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Objectives

- Provide context & need for ICP
- Describe findings from the first US demonstration study
- Describe training materials for users
- Consider possible uses of ICP in your community
Why is it Important to Assess the Quality of Inclusion?
CONTEXT: Emphasis on Quality & Accountability
Quality Movement = Multiple Quality Initiatives

OSEP Monitoring and Accountability

Head Start Performance Framework

licensing

ELG

program standards

personnel standards

QRIS
How Do States Address Inclusion within QRIS?

- Several states with statewide QRIS have included standards for the care of children with special needs but there is no guidance nor standard approach (NPDCI, 2008; NCCIC, 2010)

- QRIS standards related to inclusion vary across states by category, QRIS level, type of program, and documentation and monitoring

- A report on how the 35 state applications for RTT-ELC addressed QRIS indicated that children with special needs were overlooked (Stoney, L., 2012)
Grassroots Perspectives on QRIS & Inclusion

Survey of child care directors (n=48) in 8 states about benefits and challenges of participating in QRIS indicated concern about this issue

(Schulman, Matthews, Blank, & Ewen, 2012)
Childcare directors discussed “the importance not only of standards appropriate for children with special needs, but also of assessors with knowledge in special education who could recognize appropriate practices for children with special needs”

Example: for children with autism, room set-up to reduce distractions is not in accordance with requirements for specific number of materials of certain types in the classroom.

(Schulman, Matthews, Blank, & Ewen, 2012, p.27)
Young children with disabilities can experience low quality in classes that are otherwise rated as being of high quality.

Wolery, et al., 2000
What are Research-Based Inclusion Practices?
Research Synthesis Points on Quality Inclusive Practices

In April, 2009, two national organizations working on behalf of young children—the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the National Association for Early Childhood Intervention (NAECI)—completed two years of work and collaboration with the release of a joint position statement on inclusive education. This document provides an overview of the evidence-based and promising practices that support early childhood inclusion. These practices are organized into three major sections corresponding to the defining features of high-quality early childhood inclusion as described in the joint position statement:

Access—removing physical barriers, providing a wide range of activities and environments, and making necessary adaptations to create optimal development and learning for individual children.

Participation—using a range of instructional and intervention approaches to promote engagement in play and learning activities, and a sense of belonging for every child.

Supports—creating an infrastructure of systems-level supports for implementing high-quality inclusion.

Citations for each practice include best available research in the form of research reviews or syntheses of research. When a summary of the research does not exist, the most recent and relevant synthesis or individual studies evaluating specific practices, or both, should be included. This document does not include an exhaustive list of existing research studies on every practice, nor do all practices have a supporting body of rigorous research evidence. This document may be used in a variety of contexts, including professional development, policy development, planning, and evaluation.
How Do We know If We Are Practicing High Quality Inclusion?
Moving Beyond Global Quality: The Inclusive Classroom Profile (ICP)

- Designed to complement existing classroom quality measures & standards
- Focus on classroom-level, evidence-based inclusive practices that support the individual needs of children with disabilities
The Inclusive Classroom Profile (ICP)

- Structured Observation
- 1-7 point Rating Scale
- 12 Inclusive Practices

National Professional Development Center on Inclusion
ICP Items

1. Adaptation of space and materials
2. Adult involvement in peer interactions
3. Adult guidance of children’s play
4. Conflict resolution
5. Membership
6. Relationships between adults and children
7. Support for social communication
8. Adaptation of group activities
9. Transitions between activities
10. Feedback
11. Family-professional partnerships
12. Monitoring children’s learning
Item 3: Adult Guidance of Children’s Play
(Indicator 5.4)
### Rating Scale

#### 1. Adaptations of space and materials/equipment (O)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Most classroom areas are not accessible (e.g., stairs, various ground levels, toys covering large floor space preclude access) and children are not helped to access classroom’s areas. (O)</td>
<td>3.1 Some classroom areas are accessible by children and, when needed, adults usually help children access the classroom space (e.g., a ramp is available for child with physical disability; walker provided etc.). (O)</td>
<td>5.1 Most classroom areas can be independently accessed by children (e.g., children move around most areas independently; classroom areas are well defined; activity centers are labelled with pictures, words or signs depending on children’s individual needs). (O) NA Permitted</td>
<td>7.1 Adults intentionally organize the physical space and materials throughout the day to accommodate individual needs and/or to encourage peer interaction (e.g., adult repositions child on wheelchair so that she can face her peers; adult moves art materials placed on activity table closer to child to promote independent work; adult clears floor space from too many toys to support easy access for a particular child). (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Materials/equipment are not accessible by children (e.g., most materials placed in areas that children cannot reach; equipment/materials not adapted to enable access) and children are not helped to access them. (O)</td>
<td>3.2 Some materials/equipment are accessible by children and, when needed, adults usually help children access the materials they need to use (e.g., adult helps child reach a toy from shelf; adult places adaptive scissors on table close to where child is working). (O)</td>
<td>5.2 Adults monitor how children use materials/equipment and help children who have difficulty using materials purposefully (e.g., adult helps child use scissors to cut on paper; adult offers hand-over-hand assistance to child doing a puzzle; adult models for child how to hold pencil; adult guides child how to use glue for an art project). (O)</td>
<td>7.2 Children have access to a variety of toys, materials and equipment carefully selected to accommodate individual needs and to promote independent use. Throughout the day, adults encourage children to use many different materials in purposeful and creative ways. (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 There are at least a few materials/equipment that children use independently. (O) NA Permitted</td>
<td>5.3 In most classroom areas, there are many materials/equipment that children use independently. (O) NA Permitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Professional Development Center on Inclusion
Who Is Being Observed?

- Children with identified disabilities in the context of classroom activities and social interactions with adults and peers
- Teachers, teacher assistants, specialists
Administration

- Observation
- Teacher interview
- Document review

National Professional Development Center on Inclusion
How Can the ICP Be Used?

- As a research tool.
- As a program evaluation tool.
- As a self-assessment tool.
- As a professional development tool.
Pilot Studies on the ICP

- 1st pilot study in the UK showed promising results on reliability & validity (Soukakou, 2012)
- 2nd pilot study in the US in collaboration with:

National Professional Development Center on Inclusion

NC Department of Instruction, Exceptional Children

North Carolina Rated License Assessment Project

Division of Child Development and Early Education
ICP Pilot Study (US): Research Questions

- Did assessors learn to use the ICP with accuracy?
- What is the evidence for reliability and validity?
- Did assessors find the ICP useful and acceptable for program evaluation?
Sample: classrooms

- 51 inclusive classrooms in one state
- Public Pre-K (5), Head Start (13), Developmental Day programs (13), Other child care centers (20)
- 150 children with disabilities
- Mean age of children = 4.43 years
Sample: children

- Mean number of children w/ a disability per class = 2.94 (range =1-8).

- Most prevalent area of need: intentional communication (90%).

- 88% of classrooms had at least one child with a moderate or severe level of disability in at least one area.
Procedures

- 51 ICP assessments
- 50 ECERS-R assessments
- Assessor survey for gathering data on ICP acceptability
# Results: Inter-Rater Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICP 1 Adaptation of Space, Materials and Equipment</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 2 Adult Involvement in Peer Interactions</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 3 Adult Guidance of Children’s Play</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 4 Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 5 Membership</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 6 Relationships between Adults and Children</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 7 Support for Communication</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 8 Adaptations of Group Activities</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 9 Transitions between Activities</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 10 Feedback</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 11 Family-Professional Partnerships</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP 12 Monitoring Children’s Learning</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results: Rank-Order Correlations Between ICP and ECERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECERS-R Scale</th>
<th>ICP Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space and Furnishings</td>
<td>0.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Reasoning</td>
<td>0.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Structure</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and Staff</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECERS Total Score</td>
<td>0.48***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Results: Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean(SE)/B(SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>3.67 (0.15)(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Day</td>
<td>5.12 (0.19)(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>4.64 (0.19)(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pre-K</td>
<td>4.76 (0.30)(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means not sharing superscripts are significantly different.
Results: Social Validity

On a 1-5 point scale, assessors:

- Rated the importance of the ICP constructs measured very highly (m= 5)
- Would highly recommend the ICP measure to others (m=5)
- Found the measure easy to administer (m= 4)
- Felt well prepared after the reliability training observations (m=4)
Summary of Findings

- Assessor established adequate administration and reliability proficiency upon training.
- Evidence for construct validity.
- Differences in quality across types of programs.
- Assessors found the ICP easy to use and useful for program evaluation.
Implications

- ICP possibilities: research, program evaluation, and professional development.

- Some next steps related to emerging interests
  - Professional development curriculum for PD providers/consultants
Online Overview Training Modules
Module 1: Introduction to the ICP

- The purpose of the ICP
- Structure
- Administration
- 12 practices that are assessed by the ICP

National Professional Development Center on Inclusion
Module 2: Administration

- How to prepare for the visit
- How to conduct the observation, interview, and document review
- How to conclude the visit
Under Construction...

- Reliability Training Options:
  - Face-to-Face Overview
  - Webinar Overview
  - Guided Observations and Debriefings
What are your Interests in the ICP? How might the ICP be used in your community?
To find the resources talked about today go to:

http://npdci.fpg.unc.edu/

Thank you!
Register Now!!

2013 National Early Childhood Inclusion Institute
May 13–15

Chapel Hill, NC
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Sample: children

- Mean number of children with a disability per class = 2.94 (range = 1-8).

- Children had special needs in the following areas: intentional communication (90%); behavior/social (67%); fine motor coordination (45%); gross motor (27%); and sensory integration (27%).

- 59% of the classrooms had at least one child with a disability at the “severe” level (4 on a scale of 1-4), while 88% of classrooms had at least one child with a moderate or severe level of disability in at least one area.