. To what extent do you agree with the statement "the resources and procedures currently available are adequate to meet the needs of students with very difficult behavior problems"?

- Disagree Agree
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

17. What recommendations do you have for improving the ability of teachers, districts, etc to respond to the needs of students with severe behavior problems?
