

# Teaching essays – coteaching students disabilities essay



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

## **Coteaching Students Disabilities**

The intent of this chapter is to show a reappraisal of the literature that focuses on coteaching and instructional patterns that may positively impact accomplishment for pupils with disablements. There is a big volume of research on coteaching theoretical accounts, but really small information that includes teacher perceptual experiences of the effectivity of instructional patterns that have an impact on pupil accomplishment.

First, a brief historical reappraisal of educating pupils with disablements will be presented. Second, a brief historical reappraisal of answerability enterprises get downing with the publication *A State at Hazard* in 1983 and reasoning with the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 will be presented. Third, a brief description of pupils with disablements in Illinois is discussed. Fourth, instructional intercessions including the coteaching intercession scheme appear. Fifth, schoolroom constructions back uping coteaching are presented. Sixth, a research base is explored. The concluding subdivision of the literature reappraisal explores the leader's function in the context of easing the pattern of coteaching.

### Public Law and Educating Students with Disabilities

The thrust for altering how we educate pupils with disablements is widely attributed to Public Law 94-142, *Education for all Handicapped Children Act* ( EHA ) , passed by Congress in 1975. Harmonizing to the Office of Special Education Programs ( OSEP ) ,

Before the passage of Public Law 94-142, the destiny of many persons with disablements was likely to be dim...In 1967, for illustration, province establishments were places to about 200, 000 individuals with important disabilities...many of these restrictive scenes provided merely minimum nutrient, vesture, and shelter. ( OSEP, 1999, p. 2 )

Public Law 94-142 “ guaranteed a free, appropriate public instruction to each kid with a disablement in every province and vicinity across the country” and listed four intents in the mission of educating pupils with disablements:

- Assure that all kids with disablements have available to them...a free appropriate public instruction which emphasizes particular instruction and related services designed to run into their alone demands
- Help provinces and vicinities to supply for the instruction of all pupils with disablements
- Assure that the rights of kids with disablements and their parents are protected
- Assess and guarantee the effectivity of attempts to educate all kids with disablements. ( OSEP, 1999, p. 3-4 )

Furthermore, Public Law 94-142 mandated alterations including how kids with disablements were identified and educated, the rating of services offered by pedagogues, provided due procedure to protect kids with disablements and their parents, and authorised federal money and inducements to ease execution by provinces and vicinities to follow with the jurisprudence ( OSEP, 1999, p. 3 ) . Clearly, Public Law 94-142 addressed

basic patterns and policies since the instruction of kids with disabilities.

However, subsequent amendments to Public Law 94-142 were enacted to maintain pace with the changing demands of kids with disabilities.

There have been several cardinal amendments to EHA since its origin in 1975. The 1986 *Amendments to EHA*, Public Law 99-457, mandated that provinces provide services and plans for kids with disabilities from birth. The 1983 *Amendments to EHA*, ( Public Law 98-199 ) , the 1990 *Amendments to EHA* ( Public Law 101-476 ) , which changed the name to the *Persons with Disabilities Education Act* ( IDEA ) , and the *IDEA Amendments* of 1997 ( Public Law 105-17 ) provided a focal point on passage services for high school pupils through their Individualized Education Plan ( IEP ) get downing at age 14 ( OSEP, 1999, p. 4 ) . Although the Office of Special Education Programs asserts that “...today, 1000000s of kids with important disabilities are going to their vicinity schools and learning the life skills they will necessitate for full, active engagement in incorporate activities with their household members, friends, neighbours, and colleagues, ” the OSEP besides realizes “ that there is no easy or speedy hole to the challenges of educating kids with disabilities” ( OSEP, 1999, p. 4-5 ) .

The 2004 *Reauthorization of IDEA* , spearheaded by so President George W. Bush and Congress, closely mirrors the linguistic communication of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* ( NCLB ) and states that schools will be “ accountable for doing certain pupils with disabilities achieve high standards” ( OSERS, 2004, p. 1 ) . U. S. Education Secretary Margaret Spellings stated, “ NCLB and IDEA 2004 have non merely removed the concluding barrier dividing particular instruction from general instruction,

<https://assignbuster.com/teaching-essays-coteaching-students-disabilities-essay/>

they have besides put the demands of pupils with disablements front and center” ( OSERS, 2004, p. 1 ) . Rose & A ; Gallup ( 2006 ) presented a less favourable appraisal of the modern educational scene. In the *38 Thursday Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Attitudes Toward the Public Schools* , the writers presented the undermentioned findings:

- 47 % of people polled had an unfavourable sentiment of NCLB
- 54 % of people polled opposed coverage trials tons by pupil subgroups
- 62 % of people polled opposed the coverage of trial tons for pupils with disablements
- 75 % of people polled opposed the demand that pupils with disablements meet the same academic criterions as all other pupils in the school. ( p. 51 )

Rose & A ; Gallup ( 2006 ) besides asserted that “ perhaps the most important determination is that NCLB has made no difference in the public presentation of schools in the community” and concluded that “ because the attempt to follow with NCLB is driving direction in most schools and ruling attempts to better accomplishment, the concern of such a big proportion of the public needs to be addressed” ( p. 50-51 ) . Educators continue to necessitate programs other than statute law to better pattern and therefore consequences for pupils with disablements.

Accountability Initiatives and Students with Disabilities

Although there has been measurable advancement for many pupils as outlined below, the subgroup still most at-risk for non meeting criteria for province mandated trials is made up of pupils with disabilities. The public presentation spread between pupils with disabilities and other subgroups continues to widen, or at best, remain the same. Necessitate to infix Illinois statistics here. Look up Illinois Department of Education web site for subgroup public presentations. See page 13.

### Instructional Interventions

In an attempt to turn to alterations in policy and pattern, many schools across the United States have adopted varied theoretical accounts of learning designed specifically for bettering the academic success and advancement of pupils with disabilities. Some schools utilize a collaborative or coteaching instructional theoretical account non merely to supply a least restrictive environment ( LRE ) but besides to supply extra direction within the general instruction schoolroom. Although there is no cosmopolitan definition for coaction or coteaching, many forms appear in literature. The term *concerted instruction* is attributed to Bauwens, Hourcade, and Friend ( 1989 ) and describes “ a matter-of-fact amalgamation between general and particular pedagogues in which direct educational scheduling to all pupils would be provided by holding a particular pedagogue within a general instruction setting” ( Murawski & A ; Swanson, 2001, p. 258 ) . Concerted instruction was subsequently defined by Hourcade and Bauwens ( 2001 ) as “ two or more pedagogues possessing distinguishable sets of cognition and accomplishments, for illustration, a general pedagogue and a particular pedagogue working together to learn <https://assignbuster.com/teaching-essays-coteaching-students-disabilities-essay/>

academically heterogeneous groups of pupils in the general instruction classroom” ( p. 243 ) .

In the book *Concerted Teaching: Rebuilding and Sharing the School* ( 2003 ) , writers Hourcade and Bauwens assert “ the most typical characteristic of collaborative instruction, and the 1 that most differentiates it from indirect attacks to coercion, is this joint and coincident direct proviso of instruction” ( p. 39 ) . The writers list four basic characteristics critical to successful coercion:

- Both pedagogues are committed to alter and introspection
- Both pedagogues portion similar values, attitudes, and beliefs about schools, learning, pupils, and learning
- Both pedagogues are voluntarily committed to collaborative instruction
- Both pedagogues value each other. ( Hourcade & A ; Bauwens, 2003 )

Two prima inquiries are offered by Muraski and Dieker ( 2004 ) for instructors in a coteaching scene to find if they should go on coteaching: “ Is what we are making good for both of us? ” and “ Is what we are making good for all of our pupils? ” ( p. 58 ) . The writers further name planning, direction, and appraisal as three countries of focal point for instructors in a coteaching scene ( p. 55-57 ) .

In the mid 1990s, Cook and Friend ( 1995 ) non merely modified the term *concerted instruction* to *coteaching* but further offer coteaching as “ two or more professionals presenting substantial direction to a diverse or blended

group of pupils in a individual physical space” ( p. 2 ) . Friend and Cook ( 2007 ) present six mechanisms for successful coaction:

- Collaboration should be voluntary
- Collaboration is grounded in equality
- Collaboration embracing shared duty for determination devising and input
- Collaboration includes shared duty for pupil accomplishment
- Collaboration involves sharing resources
- Collaboration is based on sharing common ends. ( p. 7-12 )

Rice and Zigmond ( 2000 ) defined coteaching utilizing three standards:

- two qualified instructors, one of whom is a particular instruction instructor, portion the same schoolroom and pupils
- the instructors portion duty for planning and learning an academically varied category that includes both pupils with disablements and typically achieving pupils
- both instructors convey substantial direction. ( Morocco & A ; Aquilar, 2002, p. 316 )

The writers contend “ coteaching is non an stray schoolroom pattern but the extension into the schoolroom of a complex system of instructor coaction that reaches to all degrees of school organization” ( Morocco & A ; Aquilar, 2002, p. 343 ) .



In 2001, Gately and Gately stated that coteaching is “ the coaction between general and particular instruction for all of the learning duties of all pupils assigned to a classroom” ( p. 41 ) . The writers describe eight constituents that define the coteaching instructional theoretical account:

- Interpersonal communicating
- Physical agreement
- Acquaintance with the course of study
- Curriculum ends and alterations
- Instructional planning
- Instructional presentation
- Classroom direction
- Appraisal. ( p. 40 )

The writers stress that effectual coteaching relationships must turn from a *get downing phase* , categorized by “ guarded, careful communicating, ” to a *compromising phase* , described as “ give and take communicating with a sense of holding to ‘ give up’ to get” to a *join forcing phase* , where the instructors display “ open communicating and common admiration” ( p. 42 ) . The writers conclude that “ teams need to be assured that genuinely collaborative partnerships take clip and attempt to develop” ( Gately & A ; Gately, 2001 ) .

Classroom Structures Supporting Coteaching

There is no “one size fits all” agreement for a co-taught schoolroom. Research workers have, though, defined five basic coteaching agreements:

- One teaching/one observing
- Station or centre instruction
- Parallel instruction
- Alternate instruction
- Synergistic instruction. ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 )

The *one teaching/one observing* agreement provides each co-teacher with separate undertakings. In the book, *Interactions: Collaboration accomplishments for school professionals* ( 2007 ) , writers Friend and Cook suggest

the first [ instructor ] has primary duty for planning and presenting specific direction to the full group...the 2nd professional has the end of consistently rolling up information relevant to a individual pupil, a little group of pupils, or for the full category for behaviours the professionals have antecedently agreed should be noted. ( p. 120 )

Although the one teach/one observe attack requires really small concerted planning, the writers noted that one disadvantage is the possibility of the perceiver being delegated the function of helper ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 ) .

*Station learning* allows co-teachers the chance to concurrently present direction within the schoolroom ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 ) . There are assorted attacks to post learning including revolving pupils, revolving

<https://assignbuster.com/teaching-essays-coteaching-students-disabilities-essay/>

instructors, and supplying chances for independent pattern, reappraisal, or group work ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 ) . Friend and Cook ( 2007 ) stated that “ because in this attack each teacher instructs all pupils, albeit in different groups, the equal position of both the pupils and the instructor can be maximized” ( p. 123 ) .

*Parallel instruction* is an agreement where each instructor is teaching half the pupils grouped in a diverse mode ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 ) . Friend and Cook ( 2007 ) stated “ parallel instruction frequently is appropriate for drill and pattern activities, trial reappraisals, subjects necessitating a high degree of pupil treatment, or undertakings necessitating nearer teacher supervision” ( p. 124 ) . They besides contend that both instructors need a strong apprehension of the content of the topic studied, but with the chief end being to cut down the student-teacher ratio in the schoolroom ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 ) .

*Alternate instruction* is an agreement where one instructor delivers instruction to a bulk of the pupils while another instructor selects a little group of pupils for redress and enrichment ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 ) . While this method can be a really successful one, it is of import that the little group does non go a particular instruction schoolroom nestled within the regular instruction scene ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 ) .

*Synergistic instruction or teaming* refers to a state of affairs that focuses on joint planning and direction and carries with it a high degree of common trust on the portion of the co-teachers ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 ) . Friend and Cook ( 2007 ) province that “ co-teachers who team often report that it

consequences in a synergism that enhances pupil engagement and energizes the professionals, sometimes even stimulating them to seek advanced techniques and activities that each professional would not hold tried alone” ( p. 126 ) .

### The Research Base

As stated earlier, the inclusion of pupils with disabilities in the regular schoolroom scene has become a widely used instructional theoretical account ( Dieker & A ; Murawski, 2003 ) . Some research demonstrates that the successful realisation of a coteaching theoretical account may hold a positive impact on accomplishment for pupils with disabilities ( Murawski & A ; Swanson, 2001 ; Rea et al. , 2002 ) . Specifically, Murawski and Swanson ( 2001 ) indicated that the impact on pupil accomplishment was most apparent in the countries of reading and linguistic communication humanistic disciplines. Research conducted by Rea, McLaughlin, and Walther-Thomas ( 2002 ) concluded that “ students with disabilities included in the general instruction schoolrooms achieved better results on some steps than did their equals in disengagement plans and similar results on others” ( p. 219 ) . When reexamining big measures of coteaching literature, nevertheless, the impact on pupil accomplishment due to coteaching and inclusion was ill-defined and indicated that farther research in this country would be sensible ( Mastropieri et al. , 2005 ; Morocco & A ; Aguilar, 2002 ; Murawski & A ; Swanson, 2001 ; Rea, et al. , 2002 ; Zigmond, 2003 ; Zigmond & A ; Margiera, 2001 ) . Mastropieri et Al. ( 2005 ) asserted that “ although coteaching theoretical accounts have proliferated, there is a deficiency of consensus on the specific characteristics required...and the <https://assignbuster.com/teaching-essays-coteaching-students-disabilities-essay/>

best manner to mensurate the effectivity of coteaching” ( p. 261 ) . In their survey of coteaching which included three in-between school plans, Morocco & A ; Aguilar ( 2002 ) concluded “ further research should document the procedure of planning, appraisal, and schoolroom coteaching that characterizes the full rhythm of coteaching within interdisciplinary teams” ( p. 343 ) .

In 2001, Murawski and Swanson conducted a quantitative meta-analysis of coteaching articles written about general and particular instruction instructors functioning within the same schoolroom including both regular and particular instruction pupils. Harmonizing to those writers, of the 89 articles searched, merely 6 articles contained sufficient informations for analysis. Murawski and Swanson ( 2001 ) stated “ for coteaching to be considered a valid service bringing option for pupils with disablements in the general instruction or least restrictive arrangement, more experimental research must be conducted” ( p. 265 ) . Zigmund ( 2003 ) is in understanding with Murawski and Swanson ( 2001 ) in their meta-analysis of the coteaching research that there are non adequate surveies to find the true strength and success of the coteaching motion ( p. 195 ) .

### The Leader’s Role

The principal’s function as a coteaching facilitator may be critical to the success of both instructors and pupils. Harmonizing to Hourcade and Bauwens ( 2001 ) ,

concerted instruction provides pedagogues and pupils likewise with greater

chances to make their full potency. It allows pedagogues to pool their single strengths and endowments to heighten the acquisition of all pupils in an instructionally more powerful environment. It allows pupils to interact with a assortment of pedagogues who bring different manners, personalities, and accomplishments to the acquisition environment. ( p. 247 )

School and territory leaders should remain up to day of the month with the current literature to maximise the potency of coaction and coteaching described by Hourcade and Bauwens ( 2001 ) .

A reappraisal of the coteaching literature offered four general countries that principals should turn to if they are to help effectual collaborative environments for both instructors and pupils:

- Supplying sustained professional development in the country of coteaching
- Developing a agenda for teacher co-planning and coaction
- Making coteaching squads where instructors portion trust and regard
- Keeping strong support and good visiblenss for instructors. ( Friend & A ; Cook, 2007 ; Hourcade & A ; Bauwens, 2001 ; Hourcade & A ; Bauwens, 2003 ; Mastropieri, et Al. 2005 ; Murawski & A ; Dieker, 2004 )

In some schools, instructors are assigned to a coteaching state of affairs merely before school

Begins in the autumn having really small preparation to fix for that

assignment. One of the most of import patterns for principals in order to <https://assignbuster.com/teaching-essays-coteaching-students-disabilities-essay/>

guarantee teacher success is to “ provide substantial information about this collaborative agreement and encourage instructors to proactively fix for this change... *before* they really start the instruction process” ( Murawski & A ; Dieker, 2004, p. 53 ) .

Scheduling clip for teacher coaction is besides listed legion times in the literature. Murawski and Dieker ( 2004 ) stress the importance of common planning clip for co-teachers to “ find ways to utilize their strengths to guarantee that the lesson is suitably differentiated for a heterogenous class” ( p. 55 ) . Although Friend and Cook ( 2007 ) advocator scheduling common planning clip for co-teachers during the regular school twenty-four hours, they besides recommend other options for consideration, including “ scheduling early release/late reaching yearss, utilizing replacement instructors, and using instructional schemes that facilitate planning” ( p. 166-167 ) .

The most effectual forecaster of success or failure in a coteaching/inclusion theoretical account may be the relationship between the co-teachers. In their instance surveies of four schools, Mastropieri et Al. ( 2005 ) concluded “ in healthy coteaching state of affairss, the relationship between the general and particular instruction instructors appeared to be built upon common trust and regard for one another’s expertness in each several field” ( p. 268 ) . Those writers besides reported that academic content cognition is non the specifying influence on successful coteaching. They did province, nevertheless, that “ the interaction between class content and instructor cognition did turn out to hold a significant influence on coteaching” ( p. 268 ) .

Leaderships of schools can help the relationship-building procedure by <https://assignbuster.com/teaching-essays-coteaching-students-disabilities-essay/>

letting chances for instructors to learn from each other. Hourcade and Bauwens ( 2003 ) recommend that concerted instructors should detect each other in non-coteaching scenes to “ gain insight into each other’s instructional and direction style” as a method for acknowledging “ ways to outdo intermix their manners as concerted instruction partners” ( p. 53 ) . Besides harmonizing to Hourcade and Bauwens ( 2003 ) , “ without significant administrative leading and support for systems transmutation, few significant alterations toward coaction can be expected to last or succeed” ( p. 15 ) . These writers express every bit good that “ the strongest look of support for alteration is the new allotment of resources” ( p. 92 ) . Friend and Cook ( 2007 ) added administrative support to include an influence on “ school and territory policy on affairs that facilitate coteaching efforts” ( p. 134 ) .

Co-teachers should be offered the chance to self-evaluate their plans every bit good as their ain public presentation therein. Until merely a few old ages ago, this country had non been addressed. Noonan, McCormick, and Heck ( 2003 ) developed and validated a co-teacher relationship tool utilizing a little sample of early childhood pedagogues in Hawaii. The *Co-Teacher Relationship Scale* ( Noonan, et al. , 2003 ) focuses on the attitude, beliefs, and personal features of co-teachers and may be helpful in fitting possible co-teaching squad members. When reexamining consequences utilizing this graduated table with 20 instructors, the lone demographic variable giving a statistically important consequence on the compatibility graduated table was old ages of experience ( Cramer & A ; Nevin, 2006 ) . Evaluations of assurance as an pedagogue were higher for instructors who reported more



old ages of experience. In contrast, the *Are We Truly Co-Teachers Scale* developed by R. Villa in 2004 emphasizes the instruction interactions and schoolroom behaviours of co-teachers ( Cramer & A ; Nevin, 2006 ) . This graduated table may go a utile tool for decision makers and other forces in developing and planing effectual professional development activities to guarantee that co-teachers have the accomplishments to implement research-proven effectual instruction patterns ( Cramer & A ; Nevin, 2006 ) .

Harmonizing to Keefe, Moore, and Duff ( 2004 ) , collaborative instruction requires cognition of oneself, one’s instruction spouse, one’s pupils, and one’s trade. Principals need to be prepared to steer instructors in geting these four types of cognition. Whether it is doing clip for personal conversations with each instructor, or supplying professional development stuffs, principals need to be prepared to assist the professionals at their schools. Teaching can be frustrating and lonely, and all instructors need the advice of other experient professionals in order to get the better of the day-to-day challenges they face ( Keefe et al. , 2004 ) .

## Summary of Literature Review

### Mentions

Bauwens, J. , Hourcade, J. J. , & A ; Friend, M. ( 1989 ) . Concerted instruction:

A theoretical account for

general and particular instruction integrating. *Remedial and particular instruction*, 10 ( 2 ) , 17-22.

Cook, L. & A ; Friend, M. ( 1995 ) . Co-teaching: Guidelines for making effectual patterns.

*Focus on exceeding kids*, 28 ( 3 ) , 1-16.

Cramer, E. & A ; Nevin, A. ( 2006 ) . A assorted methodological analysis analysis of co-teacher

appraisals. *Teacher instruction and particular instruction*, 29 ( 4 ) , 261-274.

Dieker, L. A. & A ; Murawski, W. W. ( 2003 ) . Co-teaching at the secondary degree: Unique

issues, current tendencies, and suggestions for success. *The high school diary*, 86 ( 4 ) , 1-13.

Friend, M. & A ; Cook, L. ( 2007 ) . *Interactions: Collaboration accomplishments for school professionals*.

Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Gately, S. E. & A ; Gately, F. J. ( 2001 ) . Understanding coteaching constituents. *Teaching*

*exceeding kids*, 33 ( 4 ) , 40-47.

Hourcade, J. J. & A ; Bauwens, J. ( 2001 ) . Concerted instruction: the reclamation of instructors. *The*

*Clearing House*, 74 ( 5 ) , 242-247.

Hourcade, J. J. & A ; Bauwens, J. ( 2003 ) . *Concerted instruction: Rebuilding and sharing the*

*schoolhouse*. Austin, TX: PROED.

Keefe, E. B. , Moore, V. , & A ; Duff, F. ( 2004 ) . The four “ knows” of collaborative instruction.

*Teaching exceeding kids*, 36 ( 5 ) , 36-42.

Mastropieri, M. A. , Scruggs, T. E. , Graetz, J. , Norland, J. , Gardizi, W. , & A ; McDuffie, K.

( 2005 ) . Case surveies in co-teaching in the content countries: Success, failures, and challenges. *Intervention in school and clinic*, 40 ( 5 ) , 260-270.

Morocco, C. C. & A ; Aguilar, C. M. ( 2002 ) . Coteaching for content apprehension: A

schoolwide theoretical account. *Journal of instruction and psychological audience*, 13 ( 4 ) , 315-347.

Murawski, W. W. & A ; Dieker, L. ( 2004 ) . Tips and schemes for co-teaching at the

secondary degree. *Teaching exceeding kids*, 36 ( 5 ) , 52-58.

Murawski, W. W. & A ; Swanson, H. L. ( 2001 ) . A meta-analysis of co-teaching research:

Where are the informations? *Remedial and particular instruction*, 22 ( 5 ) , 258-267.

Noonan, M. , McCormick, L. , & A ; Heck, R. ( 2003 ) . The co-teacher relationship graduated table:

Applications for professional development. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 38, 113-120.

Rea, P. J. , McLaughlin, V. L. , & A ; Walther-Thomas, C. ( 2002 ) . Outcomes for pupils with

learning disablements in inclusive and pull-out plans. *Exceeding kids*, 68 ( 2 ) , 203-222.

Rose, L. C. & A ; Gallup, A. M. ( 2006 ) . The 38<sup>Thursday</sup> one-year phi delta kappa/gallup canvass of the

public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi delta kappan*, September, 41-53.

United States Department of Education: National Commission on Excellence in

Education. *State at Hazard: The jussive mood for educational reform*.

Retrieved on June 4, 2008 from [www. ed. gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk. html](http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html).

United States Department of Education: The Office of Special Education and

Rehabilitative Services ( OSERS ) . *History: Twenty-five old ages of advancement in educating kids with disablements through IDEA*. Retrieved on June 4, 2008 from [www. ed. gov/policy/speced/leg/idea/history. pdf](http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/leg/idea/history.pdf).

United States Department of Education: The Office of Special Education and

Rehabilitative Services ( OSERS ) . *History of the IDEA: Thirty old ages of educating kids with disablements through IDEA*. Retrieved on June 4, 2008 from [www. ed. gov/print/policy/speced/leg/idea/history30. html](http://www.ed.gov/print/policy/speced/leg/idea/history30.html).

Zigmond, N. ( 2003 ) . Where should pupils with disablements receive particular instruction

services? . *The diary of particular instruction*, 37 ( 3 ) 193-199.

Zigmond, N. , & A ; Margiera, K. ( 2001 ) . Current pattern qui vives: A focal point on co-teaching:

Use with cautiousness. *Alerts*, 36, 58-68.