

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-4-1998

An analysis of the Individual Education Plan for preschool handicapped children and its relationship to classroom curriculum

Karlene E. Zimmerman
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Zimmerman, Karlene E., "An analysis of the Individual Education Plan for preschool handicapped children and its relationship to classroom curriculum" (1998). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2010.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/2010>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN FOR
PRESCHOOL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND IT'S
RELATIONSHIP TO CLASSROOM CURRICULUM.

by
KARLENE E. ZIMMERMAN

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree in the Graduate Division
of Rowan University
May 1998

Approved by

Professor
Date Approved May 4, 1998

ABSTRACT

KARLENE E. ZIMMERMAN
AN ANALYSIS OF THE INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN FOR
PRESCHOOL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND ITS'
RELATIONSHIP TO CLASSROOM CURRICULUM
1998
DR. URBAN
LEARNING DISABILITIES: PRESCHOOL HANDICAPPED

The purpose of this study was to develop and implement an improved model for Individualized Education Plans which can be utilized in a preschool handicapped program. A questionnaire consisting of 12 questions pertaining to goals, objectives, curriculum and teaching strategies was distributed to twenty teachers of preschool handicapped children. Fifteen questionnaires were returned. Forty-six of the teachers stated that they felt a general satisfaction with the content of the IEPs especially when written by themselves. Dissatisfaction was expressed with the amount of time the Child Study Team spends visiting the PSH classroom. They also expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of time the CST members spend in the classroom and how well they know the teachers. Only two teachers were completely satisfied with all aspects of the IEP and their curriculum. These were also the only two teachers who stated that the CST members visited the classroom regularly.

ABSTRACT

KARLENE E. ZIMMERMAN
AN ANALYSIS OF THE INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN FOR
PRESCHOOL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND ITS'
RELATIONSHIP TO CLASSROOM CURRICULUM
1998
DR. URBAN
LEARNING DISABILITIES: PRESCHOOL HANDICAPPED

This study investigated the relationship of Individualized Education Plans for preschool handicapped children and the classroom curriculum. Approximately forty-six percent of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with their IEPs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM	1
Background	1
Need for the Study	2
Value of the Study	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Research Questions	3
Limitations of the Study	3
Definitions of Terms	4

CHAPTER

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	5
Summary.....	5

CHAPTER

3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.....	14
Collection of Data	14
Design of the Study	14

CHAPTER

4. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	16
Analysis and Responses	16
Conclusion	18

CHAPTER

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS	20
---	----

Summary	20
Discussion	21
Suggestions for Further Study	22
References	23
Appendix A	24
Appendix B	26
Appendix C	29

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is pleased to acknowledge her indebtedness to the following persons who have contributed so generously to the completion of this project:

To Dr. Stanley Urban, for his guidance and encouragement throughout the course of this project;

To my parents, Dorothy Zimmerman and Norman Zimmerman, who inspired me to join the teaching profession;

To Bill, for his love and understanding;

To my colleagues in South Valley's preschool handicapped class, for their faith and understanding.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, (EAHCA), signed into law in November 1975 by President Ford, contained a mandatory provision that to receive funds under the act, every school system in the nation must provide a free and appropriate education for all children between ages 5 and 18 (subsequently extended to age 21) so long as they met the broad eligibility criteria specified in the law. In 1986, PL 99-457, amended EAHCA, and mandated that all schools were to provide services for handicapped children ages 3-5 and provided incentive grants to states to establish for infants and toddlers ages 0-3.

In New Jersey, children aged three to five are determined to be eligible for special education services after completing a child study team evaluation, and classified as preschool handicapped(PSH)(New Jersey Administrative Code, Chapter 28 Special Education, pg 28-15). Special education services to be provided to the PSH child are specified in the Individualized Education Plan (IEP), and must include amount, frequency and duration of services. The IEP must be written according to the functioning level of the child as determined by formal and informal testing, observation and parent interviews. The goals must be formulated by the family and also need to be appropriate and achievable.

Unfortunately the IEP is sometimes written based on available placements rather than actual needs of the child. Also, writing IEP's so they are educationally useful is a complex task. The IEP process is the keystone of IDEA. The development of

meaningful IEP's is an area that needs to be evaluated in order to insure that child study teams and teachers are accountable for the services being rendered.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Through observation and informal conversations with preschool handicapped teachers, the need for more appropriate Individual Education Plans is frequently expressed as a concern. Legislators, the judiciary and educators, have all acknowledged that poorly constructed IEP's are a frequent source of litigation. The general usefulness of the IEP as it is currently implemented in each classroom must be in keeping with the intent of the legal mandates.

VALUE OF THE STUDY

It is important to attempt to improve the usefulness of the IEP as a means of providing quality education. The Individualized Education Program model which will be developed through this study will hopefully lead to improved services. The plan will also provide the teachers and child study team members the opportunity to coordinate the IEP and the classroom curriculum.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to develop and implement an improved model for Individualized Education Programs which can be utilized in a preschool handicapped program.

RESEARCH QUESTION

To accomplish the purpose of this study the data will be used to answer the following questions.

Research Question 1 - Are the goals and objectives of Individual Education Programs appropriately written to meet the individual needs of the preschool handicapped child?

Research Question 2 - How can goals and objectives be written in a more meaningful way?

Research Question 3 - Can the means of constructing classroom curriculum be used to insure the IEP is met?

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Among the limitations affecting this study are the following: (1) very little, if any, research has been conducted on the appropriateness of Individualized Education Programs for preschool handicapped children; (2) the IEP process results in a highly

personalized document and it is difficult to provide generalizations that apply to all children. Because of the unique nature of each IEP it is very difficult to determine in an objective manner from an external perspective the correctness of an IEP.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Individualized Education Program - a written plan developed at a meeting according to N.J.A.C. 6:28-3-6 which sets forth goals and measurable objectives and describes an integrated, sequential program of individually designed educational activities and/or related services necessary to achieve the stated goals and objectives. This plan shall establish the rationale for the pupil's educational placement, serve as the basis for program implementation and comply with the mandates set forth in Chapter 28. (New Jersey Administrative Code, Chapter 28, Special Education, page 28-5)

Child Study Team - The child study team shall consist of a school psychologist, a learning disabilities teacher consultant, a school social worker and in the case of a preschool handicapped child, a speech therapist. (New Jersey Administrative Code, Chapter 28, Special Education, pg. 28-8)

Preschool Handicapped Program - A program which is designed to ensure the availability of a free, appropriate public education for all children ages 3 to 5 with disabilities. (ERIC Digest #E503)

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142) stipulated that each state and local educational agency must provide every child receiving special education with an individualized education program (IEP). According to the law and subsequent regulations, the IEP must be developed by an interdisciplinary team and must include the following components:

1. A statement of the child's present level of educational performance
2. Annual goals and instructional objectives
3. A statement of the specific education services to be provided to the child
4. A statement of the extent to which the child can participate in regular education programs
5. The projected date and anticipated duration of services
6. Objective evaluation criteria and evaluation
7. A schedule for annual review of the child's program

(Gallagher, Desimone 1995)

The authors also added that the IEP was intended to provide a plan that specifically identified instructional goals, means to these goals and the manner by which goal achievement could be measured (Gallagher, Desimone, 1995). This written plan was also originally designed to address the unique needs of each child as well as the family (Bailey and Wolery, 1992). These factors were also designed to

encourage a greater improving IEP development and the evaluation process (Gallagher & Desimone, 1995). Many individuals have expressed the point of view that IEPs were not functioning as they were intended by law. A number of concerns with IEPs have been addressed in recent literature. Poorly written goals and objectives, excessive demands on professionals time and inadequate assessment and monitoring have all been identified as problems (Gallagher & Desimone, 1995).

The literature reveals four major content faults of IEPs: a)missing data, b) poorly written goals and objectives, c) difficulty in linking goals to the program and evaluation, and d) no systematic monitoring efforts (Gallagher & Desimone, 1995). In a study which analyzed samples of IEPs, Schenek and Levy found that 64% of IEPs did not report current levels of performance (Smith, 1990). Other areas often missing included “goals, objectives, program structure and evaluation procedures, the handicapping condition of the child, grade-level placement, parental consent signatures, justification for the placement decision, initiation and/or duration dates, and identification of the persons responsible for IEP implementation” (Gallagher & Desimone, 1995). These items, missing from the IEP often result in an inappropriate program being instituted for the special education student.

One major area in which many IEPs are lacking is goals and objectives. More often than not the goals and objectives are very limited. They are often age inappropriate, too few in number, too many in number or too vague (Gallagher & Desimone, 1995). Even though it is a challenge to write the IEP in a format that it can be easily understood and is useful in a classroom, it is crucial that the data be complete and correct and the goals and objectives well-stated and useful. Often the

personnel who put together the IEPs are afraid of the possible negative impact on their professional accountability for the individual teacher and the overall special education program (Gallagher & Desimone, 1995).

The IEPs must be developed at a specific multidisciplinary meeting at which a number of participants are given the opportunity to provide relevant input (Rosenberg and Edmond-Rosenberg, 1994). This team approach implies that a combination of trained personnel as well as the child's parents or guardians will guarantee an efficient and effective IEP (Smith, 1990). According to McLean and Ododm (1993), the IEP is a written document that should reflect this team process as well as the decisions made by the team. According to the Parental Rights in Special Education booklet (NJ Department of Education), the Child Study Team will consist of a school psychologist, a learning disabilities teacher-consultant, a school social worker and for preschool pupil, a speech-language specialist.

In 1986, section 619 of Public Law 99-457 was added as an amendment to PL 94-142. This added incentives so that all states would provide a free and public education to eligible 3 to 5 year olds by the school year 1991-1992 (Culbertson & Willis, 1993). Preschoolers who are eligible for special education are classified as preschool handicapped. These children also require an IEP no matter where their placement.

Unfortunately even though preschoolers were now added to the IEP process, training of child study team personnel in the area of preschool disabilities was not required. This often adds to the general feelings of dissatisfaction regarding IEPs.

Smith (1990) stated that this dissatisfaction often causes the educational program not to be as “special” as it is intended.

The IEP has been the focus of much attention, controversy and research. This has caused researchers to raise provocative questions about the function and usefulness of IEPs including recommendations for creditability if the students fail to reach the goals. This may account for the writing of goals which are set too low in order to ensure success (Culbertson & Willis, 1993). Unfortunately this often has the same effect as the goals which are set too high (Elden-Smith, 1995). Culbertson and Willis (1993) state that they wish the writers of the IEPs would realize that there is no legal “trap” waiting for the person who appraises needs and sets the standards for the child honestly.

Bailey and Wolery (1992) list guidelines for writing objectives that included being developmentally appropriate, realistic, achievable and attend to all phases of learning. There are now a variety of sources available to aid in the writing of goals and objectives. These include using goals from developmental tests, computerized lists from commercial programs, clinical experience and knowledge of developmental progressions. By using more appropriate goals there is a greater chance of the children achieving these goals and objectives.

In addition to content problems with the IEP, the entire process of developing and implementing the IEPs has shortcomings (Gallagher & Desimone, 1995). According to Patricia Edelen-Smith (1995), teachers view IEPs as redundant to the ongoing education process, troublesome and expensive to coordinate and implement as well as being an education burden. This is in addition to the finding of Rosenberg and

Edmond-Rosenberg (1994) who surveyed teachers who also stated that the IEP process is “an arduous task that adds little to their instructional program”. They also showed much frustration with the amount of paperwork which often gets put into a drawer not be looked at again (Sugai, 1985). IEPs cannot be sued effectively to meet educational needs when they are perceived and treated this way. The teachers also felt that the minimum components of an IEP should be the current appraisal, goals and evaluation (Gallagher, Trohanis & Clifford, 1989). These components are the basic elements that are needed to help implement the IEP into the classroom curriculum. In order to remedy some of these IEP problems, a “quick fix” may be needed. Using technology to accomplish what other recommendations have not, may be a suggestion worth looking into. It has been found that computer assisted IEPs take less time, cost less and lead to more favorable teacher’s attitudes toward the entire IEP process (Smith, 1990).

Specially designed instruction is the definition of special education according to Stephen Smith (1990), but an educational program may not be “special” if the IEP document and process are not functioning as intended. In order for the IEP to function properly, another important part of the entire process must be considered. The law states there must be a relationship between the IEP and the classroom activities (Smith, 1990). In order to establish a working relationship between the IEP and the activities, there must be an appropriate curriculum that encourages the growth of the child.

The curriculum and intervention services should be synonymous when it comes to implementing the IEP (McLean & Odom, 1993). An appropriate curriculum needs to:

- a) accommodate a broad range of individual differences
- b) support positive relationships with families
- c) recognize cultural diversity
- d) be relevant and functional
- e) actively engage children in learning
- f) support the physical needs of the children

(McLean & Ododm, 1993).

There should also be a great emphasis on performance of skills.

When surveyed, early childhood personnel held different views on what was appropriate practice within the classroom. Some felt it was appropriate for 4 and 5 year olds to do an hour of seat work and babies to “do” the calendar, when others wouldn’t even consider giving a 4 or 5 year old a ditto. This prompted the National Association for the Education of Young Children to develop a definition of developmentally appropriateness (Bredekamp, 1993). Learning environments, teaching practices and other program components would be planned based on what is generally to be expected of children of various ages and stages, but adaptations should be made for the wide range of differences between individual children. This statement reflects an interactive approach to learning, emphasizing play and active, child initiated learning. Some of the adaptations which need to made to accommodate disabled children, will include changing the total focus from child

directed activities to teacher directed activities. Often children with developmental delays will require teacher directed activities in order to achieve the goals stated on their IEPs. The teacher must be able to adapt the curriculum to accommodate for the needs and interests of all the children.

Currently there are different approaches utilized to develop curriculum for young children. The developmental approach uses the IEP objectives and strategies to allow for maximum child-environment interaction (Garwood, 1983). The teacher does not directly instruct the children but the children construct their own environment according to their individual interests and motivation. The behavioral approach includes teacher directed activities. The child learns by experiencing repeated reinforcement for responses to environmental stimuli. The teachers may vary the stimuli used in the activity or change the level of difficulty depending on the individual child's capacity.

The developmental model is not likely to be effective with handicapped children unless the teacher is willing to individualize his/her instructional approach (Thurman & Widerstrom, 1985). Another approach would be the cognitive developmental model. In this model the child begins as a passive learner as in the behavioral model but then takes an active role as time goes on.

The general curriculum often poses problems for students with disabilities. In theory the curriculum should be adapted to meet the unique needs of the special education students. The most appropriate curricular model would be the combination of each of these models into one (Thurman & Widerstrom, 1985). The teacher needs to be aware of the typical patterns of development of young children in order to use

effective change strategies. An effective teacher will be able to adapt her curriculum to meet the needs of the special education child.

Garwood (1983) developed the following considerations to be used when planning a curriculum which is to be used with young disabled children:

1. Is the curriculum based on theory of early development and learning?
2. Do the goals of the curriculum complement the existing goals of the program?
3. Can the goals and objectives be assessed?
4. Are the objectives designed to accomplish the goals of the curriculum?
5. Does the curriculum focus on the skill domain that is most critical for the target population?
6. Are the instructional objectives and activities broken down into small workable statements appropriate for use with the target population?
7. Are the items developmentally relevant and logically sequenced?
8. Does curriculum include techniques for attracting and sustaining attention?

One of the considerations Garwood suggested be used in curriculum selection is whether or not the goals and objectives can be assessed. This seems to be one area which the literature does not examine (Gallagher & Desimone, 1995). The authors stated that IEP monitoring and evaluation procedures are often lacking in the schools. Studies demonstrated that teachers did not record when the objectives were completed. Monitoring IEPs is crucial to the success of a child's program. The IEPs should be reviewed frequently so that a child's failure to reach sort term objectives does not wait to be discovered until the annual review. The fact that one of the most distinguishing features of young children is rapid developmental changes there fore

there needs to be ongoing review of the IEP to ensure the goals and objectives are current and in the best interest of the child.

SUMMARY

The IEP is the key document for providing effective special education services for students with disabilities. Even though there is a general dissatisfaction among educators concerning the entire IEP process and the implementation of the IEP into the classroom curriculum, there is plenty of opportunity for improvement in this area.

When improvements are made, the IEP will be able to be used as intended. It is designed to be the essential component in providing customized educational program for a disabled child. The IEP should both enhance and account for the student's learning and the teacher's instruction. By using the IEP, the curriculum will be able to be adapted to serve the needs of all the children. This will ensure that all disabled children will be given the opportunity to achieve to the best of their ability in an environment that offers ample opportunities for them to succeed.

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The sample for this study consists of twenty preschool handicapped teachers in Burlington County, one teacher in Cumberland County and one in Cape May County, New Jersey. The preschool handicapped classes are all located within public school systems and have been in existence for one to fifteen years.

COLLECTION OF DATA

A questionnaire consisting of twelve open ended questions was given to each teacher. The questionnaires was mailed to preschool handicapped teachers in Burlington County as well as one in Cumberland County and one in Cape May County. A self addressed stamped envelope was included for the convenience of the respondent. Each teacher was requested to answer and return the questionnaire as soon as possible. A copy of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix A. A follow letter was sent reminding the teachers to fill out and return the questionnaires.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The basic purpose of the questionnaire is to gather data regarding the perceptions of a representative sample of preschool handicapped teachers regarding Individualized Education Plans and curriculums that are currently being utilized in

their classrooms. The results of the questionnaires will be used to develop suggestions for appropriate IEPs for use with preschool handicapped children.

The questionnaire was scored using content analysis, which is a method of studying and analyzing information by the frequency of various statements. The major categories to be analyzed for the purpose of this study are:

- (1) curriculum used in PSH programs
- (2) opinions on IEP objectives/goals
- (3) items needed for appropriate IEPs

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

ANALYSIS AND RESPONSES

A total of twenty questionnaires were distributed. Fifteen questionnaires were returned (seventy-five percent return rate). The respondents were all preschool handicapped teachers within public schools with experience ranging from one to fourteen years. Fifty-three percent of the teachers possess both special education and early childhood certifications while the other forty-seven percent only possess special education certification. The services provided to the children vary from school to school. Some received individual speech, occupational therapy and physical therapy while others received integrated speech and occupational therapy. Physical therapy was not integrated in any of the schools. Two classrooms received physical education one time a month while another school received it two times a week. One class received library instruction one day a week. The remaining schools did not receive instruction by any special area teachers.

The following information was compiled by comparing the responses from the questionnaires.

Forty-six percent of the teachers felt that the IEP goals and objectives were appropriately written for the functional level of the individual children in their classes. Thirteen percent felt they were not appropriate. Thirty-three percent felt the goals and objectives were appropriate if written by themselves. When asked if the objectives were easily written and what method was used, a variety of answers were

given. Individual interpretation of this question seems to have been a variable. The responses included observation, specific assessment measures such as the Brigance and the LAP as well as different symbols(+,-) which denoted the level of accomplishment.

The Child Study Team was responsible for writing sixty-six percent of the IEPs for new students while the teachers were responsible for writing eighty-six percent of the IEPs for returning students. Thirteen percent of the teachers were responsible for writing the IEPs for both new and returning students. The IEP goals and objectives were generated from various sources. Fifty-three percent of the teachers responded that these goals and objectives were pulled from a computerized program, thirty-three percent were written by the child study team and thirteen percent had no specific bank of goals and objectives. Eight-six percent felt that these goals and objectives were appropriate while fourteen percent found that they were not appropriate. Fifty-three percent of the teachers felt that there were an appropriate amount of goals/objectives, thirty-three percent felt there were too many while thirteen felt there were too few.

Since the IEPs should correlate with the classroom curriculum, a question was asked requesting information on the curriculum that was used. Forty-six percent of the classrooms used curriculums that were written by the present or past teachers. Thirty-three percent did not have a formal curriculum and one teacher is currently writing one. One teacher stated that her curriculum is taken directly from the student's IEPs. One hundred percent of the teachers base their teaching strategies and schedules on experience as well as the curriculum and the IEPs.

When asked if the IEP was used as a teaching tool or if it is just used once or twice a year for assessment purposes, sixty-six percent only used it as an assessment tool. Thirteen percent of the teachers used it to plan small and large group activities. Two percent used it continuously throughout the year for teaching purposes. Most of the teachers(sixty-six percent) used thematic units as their curriculum with a few using the IEP as well (twenty-six).

The teachers were also asked what they would like to see included on the IEPs. Thirty-three percent of the teachers stated that they are satisfied with the IEP items and would like to see no changes. Others stated that they would like to see more social/emotional skills, self-help skills, more teacher input, more information on the child as well as more comments.

When asked the amount of time that Child Study Team members visit the classroom, eighty-six percent of the teachers stated that it was only two to three times a year and that the members did not know the children personally. Thirteen percent felt that the Child Study Team members did know the children quite well because they did visit the classroom often.

CONCLUSION

The data obtained in the survey supports the conclusion that forty-six percent of the teachers felt that their IEP goals and objectives were appropriately written for the functional level of the individual children in their class. Of these forty-six percent, thirty three percent felt the goals and objectives were more appropriate if they wrote

them themselves. They also felt that the goals and objectives were achievable as well as appropriate in number. The teachers also expressed the idea that they felt they should write the IEPs for both new and returning students. They felt that with enough information, they could write a more appropriate IEP than the Child Study Team could due to their understanding and knowledge of the program. Eighty-six percent of the teachers expressed concern that the Child Study Team members rarely visited the classrooms throughout the year. The same eighty-six percent felt that the CST members did not know the children at all. They felt the team members only came into the classroom when it was time to evaluate or if there was a problem.

The curriculum in the PSH classroom vary from teacher written(forty-six percent) to not having any formal curriculum. One teacher stated that this is the first year of her program and she is in the process of writing a curriculum. Another teacher bases her curriculum on the IEPs of the children. One hundred percent of the teachers felt that they plan their teaching strategies on their own experience rather than on the curriculum or IEPs.

The data also demonstrated that the IEPs were only looked at a few times a year for assessment purposes only. Curricular themes as well as the IEP objectives were used to teach throughout the year.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to develop and implement an improved model for IEPs which can be utilized in a preschool handicapped program. In order to determine the appropriateness of current IEPs, a questionnaire was distributed to twenty preschool handicapped teachers. The survey consisted of 12 questions pertaining to goals, objectives, curriculum and teaching strategies. The questionnaire was then analyzed using content analysis methodology.

Forty-six percent of the teachers stated that they felt the IEP goals and objectives were appropriate for the functional level of the children in their classroom. Those surveyed expressed their general satisfaction with the content of the IEPs especially when written by themselves. Dissatisfaction was expressed with the amount of time the CST spends visiting the preschool handicapped classrooms. They also expressed dissatisfaction with the IEPs when written by the CST. This seems to correlate with the amount of time the CST members spend in the classroom and how well they know the children. The two teachers who conveyed complete satisfaction with all aspects of the IEPs and curriculum were the only teachers who stated that the CST members visited the classroom on a regular basis.

DISCUSSION

These results were not consistent with the general discussions of IEPs that was found in the literature. The literature reveals that the goals and objectives are often inappropriate, too few in number, too many in number or too vague (Gallagher & Desimone, 1995). This study showed that approximately one half of the teachers felt that their IEPs were appropriate in content and number. The research suggests that by using goals and objectives from developmental tests and computerized lists from commercial programs, IEPs would be more developmentally appropriate as well as achievable. This conclusion is supported by the data gathered in this study.

Fifty-three percent of the IEPs were written using computer programs. This is in direct correlation with the forty-six percent of teachers who were satisfied with the appropriateness and achievability of their IEPs.

It seems that many school districts have already realized the inappropriateness of prior IEPs and have taken measures to correct the problems. Whether or not, this was done by chance or after research was done, it is not known. The one area that seems to remain a problem is the amount of time the Child Study Team actually spends with the children after the initial evaluation has taken place and the children were placed in a program. It seems imperative, that the Child Study Team remain an integral part of the children's education in order to ensure that a proper program is being instituted.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Suggestions for further study include research on the correlation between the types of disabilities and the IEP goals and objectives. Also a more in depth study could be done to investigate the specific items on the IEP and how they relate to the individual components of the classroom curriculum. For example, fine motor skills and free play activities.

References

Bailey, D.B. & Wolery, M. (1992). Teaching Infants and Preschoolers with Disabilities. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bredenkamp, S. (1993). The Relationship Between Early Childhood Education and Early Childhood Special Education. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 13,(3), 39-45.

Culbertson, J.L. & Willis, D. J. (1993). Testing Young Children. Austin, Texas: Library of Congress.

Edelen-Smith, P. (1995). Eight Elements to Guide Goal Determination of IEPs. Intervention in School and Clinic, 30(5), 297-301.

Gallagher, J & Desimone, L. (1995). Lessons Learned from Implementation of the IEP: Applications to the IFSP. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 15(3), 32-58.

Gallagher, J., Trohanis, P.L., & Clifford, R.M., (19989). Policy Implementation and PL 99-457: Planning for Young Children with Special Needs. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing, Co.

Garwood, S.G. (1983). Educating Young Handicapped Children: A Developmental Approach. Rockville, MD: Aspen Publication.

McLean, M.E. & Odom, S.L. (1993). Practices for Young Children With and Without Disabilities: A Comparison of DEC and NAEYC Practices. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 13(3), 19-38.

Parental Rights in Special Education (Fall 1994). New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton, NJ.

Rosenberg, M.S., Ph.D., & Edmond-Rosenberg, I., MPA. (1994) The Special Education Sourcebook. USA: Woodbine House.

Smith, S.W. (1990). Individualized Education Programs(IEPs) in Special Education - From Intent to Acquiescence. Exceptional Children 57(1), 6-12.

Sugai, G. (1985). Case Study: Designing Instruction from IEPs. Teaching Exceptional Children, Spring 1985, 233-239.

Thurman, S.K. & Widerstrom, A.H. (1985). Young Children with Special Needs:
A Developmental and Ecological Approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.



Special Educational Services/Instruction Department
Appendix A

Dear Professional Educator of Preschool Handicapped Children,

I am working on a project to meet the requirements to obtain a Master's Degree in Learning Disabilities Track III(Preschool Handicapped) at Rowan University. I would deeply appreciate your cooperation in completing a questionnaire dealing with IEPs and your classroom curriculum. I have enclosed a self-addressed stamped envelope for your use in returning the questionnaire to me:

The title of my project is:

An Analysis of the Individual Education Plan for Preschool Handicapped Children
and Its' Relationship to Classroom Curriculum.

I have completed research in the area, and found few studies dealing with the connection between IEPs and implementation as related to classroom curriculum.

Thank you in advance for your help with this project. If you would like a copy of the project after completion, send me your name and address and I will send it to you late spring of 1998.

I am also requesting that you enclose a description of how your IEPs are written. If your IEPs are formulated using a computerized list of possible goals and objective, please state that and if possible, enclose a brief sample such as a single page.

Again, I appreciate your help and hopefully this study will make a positive contribution to the education of preschool handicapped children.

Sincerely,

Kari Zimmerman
Graduate Student

Appendix B
Survey
Teacher Information

1. Your Present Position _____
2. Number of Years in this Position _____
3. Present Certification(s) _____
4. Experience in Preschool - Please describe on the back.

Program Components

1. Number of hours children spend in class daily _____
2. Number of days per week children attend _____
3. Amount of teacher preparation time daily/weekly _____
4. Please include a copy of your daily classroom schedule _____
5. Do students receive the following by special area teachers:

yes/no	Amount of time daily/weekly
Art _____	_____
Music _____	_____
Phys. Ed. _____	_____
Computers _____	_____
Other _____	_____

6. What services are provided to your students:

yes/no	Amount of time daily/weekly
Speech _____	_____
O.T. _____	_____
P.T. _____	_____
Other _____	_____

7. Are any of the services in question six provided as an integrated service, or is individual

therapy implemented?

Speech _____ O.T. _____ P.T. _____ Other _____

8. Number of students in your class:

$\frac{1}{2}$ day programs	Full day programs
AM _____	_____
PM _____	_____

9. Number of Classroom Aides: _____
One on One Aides: _____
10. Aide Certification or Experience: _____

Please answer the following questions as honestly and accurately as possible.

1. Do you feel your IEP goals and objectives are appropriately written for the functional level of the individual children in your class? Please give examples and add any clarifications you feel is important.

2. Are the objectives in the IEP easily measured? What method is used?

3. Who writes the goals and objectives, (for new students and for returning students) and what process is used to determine which objectives to include?

4. Does your district supply you with a bank of goals and objectives from which to choose? If so, where did the bank of objectives come from?

5. Do you feel the goals/objectives are achievable?

6. Do you feel there is an appropriate number of goals/objectives? Too few/ too many?

7. What curriculum do you use in your program? Is your curriculum formulized into a written form?

8. Do you change teaching strategies, scheduling, or materials according to IEPs or, do you determine these items based on your experience in working with disabled children?

9. Do you feel the IEP is used as a tool for teaching, or do you look at it once or twice a year for review and evaluation purposes?

10. Do you write lesson plans using the IEP, or do you write plans based on curricular themes? Please explain.

11. What would you like to see included on your IEPs?

12. How often do the Child Study Team members visit your classroom? Do you feel they know the children personally?

Appendix C

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PLAN:
PRESCHOOL HANDICAPPED

THIS PLAN CAN BE FORMATTED ACCORDING
TO INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL DISTRICT GUIDELINES

COGNITIVE

_____ (child's name) will improve cognitive skills.

The Student Will:

- match pictures to objects; match pictures to pictures
- identify big, little, small
- build tower of _____ cubes
- stack rings
- complete _____ piece puzzle
- name missing object
- repeat _____ objects
- match colors
- sort/point/identify colors
- sort/point/identify shapes
- rote count to _____
- count objects with one on one correspondence
- sort objects into _____ categories
- identify quantity concepts; more/less, some/none, all/most
- identify objects which are same/different
- identify empty/full
- begin to identify numbers
- begin to identify letters of the alphabet
- sequence by size

FINE MOTOR

_____ (child's name) will increase fine motor skills

The student will:

- string ½, 1 inch beads
- roll, pound, squeeze playdough
- put pegs in pegboard
- snip with scissors
- cut line, circle, various shapes with circle
- put together _____ piece puzzle
- use manipulatives (legos, interlockers, etc.)
- pour from pitcher
- pick up objects with tongs
- place small objects into bottle

GROSS MOTOR

_____ (child's name) will increase gross motor skill abilities.

The Student Will:

- jump in place
- walk backward
- stand on 1 foot _____ seconds
- walk on line
- walk on tiptoe
- catch ball with extended stiff arms
- hops on 1 foot
- gallop
- throws ball overhand _____ feet
- climbs ladder of playground equipment
- walks up and kicks ball
- skips

LANGUAGE

_____ (child's name) will improve expressive/receptive language development

Present Level of Development _____

The Student Will:

- identify _____ pictures
- say first name
- use gestures, words to express needs/wants
- bring familiar object on request
- use name in reference to self
- participate in rhymes and fingerplays
- identify and name common objects in the environment
- identify objects by use
- use plurals
- give first and last name
- respond appropriately to and be able to ask "what", "where", "when" and "why" questions
- follow 2 step directions
- point/name body parts
- repeat 6-7 syllable sentences
- tell full name, age, sex
- understand and use _____ prepositions
- understand and use pronouns
- use 3 or more word sentences
- describe objects using color, shape, size and use
- predict what will happen next
- sequence 3-4 events
- use and identify opposites
- identify objects by function
- improve ability to carry on a social conversation with a peer
- answer yes/no questions
- improve ability to produce age appropriate phrases and questions
- relate experiences
- deliver one part verbal message
- follow 2/3 step directions
- tell use of senses
- tell opposites

PREWRITING

_____ (child's name) will increase prewriting skills.

The students will:

- scribble
- imitate horizontal line, vertical line, circle
- imitate, copy various shapes, letters
- hold pencil with appropriate grasp
- hold paper with hand
- draw a man with _____ body parts
- color with control within a defined area
- trace predrawn lines, shapes
- copy first name
- print first name

SELF HELP SKILLS

_____ (child's name) will improve self help skills.

The Student Will:

- wipe and blow own nose
- will distinguish between food and non-food substances(placing only food items in mouth)
- will drink from cup without spilling
- will feed self with spoon/fork
- will spread with knife
- will use napkin to wipe mouth
- will wash and dry face/hands
- will demonstrate appropriate use of table manners
- express need to use the toilet
- use the toilet independently
- remove coat independently
- hang coat on hook
- put on coat
- fasten/unfasten fasteners on own clothing
- take/put off shoes/socks
- unbuckle/buckle belt
- pull up pants
- dress self with minimal assistance

PERSONAL - SOCIAL SKILLS

_____ (child's name) will improve personal-social skills.

The Student Will:

- initiate play activities
- respond to initial greeting
- sit in circle and imitate leader
- attend to activity for _____ minutes
- play simple group games
- puts toys away with/without supervision
- shares toys
- takes turns
- listens attentively to stories
- expresses displeasure verbally rather than physically
- tells sex
- performs for others
- plays cooperatively with other children
- says thank you/ please spontaneously
- goes on errands outside classroom
- tells age; address; phone number; birthday

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

- Utilize a multi-sensory approach to instruction.
- Provide multiple opportunities to learn and develop skills in a variety of contexts to increase likelihood of generalization.
- provide experiences to develop emerging skills
- provide challenges to elicit skills that are expected next in the developmental sequence
- provide group lessons that facilitate success experiences on each level represented in the class

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The student will demonstrate mastery of objectives with _____% accuracy _____ out of _____ times. (will be determined according to student's ability level and discretion of teacher)

- staff observation
- informal checklists
- formal assessment
- report cards
- parent - teacher conferences
- portfolio review

PRESCHOOL MATERIALS

AV Materials

record player and records
tape recorder/player computer/software
CD player
TV/VCR

Toys

dolls and housekeeping materials
cars, trucks, etc.
puzzles, manipulatives, etc.
games
blocks and building materials
toy animals
dress up clothes

Art Materials

paper, oaktag, construction, etc.
crayons, chalk, pencils, markers, etc.
scissors, glue, etc.
finger paint
tempra paint
watercolor paint
playdough
collage materials - sequins, buttons, macaroni, confetti, etc.

Instructional Materials

story books, picture books
games
flannel board materials
manipulatives - counters, etc.

Equipment

tables, chairs, rifton chairs kitchen equipment
flannel board
balls, hoops,
parachute
balance beam
sandbox
rug
cooking equipment
shelves