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Survey Overview

Description
A description of the survey should go here.

Instructions Provided To Respondents
Please complete the following survey by answering the questions pertaining to the 2008-2009 school year.

Respondent Metrics
Respondents: 183

First Response: 10/13/2008 06:11 PM
Last Response: 10/28/2008 09:21 PM
Survey Results
The following is a graphical depiction of the responses to each survey question. Additional comments provided by respondents, if any, are included after each graph.

Section - Background Information

1. What is your gender?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.08% (174)</td>
<td>4.92% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Choice: 1.05
2. What is your age?

Average Choice: 5.16
3. Which state are you currently employed in?

Average Choice: 2.97

- Minnesota: 26.23% (48)
- Oklahoma: 12.02% (22)
- Virginia: 20.22% (37)
- Massachusetts: 21.31% (39)
- Wyoming: 20.22% (37)
### 4. How many years of experience do you have as a school-based SLP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>12.57%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>19.13%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more years</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Choice: 3.26
5. Do you hold the ASHA Certificate of Clinical Competence in Speech-Language Pathology?

Average Choice: 1.02
6. What grade levels do you work with?

Average Choice: 2.76
7. How many children are currently on your caseload?

- 0-20: 13.11% (24)
- 21-40: 31.69% (58)
- 41-60: 44.81% (82)
- 61-80: 8.74% (16)
- 81-100: 1.09% (2)
- 100+: 0.55% (1)

Average Choice: 2.55
8. Approximately how many of these children require intervention for language skills?

Average Choice: 3.12
9. What training have you received about classroom-based interventions?

Average Choice: 2.30

- college courses
- in-service meetings/workshops
- continuing education
- none
- other
10. Approximately how many hours of training have you received that focuses on classroom-based interventions?

Average Choice: 1.97
11. Do you provide language intervention services within the regular education classroom?

- Yes (63.93% (117))
- No (36.07% (66))

Average Choice: 1.36
12. I believe that the planning time between the classroom teacher and me is adequate.

Average Choice: 2.97
13. I believe that the classroom teachers are willing to be involved with me in co-teaching models.

Average Choice: 2.08

Strongly Agree: 13.68% (16)
Agree: 67.52% (79)
Disagree: 16.24% (19)
Strongly Disagree: 2.56% (3)
14. *I am able to meet IEP goals while providing language intervention in the classroom.*

Average Choice: 2.07
15. I would be better able to meet IEP goals in the classroom if more consultation and planning time were available.

Average Choice: 1.76
16. I believe that generalization of communication targets is enhanced when intervention is provided in the classroom.

Average Choice: 1.62
17. I am able to provide appropriate reinforcement of target responses while in the classroom.

Average Choice: 2.03
18. I believe children receiving language intervention are singled-out in the classroom.

Average Choice: 3.04
19. I believe the attention of non-targeted children is easily maintained during co-teaching sessions.

Average Choice: 2.03
20. Approximately how many of the language impaired children on your caseload receive language intervention services from you within the regular classroom?

Average Choice: 2.62
21. Within how many classrooms do you provide language intervention services?

Average Choice: 3.30
22. With which grade levels do you provide language intervention in the classroom?

Average Choice: 2.74
Section - Co-Teaching

Instructions Provided To Respondents
Please read the following definitions of co-teaching models and answer the questions below.
Definitions provided by Elksnin & Capilouto, 1994:

One teach, one observe --- Either the speech-language pathologist (SLP) or classroom teacher (CT) observes, while the other assumes primary instructional responsibility.

One teach, one drift --- The SLP or CT assumes primary instructional responsibility while the other assists students with their work, monitors behavior, corrects assignments, and the like.

Station teaching --- The SLP and CT divide instructional content into two parts (ex. vocabulary and content, new concepts and review). Groups are switched so that all students receive instruction from each teacher.

Parallel teaching --- The SLP and CT each instruct half the group, each addressing the same instructional objectives.

Remedial teaching --- The SLP or CT instructs students who have mastered the material to be learned while the other re-teaches those students who have not mastered the material.

Supplemental teaching --- The SLP or CT presents the lesson using a standard format. The other adapts the lesson for those students who cannot master the material.

Team teaching --- Both the SLP and CT present the lesson to all students. This may include shared lecturing or having one teacher begin the lesson while the other takes over when appropriate.

Other
23. Which of the following models have you used in the classroom?

Average Choice: 3.79
24. Which model do you use most frequently?

- One teach, one observe: 17.26% (34)
- One teach, one drift: 12.69% (25)
- Station teaching: 11.17% (22)
- Parallel teaching: 10.15% (20)
- Remedial teaching: 8.63% (17)
- Supplemental teaching: 7.61% (15)
- Team teaching: 5.17% (10)
- Other: 2.03% (4)

Average Choice: 3.89
25. Which model do you prefer to use in the classroom?

Average Choice: 4.47
26. Which model do you feel is the easiest to use in the classroom?

Average Choice: 3.61

- One teach, one observe: 13.30% (29)
- One teach, one drift: 27.98% (61)
- Station teaching: 11.01% (24)
- Parallel teaching: 17.43% (38)
- Remedial teaching: 8.72% (19)
- Supplemental teaching: 6.88% (15)
- Team teaching: 13.30% (29)
- Other: 1.38% (3)
27. Which model do you feel is the most difficult to use in the classroom?

Average Choice: 5.12
28. Do you feel the length of this survey was reasonable?

Average Choice: 1.01

- Yes: 99.15% (116)
- No: 0.85% (1)
Instructions Provided To Respondents
Please select one answer for each question.

29. I would provide language intervention in the classroom if more time was available to consult and plan with the classroom teacher.

Average Choice: 1.88
30. I feel that teachers are willing to be involved with me in co-teaching models.

Average Choice: 2.33
31. I believe that generalization of communication targets is enhanced when intervention is provided in the classroom.

Average Choice: 1.74

- Strongly Agree: 31.82% (21)
- Agree: 62.12% (41)
- Disagree: 6.06% (4)

60.12% (41)
32. I do not provide language intervention in the classroom because it is difficult to keep track of IEP goals.

Average Choice: 2.80
33. I do not provide language intervention in the classroom because of uncooperative teachers.

Average Choice: 2.89
34. I do not provide language intervention in the classroom due to inadequate time to prepare.

Average Choice: 2.15
35. I do not provide language intervention in the classroom due to lack of time to plan with the classroom teacher.

Average Choice: 1.92
36. I do not provide language intervention in the classroom because the classroom teacher's territory is invaded.

Average Choice: 2.85
37. *I do not provide language intervention in the classroom because nontarget students may become bored.*

Average Choice: 3.17
38. I do not provide language intervention in the classroom because children receiving language intervention are singled-out.

Average Choice: 2.98
39. I do not provide language intervention in the classroom because I am not able to provide appropriate reinforcement of target responses.

Average Choice: 2.86
40. Other comments?

At middle school and high school level, co-teaching is dependent on scheduling which is difficult to control in our district. The people who do the scheduling do not take these factors into consideration. (0000000036 Anonymous)

At my current school, teachers are very focused on their lesson plans and meeting Virginia Standards that my time would delay their pacing with the curriculum. For the students with Autism or Cognitive Impairments, I do provide therapy in the classroom setting. (0000000100 Anonymous)

At the middle and high school level, this is a difficult model to apply due to rotating schedules, etc. (0000000067 Anonymous)

Classroom intervention is always a work in progress. Each time I go to a new school, it takes time to gain the trust and respect of the teachers, so that they will be willing to "let me in". (0000000141 Anonymous)

Collaborating in the classroom at the high school level is difficult due to planning and the teacher's responsibility to cover all of their material. It is easier to pull students out and work with them on their target goals. (0000000061 Anonymous)

Common planning time is crucial for success. (0000000135 Anonymous)

Even though I don't work in the classroom, at times I work with students on classroom projects that the teacher has asked me to help with that target the student's goals/objectives. (0000000163 Anonymous)

I am a part time contract provider and it's mostly due to lack of time that I provided services in the classroom (0000000018 Anonymous)
I am an slp in a school for Autism so all of our classrooms are special education classrooms. All teachers are open to my being in the classroom since we are a communication-based program. This is not typical for schools. (0000000042 Anonymous)

I am in private practice, and beyond providing intervention, I do not manage the IEP and am usually involved at the consultation level with school providers/ (0000000107 Anonymous)

I currently teach speech classes for kids age 3-5. These classes are only for students in IEPs. (0000000124 Anonymous)

I did provide language interventions in the classroom for mentally disabled children for many years with other SLPs as the co-teacher and sometimes with the Social Worker. However, this year I am in three buildings and that and the number of my caseload does not allow me to go into the classroom. (0000000178 Anonymous)

I do not go into the regular classroom at this time but do provide extensive service delivery within a variety of the special education classrooms (LD resource, mild-moderate, autism) (0000000149 Anonymous)

I do some classroom inclusion with autistic kids, but do not co-teach with the regular ed teacher. I help her solve problems with special needs children and target some of her goals when I do direct services. My primary reason for not doing classroom intervention is the diversity or my caseload and having time to take away from direct services. I consult with classroom teachers a great deal. (0000000138 Anonymous)

I found it difficult to honestly answer these questions since I work in a preschool handicapped classroom... Many of the questions didn't really apply to our situation. (0000000118 Anonymous)

I have team taught in a curriculum modified survey biology class of 20 students for eight years. This class includes students with IEP’s, ELL, and low ability reg. ed. students. This class with labs, vocabulary, analogies, higher level thinking skills and writing skills is an excellent class for an SLP to team teach. I also pull out students to read the tests to and to further modify or explain test questions as needed. In
addition, I teach my own Language Lab class for 66 minutes each day. I have nine students in this class. (000000022 Anonymous)

I have teamed in the past with kindergarten teachers, LD teachers and teachers of moderate/severe impaired students. At this time it is felt that their language needs can best be met with one on one services. This is often due to time constraints within my schedule. (000000087 Anonymous)

I implement language services in a high needs classroom with highschool students with developmental delay. (000000155 Anonymous)

I just attended the Minnesota Speech and Hearing Association's Fall Conference, and I learned (and have gotten really excited about) some of the things I learned about in-classroom service delivery models including collaborative teaching and the 3:1 service delivery model which includes in-classroom time once per month or so. (000000137 Anonymous)

I often employ a variety of service delivery models with my students. As the year goes on and the caseload soars, less flexibility is available and I sometimes have to go to pulling more children whether I like it or not. (000000066 Anonymous)

I often find that I need to spend more time working on language concepts via drawing, discussion, visuals, etc. to secure comprehension when working with students in class, so we always seem to be behind the rest of the class (if working in groups). I feel like I could spend all day helping the kids understand the language enough to express themselves, written and orally. (000000181 Anonymous)

I primarily provide home based services, with a hand full of 2-6th grade day-treatment children as they rotate through our program. (000000054 Anonymous)

I provide indirect language support with students that are moving on to a consultation only basis to the teachers. This way, the teacher has some knowledge of how to support and/or enhance the target child's language within his/her classroom. (000000109 Anonymous)
I provide services in the classroom everyday but they are in the center based special education classrooms and in a DCD classroom. I do not go into the classroom to provide support for my higher functioning students at the high school level because they do not want me to. (Anonymous)

I provides classroom intervention for "self contained" special ed. classrooms and have for years I do not go into the regular classroom because of not having very many students in one class who are on IEPs (Anonymous)

I think more time should be spent in graduate programs on this topic. None of my classes discussed in-class intervention; while interviewing for jobs, many principals/SpEd directors asked many questions about my ideas on working in classrooms. I felt unprepared as I started my 1st year and many teachers were looking for classroom support. It was something I had to learn "on the go." (Anonymous)

I think that there could be "language specialists" like there are reading and math specialists, but a general SLP in the schools is pulled so many ways as it is, I think we are asking for more overextension. This could be a "specialty" area. (Anonymous)

I tried language inclusion services within a 3rd grade room and pulled all 3rd grade students receiving language into that room. While I saw the benefits of inclusion (i.e., students in with their peers), I did not feel that IEPd students got enough response opportunities. Also, I found I had to preteach to my IEP students so that when I called on them in the classroom, they would have the answers. (Anonymous)

I utilize curriculum materials from the classroom in all my daily therapy sessions (Anonymous)

I work in a preschool setting in which not all services are provided in the classroom. Depending on the child I prefer lessons in the classroom following pre-teaching in my office. The point of educational services is that the child can access the curriculum in the class room. If you are not working in the classroom setting you are not targeting your goals. (Anonymous)
I work in a residential school for behavior/emotionally disordered children. It is difficult for me to work within the classroom setting due to behavior problems, but I am hoping to try to interact more with the teachers. However, my caseload usually includes children with severe language impairments and small group therapy seems to work best. (0000000119 Anonymous)

In our Early Childhood setting, scheduling is the biggest barrier to providing services within the regular education setting, due to limited classtime that preschool children have. Not having access to students 5 days a week can be a challenge. Many of our students attend preschools that are off site or scattered throughout the community. I provide intervention to children in an ECSE classroom, and have a great collegial relationship with the ECSE teacher. (0000000157 Anonymous)

In pre-school and Kindergarten there is much more and better opportunity to directly work with the student's needs in a more naturalistic setting. As the students move into more academic work it is much harder to provide meaningful therapy without mutual planning time. CT'S are not sure how we can help and use us as assistant's and not as co-teachers or SLP's. This is an old complaint but things don't seem to improve, especially if you work in different schools each year. (0000000032 Anonymous)

In the past, I have provided some direct services in the regular education classroom. I feel this is a very appropriate setting, and provides good language intervention for all students. I feel I was very capable of keeping track of targeted student's responses. At the present time, I am in a telepractice, so do not provide therapy in the classroom. (0000000020 Anonymous)

It is an all around difficult situation no matter what type of teaching one uses. (0000000026 Anonymous)

It is not that I truly "disagree" with some of the statements I checked that box for, but those elements to figure into the whole equation. Many of the classroom teachers I work with probably would feel that I'm invading their territories. (0000000122 Anonymous)

It's harder in the upper grades because there is so much focus on covering the content. The teachers are stressed because they have so much material to teach in the year. (0000000049 Anonymous)
Most of the trouble with classroom intervention is just a lack of time on my part - unfortunately it is just easier to pull-out. (0000000092 Anonymous)

My language children are mostly in a self contained classroom. If I am serving a child in K-3 (most of my caseload is within this age group), I have difficulty going into the classroom due to our reading program (Reading first) which calls for 90 minutes of uninterrupted direct intervention daily. Since we are only in school for 6 hours, this is a large portion of the day. I therefore pull these children and do not do classroom based intervention due to time constraints. (0000000130 Anonymous)

My state was not listed. I live in Wyoming. I think this is a very interesting topic and I find co-teaching and providing therapy in the classroom is very difficult. I feel like I am not addressing their IEP needs and gathering enough information to monitor progress. Certainly the planning time and collaboration factor into that. Please be aware that I am also working 17.5 hours a week and am considered 1/2 time employee, thus my caseload is lower than average of our SLPs. (0000000011 Anonymous)

My students all carry diagnoses on the Autism Spectrum and spend at least part of each day in substantially separate classrooms. All are working well below grade level and require adapted curricula, which influences my desire for more planning time with the teachers. (0000000128 Anonymous)

My teachers and I use all of the models, and it really depends on the subject, the needs of the student, and the personality of the teacher. (0000000202 Anonymous)

none (0000000058 Anonymous)

Not enough time in my day to provide a needed chunk of time in the classroom setting. All kids gets about 20 minutes a session, I am only able to enter classrooms for 2 groups of kids, 2 grade levels. (0000000039 Anonymous)

One of the biggest reasons that I do not provide language intervention in the classroom is because I have to group kids from several classrooms, grade levels, needs together. I would be nearly impossible to take all of these students with varying needs, from different grade levels and different classrooms into one teacher's room and get the # of target trials that I need in a 20 minute period. (0000000047 Anonymous)
Planning time is the biggest barrier to effective treatment in the classroom. (0000000115 Anonymous)

Providing classroom interventions is harder with today's curriculum. The teachers have blocks of time that are sacred for reading and math and have to fit everything else in between. We have to fight to get into the rooms at the elementary level. (0000000171 Anonymous)

Reminder that needs of language students are different and decisions made for service delivery are made on the basis of individual need. (0000000191 Anonymous)

Results of my survey may be a bit skewed as I work only part time and primarily b-3 within homes. I just see a couple of 3 year olds in a community preschool. (0000000177 Anonymous)

Some classroom teachers feel their space is invaded. Several of your questions elude to the barriers of providing lang. interventions in the classroom. When application of skills in the classroom environment are appropriate then I will try to get into that classroom to observe. But I prefer a combination of pull-out/direct instruction and then observe and reinforce the application of skills but getting into the classroom. (0000000126 Anonymous)

Some teachers are open to working with the therapist and others would feel like you were invading their territory. Some would work cooperatively and and others would want to leave while you teach the class rather than work cooperatively. (0000000059 Anonymous)

Some teachers have been very vocal about not wanting me in the classroom at all - they see any inclusion services as "undermining their authority as a teacher" and "unfair" when I rephrase and clarify instruction for my language impaired students. (0000000133 Anonymous)

supplemental teaching has definite value but time constraints are prohibitive for planning, material prep and further teacher consultation which, while I enjoy this design, it can be difficult due to prohibitions discussed. (0000000065 Anonymous)
Teaching curriculum based IEP objectives is a real challenge with the high numbers on our caseloads. If the numbers were smaller then this would be an easier, more directed task. As of now, I am able to team teach or do an inservice to only a few classrooms and usually it is for the LD students and maybe the kindergarten or Pre K levels. (0000000010 Anonymous)

Teaching styles and training definitely influence how receptive classroom teachers are to "sharing" the teaching responsibility with an SLP (or a special ed teacher). When it works, it works well. (0000000134 Anonymous)

Thank you. I like your list of various styles of teaming. It defines each well. I feel like I could use the list when approaching a CT to present options for teaming and consult. (0000000150 Anonymous)

The challenges of the secondary setting need to be addressed! (0000000062 Anonymous)

The elementary school I work in is a Reading First building which requires an hour and a half uninterrupted block of reading everyday, plus another 30 minute minimum of small group time. The Reading First program is scripted and students cannot be removed for any reason. The math program utilized in my building is also scripted and a one hour uninterrupted math block is required. After scheduling around reading and math I must also take into account PE, Art, and Music times. This leaves minimal time for collaboration with the teacher and/or classroom time for co-teaching. (0000000076 Anonymous)

The idea of classroom based intervention is a good one theoretically and is more easily applied in the preschool setting. However I have found classroom based intervention to be difficult to apply as children get older due to curriculum demands, time, peer pressure and classroom teacher support. Many educators at my previous grade 3 to 6 school were are under extreme pressure from a community and administration that had unrealistic performance expectations for both teachers and students. This climate created an environment where teachers reacted by becoming very controlling of there classrooms as well as making multiple referrals for parent meetings and testing of typically developing children who were considered to be "under performing." This situation took much time away from treatment time for the special education staff (meetings typical lasted at least 2 hours) In addition although consult time is in most IEPs and the educators were very receptive to my input, it was difficult to arrange consult times that were not impacted by other activities. Next as the curriculum demands increase it is difficult for a SLP with an entire school to learn the curriculum of all the subjects necessary. Because of scheduling limitations an SLP could be in social studies, science or language arts. It is
impossible to stay current with all this information to do a team teaching model. Also because the SLP is typically working throughout one or more schools, she is not a constant presence in the classroom and does become viewed by older students (grades 5 and up) as "sped." Therefore many students view that any contact with you gives them the special education label. I know the typical response from academics in this case is that the SLP should engage in the entire school community and focus on all students not just special education. I have done this (which takes a tremendous amount of extra time and energy), it still does not work. (0000000108 Anonymous)

The most difficult part of delivering services in the classroom is scheduling and co-planning time. (0000000044 Anonymous)

The pre-K classrooms that I work in are Head Starts classrooms and vary greatly in the structure that each teacher provides. (0000000106 Anonymous)

The success of collaborative intervention depends on many things, including a buy-in of the regular ed. teacher and an understanding (on the part of the teacher) of deficits present in the students who are on IEPs. A similar philosophy of teaching method is also advantageous. (0000000090 Anonymous)

Typically, the preschool teachers in my school have asked me to come in and do "whole group" lessons for one of my sessions with the children. Usually, when I'm doing my lesson, the teacher is in the room, but not part of my activity. Often, they use this time as planning time or time to do paperwork. *Also, I should note that my caseload is large right now because I am helping to cover for another SLP who is out on medical leave. I typically only service PreK and my max. caseload is usually around 50. (0000000019 Anonymous)

Unfortunately, my SLP position was RIF'ed...reduced in force... for the 08-09 year...and probably there-in unless the district I work for wants to get involved in a law suit. They kept 2 non-ASHA certified SLPs and one ASHA certified SLP. Other than one non-ASHA, I had seniority. The problem: kept calling attention to high case load numbers, SPENDING ENDLESS HOURS with paperwork instead of students, and the fact that my salary was one of the highest. I'm now teaching English (9th G. Language Arts) at the district high school...I do not believe (actually KNOW) that the Superintendent was not pleased that I was certified in English. I have 5 years to go until I qualify for full retirement. They are now hiring all new SLPs on a non-contract, "at-will" basis. The services I used to provide are now "provided" by a para-professional who doesn't even have a BS in Speech Path. The supervisor sees the para once a week. (0000000219 Anonymous)
We don’t do co-taught classes in our school district at the high school level, for many different reasons. I see all of my students in the pull-out setting. (0000000151 Anonymous)

Yeah for online surveys!!!! (0000000213 Anonymous)
41. Please list what you feel are the advantages of providing language intervention within the classroom.

- addressing skills in natural setting, second set of eyes/ears/thoughts on the assignment, addressing the skills of those who do not qualify for services but who still may exhibit relative weaknesses, **reconnection with what is "average" (0000000067 Anonymous)

"Real life" experiences with language, group interaction - especially important for social skills training at any level. (0000000149 Anonymous)

1) kids generalize skills more rapidly; 2) kids have higher self esteem; 3) the co teacher learns about language as it interacts within their particular classroom and has usually grown to enjoy the collaborative teaching model (0000000219 Anonymous)

1) Student's aren't missing general ed. instructional time, as they might during pull-out (0000000075 Anonymous)

advantage of peer models, naturalistic contexts, generalization of language skills into a larger environment (0000000157 Anonymous)

All children can benefit from language intervention to some degree so classroom teaching is a great tool to reach a large number of students and to model the teaching and what you want the teacher to do withing the course of the classroom day. (0000000131 Anonymous)

All kids can benefit from language enrichment, and it provides variety in the classroom. (0000000138 Anonymous)

All of my students have difficulty with social interactions. If I were to try to work with them solely in the separate classroom or in my office, their opportunities to interact with independently responsive peers would be severely limited. Being in the classroom also gives me time around typically developing children, which gives me a better frame of reference for how children really act and interact (so that I
can help my students use age-appropriate social language). It is very easy to develop unreasonably high or low expectations when I spend my entire day in a separate classroom. (0000000128 Anonymous)

All students benefit from having the SLP in the classroom. The classroom teacher benefits from the expertise of the SLP and the language instruction. (0000000073 Anonymous)

All students benefit from the presence of the SLP (0000000074 Anonymous)

All students benefit from you being in there. I go into a lot of special ed study halls and help all students, not just language students. (0000000151 Anonymous)

b/c speech and language crosses across all academics and we have alot of knowledge to share and demonstrate on behalf of the students. (0000000065 Anonymous)

Been able to reduce my time in classrooms where I have co-taught for 3-5 years, as the CT, SPED T aides & assistants have assimilated interventions & techniques, & thus are included as service providers on IEPs. This is especially true for any artic, phonological interventions & dev delayed lang. Principal specially places LLD kids in "seasoned" classrooms insuring interventions thru out the day. SLP is in turn up to date on curriculum & district demands in the classrooms, as well as the individual classroom environments. Easier to get parents to accept termination as well, if both teacher & SLP's "onsite" obs, as well as testing confirm. (0000000148 Anonymous)

Built in generalization, using skills "when and where needed", immediate identification of need and strategy support, immediate feedback and use of modifications and accommodations (0000000191 Anonymous)

Carrryover of skills (0000000033 Anonymous)

carry-over of skills; immediate application of knowledge;reinforcement;role-release (0000000127 Anonymous)
Carry-over of targeted skills and continued intervention when the SLP is not present. (0000000135 Anonymous)

Children participate in the regular curriculum with adaptations/interventions to allow them to succeed. They can work with their peers but at their level. (0000000102 Anonymous)

Classroom intervention is advantageous for the teacher, the student, and the SLP. Teacher gets to see SLP in action using the strategies appropriate for student. SLP learns curriculum and classroom management. Student benefits all around. (0000000046 Anonymous)

decreasing the stigma associated with the 'speech room' and the speech teacher. Assisting the classroom teacher with strategies for language development. Application of skills learned in the therapy room. Enhance the learning of my student. Collaboration with classroom teacher on successful strategies. (0000000126 Anonymous)

enhanced generalization, reducing stigma of services, allowing for teacher to see how our work can be integrated into teaching tactics. (0000000107 Anonymous)

First of all, this has to be a school-wide effort - from the principal down. There needs to be a willingness from all parties. In my particular school, the attitude is not there. To make it efficient, all students needing language intervention should be in the same classroom (per grade) or it is impossible time-wise. I believe that if planned appropriately, specific classrooms that have a high number of language delayed students can be taught/facilitated by teacher and SLP. The caseload numbers would need to drop dramatically. Currently, I travel to 3 schools and have about 60 students. It is impossible to use this type of intervention with such high caseloads. As you know it is not just about numbers. I have 2 students that need 30min/day of individual services. This type of intervention seems so far from reality in this budget-strapped world right now. Administration is not going to lower our caseloads, they would simply see this as a great resource for the regular teachers and give us more responsibilities, when we are overwhelmed as it is. Sorry to sound so pessimistic. In theory, and in a perfect world, I think it is a great idea. (0000000024 Anonymous)

For some students, it is nice to see carryover of the strategies that I teach in pull out sessions. Also, some students can learn from their peers and how they solved or comprehended the problem or text. (0000000023 Anonymous)
Generalization is built in. Benefit of peer models. Doesn't single out the language delayed student. Do miss classroom instruction for pull out. (0000000085 Anonymous)

Generalization of skills outside of individual therapy; able to service more students at one time (0000000147 Anonymous)

generalization of skills, conservation of slp time, target specific and additional students (0000000025 Anonymous)

Generalization of skills. Our help to the child is more meaningful. (0000000173 Anonymous)

Generalization of targeted goals; child can demonstrate true mastery of concepts in the classroom, rather than only in a therapy session (0000000101 Anonymous)

Generalization, and the increased skill of the SLP as he or she learns the curriculum and style of different teachers. (0000000094 Anonymous)

generalization, learning skills within the environment for which it would apply (0000000029 Anonymous)

generalization, natural context, typical peer models, integrated services, classroom based materials, team building, preventative services, time efficiency (0000000058 Anonymous)

Generalizing and instruction that makes sense in their environment (0000000114 Anonymous)

Gives students the ability to acquire new skills within the regular education classroom; therefore, generalization is not an issue. (0000000031 Anonymous)
Helping language disordered students learn to learn: listening skills, asking questions, expressing "I don't know" versus "I don't understand", learning notetaking and test taking skills. (0000000039 Anonymous)

Higher degree of curriculum integration into therapy, greater opportunities for generalization of targets, progress charting in a different setting than the therapy room (0000000137 Anonymous)

I am able to observe the challenges of the child within the classroom, I am able to reinforce vocabulary and concepts that are specific to the classroom and content. I do still pull most of my students out for specific one-on-one or small group remediation, also. (0000000202 Anonymous)

I believe that being able to provide services within the classroom will provide not only those identified as having language delays but those poorly performing or average performing students with appropriate language models and reinforcement. It also the service provider to gauge the student's ability to carryover skills outside of the therapy setting. (0000000190 Anonymous)

I can serve a larger group of children. (0000000130 Anonymous)

I feel at least the students having difficulty get a second chance to have the info explained completely and within the setting where it is taught in the first place. (0000000026 Anonymous)

I feel that students who are pulled out of the classroom for language therapy exclusively miss out on important classroom and academic vocabulary. By remaining in the classroom and adding in language targets, the student could get both IEP target language goals and classroom vocabulary. (0000000081 Anonymous)

I get a more realistic view of the students ability to function in a regular ed. class. I can make sure students understand the material. I review directions, lab procedures, vocabulary as needed. Often these student would not complete assignments as they need information repeated or clarified in order to make steady/timely progress. By moving around the room, I am also able to keep ADHD students on task and reduce behavior problems. I teach memory strategies, comprehension strategies and test taking strategies. Materials have been modified in length to address the processing problems of most of the students. (0000000022 Anonymous)
I like that I can service a good number of children in a small amount of time. I also like to see the performance differences in small vs. large group settings. (Anonymous)

I never really felt that there were advantages of providing language intervention within the classroom. I can directly teach and track my students progress much easier in a smaller group format. (Anonymous)

I see a lot more progress and generalization if I do curriculum based intervention especially at the middle school level. (Anonymous)

I think there are so many benefits to this but it is so hard to realistically do and meet all the needs of all the students on our caseloads. The benefits include: modeling language enhancing teaching strategies to the classroom teachers, language specific lessons, allows the SLP to watch learning of their students in the large group setting, allows class to know SLP so they are considered part of the teaching team and not just for special ed kids... (Anonymous)

I'm able to use peer models to enhance language services in the classroom, especially with my ASD students. At the Early Childhood level, classroom services for language disabilities are essential, in my opinion. (Anonymous)

Improved generalization & transfer of skills across settings; All children in classroom benefit from language lessons; Language lessons are easily incorporated into all subject matter; Better use of SLP’s time in that several children can be served at the same time (Anonymous)

In the free flow world of the preschool classroom, the vocabulary and language structures needed right here, right now are apparent. I like to coach the children as they attempt to navigate the language of the classroom and interact with peers. It can be extremely effective. (Anonymous)

It enables me to see and help meet the language demands placed on my students. It helps me to build a bridge of communication for this child and his/her teachers or peers. (Anonymous)
It gives the speech pathologist a chance to see if the skills the children are learning in pull out sessions are carrying over to the classroom. It also gives you a chance to observe the overall skills of the child (attention, fine and gross motor skills, cognitive etc.). It also gives me a chance to see what and/or where a breakdown may be that the child is experiencing and what special adaptations or prompts may be needed in the classroom. (0000000083 Anonymous)

It helps with generalization of strategies and skills taught in pull-out therapy sessions. It also allows me to observe how well the kids can synthesize the information they have learned given their weaknesses. I also think that working on activities that the kids are doing everyday helps them put "therapy" into perspective in how this will help them in the classroom. (0000000181 Anonymous)

It is good for carry-over and good models for the students (0000000162 Anonymous)

It is helpful for the classroom teacher to see how to make accommodations while teaching the material. (0000000044 Anonymous)

It's easier to work on carryover. Regular Ed students provide excellent modeling and support to the speech/language students. (0000000089 Anonymous)

It's meaningful both socially and educationally and is linked to the curriculum. When SLPs pull students out, they sometimes end up creating more for a student to learn, when the student has a difficult time with rate of learning to begin with. There tends to be a benefit to all students. Cross-learning for the SLP and the regular educator. The SLP becomes more familiar with the curriculum. (0000000035 Anonymous)

It's much more practical. I feel it's a plus for student's to be in their natural environment. (0000000018 Anonymous)

Kill lots of IEP time off with one session. Other students who needed modified reading/writing assignments benefitted from my adapted worksheets for my IEP students. (0000000110 Anonymous)
knowledge of classroom content, applicability to academic work, extending our services and educating classroom teachers of our work, decreasing students time being pulled out of academics, learning strategies and skills from another professional, time saving (000000011 Anonymous)

Language based intervention in the classroom is the only way to do secondary therapy. (0000000171 Anonymous)

Language intervention in the classroom could be a powerful tool (given sufficient resources) for assessing, planning and targeting treatment which would most benefit the student academically and socially. In addition if collaboration is open between professionals a team approach to addressing the student learning needs is extremely beneficial. (0000000108 Anonymous)

Language intervention, when provided in pull-out sessions, does not generalize and serves to replace the curriculum. Language intervention, provided in the classroom, provides modeling for the teacher, incidental learning for non-identified students, and also supports the students' attainment of curriculum standards. (000000008 Anonymous)

Language is learned and applied contextually within the regular curriculum. Individuals have the advantage of sharing expertise and knowledge from their own perspectives, so cognition is shared and thereby expanded. More students can be served at a given time so it is time efficient (0000000146 Anonymous)

Language skills are reinforced in a natural setting, using classroom materials. (0000000092 Anonymous)

Less time away from peers. More opportunities for generalizing skills. (0000000008 Anonymous)

Many of my students use aug comm and assistive technology to access the general curriculum. I rely heavily on para professionals to carry out activities and increase communication opportunities throughout each student's day. (0000000155 Anonymous)
Meaningful reinforcement of intervention strategies through application in curriculum they are learning from. Validation of SLPs as professionals who work on actual language development with meaningful planned strategies and not just people who "play games". (000000030 Anonymous)

More carryover; Makes general education teacher more aware of child's IEP goals; Makes general education teacher more accountable for helping with IEP goals. (000000095 Anonymous)

More natural setting, can work with many students at one time that have similar needs. Can be used as a Response To Intervention activity if a student is in the classroom and adapted materials are used...even though SPED is not supposed to do that. All students benefit from the language lesson. A SLP is seen more as a "teacher" than a SPED staff - and I think that gives us more credibility among regular education co-workers. (000000071 Anonymous)

Most relevant content for student, students are able to learn more diverse strategies through more varied teaching styles. (000000036 Anonymous)

Natural setting and natural interactions with peers. (000000034 Anonymous)

natural setting, integrated with curriculum; student does not miss class time (000000043 Anonymous)

Naturalistic environment, functional language usage, supports the language needed to achieve/perform successfully, target specific goals in a functional setting (000000145 Anonymous)

Not singling out the child, not practicing in a box, providing skills for the entire class (000000053 Anonymous)

Opportunities to reinforce what has been addressed in direct therapy. (000000121 Anonymous)
Our preschool handicapped classrooms are designed to be language based. Therefore, the teacher and assistants are able to facilitate language development during the 3 1/2 hours that our children are here. (0000000118 Anonymous)

Particularly at the upper levels they are required to know the same information as the other students for tests, discussions, etc... if you take them out of the class they miss the information given. (0000000159 Anonymous)

Peer interactions from age appropriate peer models (0000000078 Anonymous)

Pragmatics can be addressed within the regular education environment, and regular education students may be easily accessible communication partners for those with social communication needs. The regular education teacher may have an opportunity to observe intervention techniques to help address speech goals. (0000000161 Anonymous)

Providing language intervention in the classroom allows the teachers/paraprofessionals the opportunities to learn and later utilize beneficial strategies. Overall, I think all students benefit from learning effective strategies and the special ed. students are not missing the inclusion benefits of being with their peers in class. (0000000040 Anonymous)

Providing more efficient carry over therapy and tracking of carry over would be the advantages. Also, we would not need to remove regular students out of their classroom setting to do "reverse mainstreaming." (0000000047 Anonymous)

Regardless of my level of involvement (drifting, observing, co-teaching, etc), I nearly always am able to gain information regarding my students in terms of areas/issues to address in pull out sessions, their carryover of strategies learned in pull out sessions, and how the students interact in a larger group of typical peers. For most students, I like to do a combination of inclusion and pull out services, particularly in the younger grades. (0000000134 Anonymous)

Reinforcement of concepts and vocabulary that are being presented in class. Children do not "miss" activities that are happening in the regular classroom. Children not "identified" benefit from additional support. (0000000142 Anonymous)
Seeing how the special ed students compare with reg ed students in terms of skills and needs that may not be noted in a small group setting (0000000041 Anonymous)

Seems like skills would be generalized to core curriculum. (0000000019 Anonymous)

Services are provided in the natural environment related to meaningful experiences of the student. Generalization occurs easier. (00000000168 Anonymous)

Since I teach children in preschool I do not have the opportunity to teach children in the regular education setting. (00000000124 Anonymous)

Skills are taught in the environment that we want the students to use them in so generalization may be quicker. (00000000100 Anonymous)

Skills would be more generalized, intervention would more directly impact the student's education. (00000000163 Anonymous)

SLP's exposure to the curriculum and to the different teacher styles and expectations. Provides invaluable insight into the student's needs related directly to the classroom and curriculum so that pullout services are more meaningful and relevant to the student. (0000000032 Anonymous)

Students are taught within a natural setting, thereby enhancing carryover and use of target skills. Regular ed teachers see what I do and copy it - much better than trying to just tell them. At the moment a regular ed teacher and I are employing the "divide and conquer" method with a very difficult classroom of students (the children with IEP's are the stars in this particular classroom). This has allowed me to help her with difficult children and has allowed me to provide service within a natural setting. The smaller groups that we each have during "small group time" in the classroom allow development of a deeper relationship with each child. The children in this classroom know my name! The children on IEP's don't have to leave the classroom and miss what is happening during that time. Last year I saw a group of students who have high functioning autism within their SPED classroom. We worked on a large number of social communication skills. Because the teacher saw what I did (and it
helped her out) she expanded what I started both on the days when the children were in the SPED class and on the days when they were included within the general ed preschool. It worked wonderfully. (0000000066 Anonymous)

Students can learn from other students. (0000000049 Anonymous)

Students directly apply strategies for learning in the classroom setting. All students benefit from another staff being available for clarification. (0000000045 Anonymous)

Students do not miss what is happening in the classroom. Skills generalize as they are not taught isolated in the speech room. (0000000115 Anonymous)

Students don't miss any classroom teaching time - their lessons are supplemented by the speech-language pathologist. (0000000061 Anonymous)

students don’t miss class, stx are able to see the needs of the students in the class not just by IEP goals. (0000000009 Anonymous)

Students learn needed skills in the environment where they should be using the skills. Less difficulty with carry over. (0000000111 Anonymous)

Students learn to ask more questions when they are confused, learn to clarify their understanding, and become more aware of their particular learning styles. (0000000068 Anonymous)

Students not having to "make up" work they miss while in pull-out services, being in touch with the vocabulary and concepts being taught in the classroom (better able to focus on classroom content). (0000000167 Anonymous)
Students who are not IEP’d can receive extra help; when the SLP can deliver fun, "jazzy" activities, it makes pull-out services a "get to go" not a "have to go"; generalization of skills is less of an issue. (0000000141 Anonymous)

Supports progress in the curriculum (0000000184 Anonymous)

Targeted materials would probably be easier to carry over to other areas in the child's life. (0000000125 Anonymous)

Targeting structures that are pertinent to the curriculum. Working with the teacher, if they are willing to provide instruction in areas pertinent to the state assessments and goals for their grade level. (0000000059 Anonymous)

Teachers can see how to reinforce language within the structure of their class, however most of the time, they are not as concerned with the goals I am working on. Works much better in the younger grades (pre-1st) where their goals align with ours. They are working for following directions, answering "wh" questions, vocabulary development etc. There are wonderful books that can be used in these lower levels to hit all of that and more. (0000000063 Anonymous)

The advantage to providing language intervention within the classroom is that you can service more children at one time. You can work with at risk children before they are referred for direct services. You are also able to observe the children in the classroom setting and keep your goals and objectives relative to their needs within the classroom. (0000000105 Anonymous)

The advantages of classroom intervention are that the SLP is able to observe the CT and create appropriate reinforcement/intervention based on the classroom expectations and curriculum, as well as supplement or compliment accordingly. SLP and CT can team by reviewing specific examples of student performance through ongoing observation and data keeping for enhanced generalization of skills. (0000000150 Anonymous)

The advantages of providing language intervention within the classroom are that the child is in a less structured setting and carryover skills are more easily observed and/or corrected as needed. (0000000070 Anonymous)
The classroom environment is already a language-rich environment and providing intervention within the classroom lends itself to be in the moment. It allows students to remain in the regular classroom with their peers and also provides for some incidental teaching of non-identified students. (0000000076 Anonymous)

the classroom is their natural learning environment skills do not transfer as well from therapy setting to classroom therapy is not a normal social setting students learn that they need to practice artic and lang skills in other environments teachers and aids learn how to elicit artic targets and how to praise self monitoring and corrections of speech and language skills (0000000051 Anonymous)

The generalization happens more naturally (0000000156 Anonymous)

the greatest positive would be the generalization of language skills targeted in the speech room (0000000165 Anonymous)

The instructional assistants see the speech and language pathologist working with the children so they can carryover the children's goals and objectives even when the therapist is not in the classroom. (0000000055 Anonymous)

The LLD child keeps up with the material the class is learning and the SLP learns where the child has difficulty. (0000000117 Anonymous)

The SLP can figure out what skills need to be supplemented during opull out therapy. The SLP can work first hand to figure out strategies that aid in the child's ability to access the curriculum in the classroom as well as demonstrate those strategies to the classroom teacher. (0000000086 Anonymous)

The SLP helps the student achieve the district's standards and benchmarks; the students are working on skills that are required of them in the classroom, not additional isolated skills that are not applicable to academics; students are not "singled out" from regular classroom work. (0000000090 Anonymous)
The student receives information that is more relevant to understanding texts and lessons (Anonymous)

The students are able to hear models from other students, students are able to more naturally generalize their skills, all students get a good dose of targeted skills (Anonymous)

The students are not pulled out so they don't lose instructional time or time with their peers. The students are included so they don't look different from their peers. (Anonymous)

The students can really see the relevance of the intervention. The SLP can do more task analysis and problem solving in the classroom. (Anonymous)

The students have the opportunity to extend what they have learned in therapy to different situations and locations. It helps them generalize skills. (Anonymous)

Therapists gain an understanding of student functioning in the classroom as well as what the typical child is able to do. Sometimes our expectations exceed what a typical student is able to perform. (Anonymous)

There is more of a generalization of language intervention when you can connect it. Also, by using concepts and vocabulary that they are using in class, it makes the work more relevant. (Anonymous)

This model does not single out individuals. Important to see how children react in the classroom as well as to incorporate curriculum material. (Anonymous)

Transfer of skills. (Anonymous)
Typical peer models and interactions, as a pre-k SLP I think the transition and success in K is higher, instilling the idea and methodology that "these kids" are all our kids and strategies that help them help all. (0000000177 Anonymous)

Use of curricular materials not always shared by teachers for pull-out sessions (0000000133 Anonymous)

Using peers as models, generalization of skills, giving teachers more involvement with the language needs of his/her students. (0000000106 Anonymous)

We have found that providing intervention in the classroom for our students is essential because we need to focus on functional goals and objectives. It also helps our students to generalize skills better, which is a typical problem for students with Autism. It is very helpful to me to learn what they need to accomplish in the classroom. It is also helpful to teachers and assistants to see us directly model what we want them to do. (0000000042 Anonymous)

When in the classroom, you can serve more students with and without IEPs for language since we know that many students may be "on the cusp" of needing services but receive none. (0000000062 Anonymous)

When the child has mastered a concept it is appropriate for carryover/generalization to be addressed in the classroom. (0000000213 Anonymous)

working directly on academic intervention from a language perspective (0000000103 Anonymous)

You can get a better feel for what a high school student goes through each day. As a speech clinician, you could also direct the focus of the class to help those with needs that you are aware of. You could adapt and modify easier for those students who need it. (0000000048 Anonymous)
You can reinforce concepts immediately. You can role-play and implement strategies to help students understand information as they need it and not when the teacher has time to tell you what the student is struggling with. (0000000178 Anonymous)

You don't have to worry about what the child is missing in the regular education curriculum because they are getting both the regular education curriculum and a language rich lesson. (0000000170 Anonymous)

You get to see what the student is actually able to do and not do in the classroom and it gives you a better ability to work within the framework of the curriculum. Also the student does not miss class time for speech therapy (0000000069 Anonymous)

You might be able to use teachable moments with students that have not been identified as being in need of SLP services, but may be weak in some areas. (0000000122 Anonymous)
**42. Please list what you feel are the disadvantages of providing language intervention within the classroom.**

1) Classroom teachers who are not interested in collaboration, co-teaching, and see the SLP as another "body" in the regular classroom (Anonymous)

1) Difficult to find time to collaborate with classroom teachers (Anonymous)

A disadvantage is having time to plan with the teacher and having them follow a schedule that allows me to come in at set times to address the language areas. (Anonymous)

A student's specific goals/objectives could be more difficult to target within the classroom setting. Specific feedback is more difficult to give in this setting. Certain teachers are very protective of their time/schedule/teaching and it may be difficult to implement language intervention within the classroom. Speech pathologist may lose "control" of specific interventions for the student. (Anonymous)

At this point, planning is difficult. Most often I do not know in advance what will be covered from week to week. (Anonymous)

At times it is difficult when you have students with short attention spans or are easily distracted. (Anonymous)

Can be difficult to get a significant number of trials on a specific language goal. Difficult to manage more than one child in a classroom if they have different goals and levels. (Anonymous)

Children do not get the individualized attention that they sometimes need. (Anonymous)

Children on IEP has less opportunities to respond and less attention as the group increases while working in class. Background noise, behaviors of other children could be a problem as well. Articulation goals are difficult to be targeted in class. (Anonymous)
Children with attention &/or behavioral issues usually are more attentive and retain information better when worked with in a quiet setting outside of the classroom where there are numerous distractions. (0000000072 Anonymous)

collaboration time; control over the activities that specifically target language objectives; difficulty with data collection; protecting confidentiality when serving children in an ECFE classroom in which other parents are present. (0000000157 Anonymous)

Coordinating and planning with the teacher; planning an activity that is appropriate for regular education students; providing feedback to speech student(s) while trying to implement the lesson/activity. (0000000161 Anonymous)

Depending upon the activity or the lesson, the level of interaction or the value of the observation in the classroom may or may not target specific skills being addressed. For example, if social communication is an area of focus and the student is listening to a lecture or working independently on an assignment, then very little information or ability to provide the student with feedback is available. In my opinion, an inclusive component is valuable, but difficult in addressing all objectives if it is the only component to a student's program. (0000000134 Anonymous)

Difficult to target all students language objectives with one activity; difficulty providing adequate on-line teaching; difficulty with teacher carry-over; behavior management (0000000147 Anonymous)

difficult to target specific IEP objectives and achieve multiple responses for target skills (0000000043 Anonymous)

Distracting the other children with presence, not having teacher’s acceptance, no planning time with teacher (0000000106 Anonymous)

distractions, students may initially be shy/reserved about attempting verbal responses (0000000060 Anonymous)
Goals for classroom intervention must be written to reflect mainstream goals not intensive instruction goals otherwise it turns into pullout in the classroom. (Anonymous)

Hard to do artic therapy, some children benefit from more opportunities to practice targets in a one on one setting. (Anonymous)

I can’t think of any. Even if a child is not at the level of the other students you can be adressing a variety of goals geared to individual children with in a single lesson/activity. (Anonymous)

I compare it to a math teacher coming into my language therapy session and trying to meet her math curriculum goals/objectives within the context of therapy. Compare that to the students who remained in the classroom for regular math. Who would be more advanced in the math curriculum at the end of the year? (Anonymous)

I did co-taught at the middle school level and did not like it. I felt that the teacher and I never had time to collaborate and many times I was just working on behavior issues. The student was definitely singled out. (Anonymous)

I do not find providing service in class is a problem with most kids. Problem is mechanics. You cannot provide in class to all kids you feel appropriate, and teachers you think would benefit from the experience... or ask for the experience. School, specialists, grade, Title 1 & special service providers schedules make it difficult to be in all rooms. This year, I have students in 21 classrooms. (Anonymous)

I feel as though para professionals do not receive the necessary training and turn over is frequent so that is one barrier to implementation. (Anonymous)

I feel that it is very hard to accomplish all the goals that I have set for a child on their IEP when I am providing services in the classroom. I feel that it is very difficult to get together with the classroom teacher to do team teaching. I work in a preschool setting where children only may come 2 times a week and with my caseload it is very hard to find time to have a planning session with the classroom teacher.
I find it easier to take the material that the child is working on in the classroom back to the speech room and work on the material one on one. I find it very difficult to gain attention from the child in a classroom setting. However, language is easier to work in the classroom than speech sounds. (0000000083 Anonymous)

I have had some experience with classroom intervention. As a general rule, I felt the average students were bored with the target areas that I was instructing, as they had already accomplished those skills. Also, the language delayed students are often more distracted in a regular classroom and if they haven't already picked it up in a large group setting, they aren't more likely to do so, just because I'm in front of the group. Teachers are under such pressure to meet testing criteria and be accountable for direct instruction time that they may not be as open to classroom intervention - as they are concerned about the age appropriate skills that will be covered on state testing. (0000000091 Anonymous)

I haven't discovered any disadvantages. (0000000046 Anonymous)

I really do not see disadvantages, as long as students can still be pulled for specific remediation as deemed appropriate by the IEP team. (0000000202 Anonymous)

I see only advantages. This is a 10th grade class. Many of these students have been in my 9th grade Lang. Lab class. This is a way for me to follow them into a reg. ed. setting. This reg. ed. teacher and I have presented our team teaching program at the MN. State Teachers Convention. It seems teachers are hungry for this information. (0000000022 Anonymous)

I think the biggest issue for the service provider is planning and coordinating with the classroom teacher. There are those teachers who view your coming in as a "distraction" to what they are doing when really we have the same goals and expectations. Scheduling may also be difficult as it varies with grade levels and you still have the responsibility of services for those students with articulation, voice, and fluency issues. (0000000190 Anonymous)

I'm not always able to address all IEP objectives in a large group setting. All of my language students receive services in a combination of classroom and individual/small group settings. (0000000182 Anonymous)
If a student is extremely delayed, then it is difficult to meet their needs in a crowded classroom. (Anonymous)

If not done correctly, SLP can become a glorified "teacher's aide". If done correctly, the classroom teacher and SLP both learn greatly from one another. Teachers learn how "linguistically loaded" the classroom is, SLP learns the skill, standards, and benchmarks that students need to know. (Anonymous)

If you have a teacher who is unwilling to learn, help or do what needs to be in done in order to increase language skills, then the intervention is worthless. (Anonymous)

In situations when it is mandated and not determined by the specific needs of the child, it can be used inappropriately. For example, a child who stutters needs to be pulled out to work on strategies. This is not appropriate within the classroom. (Anonymous)

Inability to have hands on time with each student depending on the classroom activity that day, CT viewing therapist as assistant or providing break for CT, inability to meet and monitor progress on IEP goals and objectives, collaboration time not sufficient to plan with CT, difficult to build a rapport with the student when they are around their peers, difficult to come and go from the classroom to serve other students. (Anonymous)

It can be difficult to hear the students within a busy preschool classroom. It is more difficult to formally document progress. It takes time to touch bases with teachers. The more teachers that are involved, the more difficult the time crunch becomes. (Anonymous)

It can water down the intensity of intervention, so I prefer to do a combination of in-class and pull-out services. (Anonymous)

It depends on the classroom: But, when the teacher wants a parallel or SLP adrift situation, students who receive services risk being pin-pointed as different by peers, especially in intermediate grades. It works better when there is an environment of collaboration (Anonymous)
It is difficult at times to specifically address certain IEP goals. Lack of time with the classroom teacher to prepare in co-teaching situations is very difficult. I do think the students benefit from this type of delivery. (0000000149 Anonymous)

It is difficult to find planning time with teachers to deliver an effective team teaching lesson. I find it frustrating when the teachers try to use our time as a prep period. (0000000040 Anonymous)

It is difficult to make going into the mainstream classroom worthwhile at the high school level, because with so many sections offered, you are seldom able to get more than one student in a class at one time. They would have to be hand scheduled and the kids don't want to be identified so it is easier for them to receive pull out services to prevent others from recognizing their weaknesses. It (0000000048 Anonymous)

It is difficult to target and drill through repetition of specific skills. It is also difficult from a data-collection standpoint. (0000000076 Anonymous)

It is difficult to teach to language targets when they are not aligned with the curriculum. Most of my students have significant delays that are at the level of their peers. It would be easier to build prior knowledge and vocabulary outside of the classroom prior to the language lesson, but then this would require more of my time. (0000000104 Anonymous)

It is distracting at times to the student being taught as well as the rest of the class. Students are singled out, even though we do our best to help ALL the students in an effort to avoid that. You also never really get everything you want accomplished. (0000000026 Anonymous)

It is sometimes difficult to take objective data in this setting without doing more individualized quick check assessment, so often progress seems to be measured more subjectively. (0000000142 Anonymous)

It is very challenging finding the time to plan and consult with each other. It has also been very difficult dealing with various personalities of teachers we have to work with. Some work better with us than others. We have to vary how we interact with different teachers. (0000000042 Anonymous)
It may create confusion in the minds of the children when the "SLP" comes in and never helps anyone but a couple of the kids. They might not understand that this "adult" isn't there to help everyone if they have a question. (0000000070 Anonymous)

It singles children out. (0000000130 Anonymous)

It's difficult to target each student's specific goals effectively. Many more distractions. (0000000089 Anonymous)

It's hard to create enough opportunities for learning discrete skills like grammar (0000000035 Anonymous)

Keeping the child's attention for the whole lesson can be difficult if they have attention difficulties. It is also difficult to give them enough responses to ensure that they are getting a great enough picture of the concept you are trying to teach because they don't give you the responses as often as in small group instruction. Keeping data is very difficult in this setting, unless you have the co-teacher, who is familiar with the goals, take data on the target students you are wanting to serve. I think it can be a great way of working with children with LLDs, but it requires more planning and preparation (especially for a fairly new SLP) than is often given in the school setting. (0000000170 Anonymous)

Lack of planning time with classroom teacher. (0000000074 Anonymous)

lack of skills from my student/they might not be ready to apply skills in the classroom. complex language use in the classroom might be loosing them. The classroom expectations might be too high for them. (0000000126 Anonymous)

Lack of time, too high of caseloads to do this (puts more pressure on us) (0000000024 Anonymous)

language interventions could be much more meaningful and pertain closer to unit being taught if the SLP and teacher had consistent time to plan together. My planning is usually a fly by in the hall about
what the teacher is doing and then I go plan something that I think relates and then I try in incorporate my information in a tiered format using differentiation for the different learning styles. (0000000180 Anonymous)

limited time to consult with one another (0000000029 Anonymous)

Loss of some social-emotional supports that students get in the 1:1 setting. Some loss of student's willingness to try things or be more talkative because they are in the presence of peers (especially as they get older) (0000000030 Anonymous)

Making sure they are truly receiving the services and benefits of services that they really need in order to succeed. (0000000167 Anonymous)

Many of my teachers are uncomfortable with the methodologies I use to adapt the lesson or explain the content to my students. Impact of the service is questionable due to other students interrupting or asking questions about the diversification. (0000000068 Anonymous)

Maybe not getting enough individualized time with the student. Less trials for the language student. Losing the attention of the student or students that you have on the IEP because they are less focused in a large group. (0000000059 Anonymous)

Meeting the specific needs of individual language impaired students, level of support, cooperation, and collaboration of the classroom teacher. (0000000191 Anonymous)

Most teachers I work with are unwilling to do this. Also, my students who have language goals/objectives on their IEP would not get as much of my time and attention if I were to work with them in the classroom environment. (0000000031 Anonymous)

My students often have difficulty attending to the teacher or materials in very busy classrooms. Other students may baby them or assume they are incapable of contributing to a group project. It is particularly challenging to implement behavioral programs in a regular ed classroom because children
are often frightened by inappropriate behaviors or concerned about apparent inequities (e.g., "How come he gets to take a break?") (0000000128 Anonymous)

Need lots of planning time and must be a creative SLP that isn't afraid to work with groups of kids. The classroom teacher and SLP must be comfortable enough with each other to work together without fear that the other is judging their work/methods. Teaming takes trust and confidence. (0000000111 Anonymous)

no direct therapy and goals/objectives aren't necessarily targeted (0000000103 Anonymous)

No opportunities to work 1:1 if needed. Not a good environment for repetitions if needed. (0000000008 Anonymous)

No planning time with classroom staff. (0000000034 Anonymous)

Not a good use of time. Have to plan a great deal of time for only a few students in a class, and the same at a different grade level or topic that are being taught. (0000000063 Anonymous)

Not being able to elicit repetitions of targets, making it difficult to show response to intervention and to document progress in an objective manner. (0000000094 Anonymous)

Not enough individual time devoted to the specific student. (0000000082 Anonymous)

Not enough mutual planning time and most times NO mutual planning time. (0000000032 Anonymous)

not enough planning time to ensure sucessful interventions; inability to address specific IEP goals (0000000127 Anonymous)
Not enough planning time with teachers, especially when the slp is in multiple classrooms. Not convinced that students on IEPs get the maximum benefit from classroom intervention. Takes time on learning away from other students in the classroom who do not need this classroom intervention. It is difficult to tailor a classroom lesson to all the needs. The students enjoy the classroom lessons that are conducted, but much of it is enrichment for the the students not on IEPS. (0000000057 Anonymous)

Not enough response opportunities for IEPd students. (0000000110 Anonymous)

not enough time and inconsistencies with teachers about this approach. Some feel as though their training is what allows them to teach and they don't need someone else coming in telling them what to do. Perhaps at the institutional level, classroom teachers can be taught/trained about the knowledge and expertise an SLP can bring to their classroom and I think too SLPs should receive more training in the areas of reading and written language. (0000000065 Anonymous)

Not enough time in schedule to be in one classroom long enough. Difficult to plan with some teachers or teacher not enthusiastic about my presence in classroom. (0000000039 Anonymous)

Not having enough time to collaborate with teachers so we all know what skill level each child is on, what the next targeted area should be, etc. (0000000118 Anonymous)

Not targeting all IEP goals (0000000119 Anonymous)

Other kids are aware that you are assisting a student/students and it is sometimes hard dealing with the students who do not want to "stand out" (0000000159 Anonymous)

Plan time, co-operation from teachers, meeting goals/objectives (0000000078 Anonymous)

Planning is the biggest issue (time). To coteach/parallel teach, etc you have to have time to plan. Drifting works more easily, probably not quite as good use of professional's times but it works. Supplemental works well when students don't understand the material as presented to the whole class - but takes time to re-teach. (0000000145 Anonymous)
Planning time would have to be the #1 issue both for myself and the teacher(s) and students possibly being singled out/they may react negatively (0000000165 Anonymous)

possible "singling out" of iep students; classroom teachers that are unwilling to cooperate or won’t follow through with slp’s recommendations, etc. (0000000122 Anonymous)

Same as above. (0000000109 Anonymous)

scheduling classes, scheduling common teacher time, addressing students among peers - at this age, some don’t want anyone to know you even know who they are, let alone that they are serviced!, some days minimally touch on goals (0000000067 Anonymous)

Scheduling time to plan is limited in our district. (0000000036 Anonymous)

See above. Also many children need very specific, focused interventions or programs which are much more easily addresses in a separate setting. (0000000108 Anonymous)

Serving multiple grade levels and rooms with a large caseload, it is very difficult to schedule time in each room as they have the language arts times at the same time. Also, for many students for have auditory processing difficulties, a quiet, non-distracting room is needed and a regular classroom is not the place to be. For it to be successful, much conversation between the teacher and SLP is needed and this is very hard to acheive with my schedule of meetings and traveling to other schools. (0000000162 Anonymous)

Some children need very intense and individualized instruction that would be a distraction for regular ed children. Also, when special needs kids are scattered throughout the school in many grade levels, scheduling classroom time becomes problematic. (0000000138 Anonymous)

Some children require discrete lessons that are no well suited for classroom delivery. (0000000025 Anonymous)
Some students feel uncomfortable receiving support in front of their peers. (0000000045 Anonymous)

sometimes the classroom environment/structure is not conducive to specialized intervention and the student may not get as intensive intervention. A combination of service delivery works well at times. (0000000184 Anonymous)

Sometimes the LLD child does not like to be singled out as needing help but the SLP could help more than one student which takes care of that problem. (0000000117 Anonymous)

Sometimes there are unnecessary interruptions. Sometimes, since most of my career has been providing "pull-out" services, I feel that behavior management can get in the way of some good learning. As an SLP who graduated several years ago, I did not have class work on classroom behavior management. (0000000178 Anonymous)

sometimes you need some 1:1 time to teach a specific skill that will then be taken into a larger classroom setting (0000000020 Anonymous)

Sometimes I feel too many adults can be in the classroom at one time. (0000000055 Anonymous)

specifically addressing objectives on IEP (0000000114 Anonymous)

Speech and language students often take longer to learn concepts and need more practice. (0000000049 Anonymous)

Students have to split their attention between myself and the CT. (0000000133 Anonymous)
Takes more ahead of time planning, takes away from time in small groups, takes away from paperwork time, harder to keep tallies or specifics on performances... Reaches fewer IEP kids unless you happen to have several in one classroom.. (0000000010 Anonymous)

Takes more time to plan and coordinate (0000000156 Anonymous)

Teacher attitudes toward you being in the classroom and possibly taking away time from their instruction. (0000000018 Anonymous)

teachers and aids may use the time as break time it is harder to document groups can be as big as 12-14 and they can be hard to control/keep attention/manage inappropriate behaviors/cover the different levels of functioning (0000000051 Anonymous)

Teachers plans change and my schedule is not always flexible. Sometimes it is hard to meet IEP objectives. (0000000092 Anonymous)

The amount of time that it takes. Overload. (0000000053 Anonymous)

The biggest disadvantage is that there is little to no planning time with the classroom teacher which is essential when providing services within the classroom. (0000000105 Anonymous)

The class moves at a faster pace than what the child is working at. Hard to repeat skills if the child needs it. Some children need to work on skills that are not covered in that particular grade/class. (0000000173 Anonymous)

The disadvantages are that some students need multiple repetitions and spiraling back on various language concepts and skills. Unfortunately, during a classroom lesson with other regular ed. students, there is less time for frequent repetitions and less opportunities to enforce these skills multiple times. The students with language learning disorders need a chance to learn at their own pace, and frequently in the classroom setting, they are being asked to keep up with the pace of their peers, which is not a realistic goal. Also, high caseload numbers and insufficient co-planning time for teaching instruction is
not adequate in my school district to effectively work with all 12 teachers that I am in the classroom for. Additionally, some students with significant learning disabilities who are multiple grade levels behind their peers are asked to do modified assignments in the classroom setting. I think that some of these students feel different because of this. Furthermore, students with behavior difficulties tend to disrupt regular education students which doesn't seem to be effective for the child with the behavior plan or for the regular education students. Basically, in an ideal world where caseload numbers were kept low and severity of the disorders were accounted for, inclusion would be much more effective. However, given the high caseloads and intense workloads that SLPs are faced with in the school setting, it seems pretty lofty for anyone to think that SLPs can do it all in the short time that we are given each day and week. (0000000023 Anonymous)

The distractions of the busy classroom can compete with efforts to scaffold, and can be distracting to other children. Also, nontargeted children compete for your attention, sometimes making it difficult to provide adequate focus on the targeted child(ren). (0000000175 Anonymous)

The major disadvantage for me is that a lot of the peer partners (children in the classroom not on IEPs) are needy for attention and take away from the children on my caseload. Also, they tend to shout answers for the other children, making it difficult for children with slower processing times to participate and to respond. (0000000019 Anonymous)

The number of responses per student is limited. (0000000152 Anonymous)

The only disadvantage is when you have an uncooperative or unenthusiastic classroom teacher. (0000000085 Anonymous)

The prep time needed for class-based intervention does not exist. (0000000069 Anonymous)

the teachers are not always willing to have you in the class. Some do not understand that when I come in it is not a break for them. (0000000009 Anonymous)

the temptation for one teach, one drift. teachers have sometimes enjoyed my presence as breaktime. classroom managment. 'teaching' non-caseload students when most concerned about prioritized intervention for language impairiment. (0000000058 Anonymous)
There are times when I go into the class, and the teacher is working on something that is hard to gear for language intervention. (0000000116 Anonymous)

There is an advantage of having the perspective of what is being taught in the classroom and modifying and adapting IEP goals to their assignments. (0000000121 Anonymous)

There is not a lot of time for co-planning. Individuals may need more individual time. (0000000038 Anonymous)

This type of strategy is very dependent upon the classroom teacher. Some teachers do not like the teaming approach. (0000000097 Anonymous)

Time constraints often play a role. Grouping students together is often necessary and these students are usually in different classrooms. Also, at times language based therapy overlaps with articulation therapy and direct intervention is needed to establish correct placement and techniques. (0000000081 Anonymous)

time management. I could work on a lesson for 60 minutes when I'm only scheduled to be in there for 30. teacher flexibility can be difficult and sometimes there is a disconnect between teh teacher and therapist. (0000000181 Anonymous)

time to plan and coordinate lessons is our biggest obstacle, also making sure the division of labor is fair, really it is procedural challenges vs. having the model be less effective. If the model is less effective, it comes from our lack of coordination, not the child's deficits. (0000000041 Anonymous)

Time to team outside of class is limited. Able to achieve more intensive, systematic targets in pull out, but does this lead to more functional, natural, meaningful, generalized skills within the contexts and with the people they need to be used... I think not. (0000000177 Anonymous)
Too many mandated requirements for all staff to be motivated or interested in more teaming. We're all forced to receive information relevant to our like counterparts, ie: special ed, grade level teams, which limits our time available to team where we could actually compliment each other with our different backgrounds and training. (0000000150 Anonymous)

Typical peers in the classroom have a faster processing time. Therefore, it is difficult to give adequate time for the child with special needs to respond to questions/requests. (0000000213 Anonymous)

Unless the content of the lesson is shared and then adhered to, you may find that you can not meet the IEP goals for that day and need to reschedule services. (0000000062 Anonymous)

Very difficult to meet IEP goals. Very difficult to supply fundamental skills that support and undergird all the other academics. (0000000153 Anonymous)

Very difficult to schedule and you need to have teachers who are willing to participate and stay in the room while you are there. (0000000135 Anonymous)

Very hard to schedule and to maintain ongoing communication and planning with teachers and their already overbooked schedules. (0000000107 Anonymous)

When I have attempted some interventions within the classroom some of the teachers have often viewed this as a time for them to do their prep work rather than use this time as an opportunity to co teach and learn some language strategies that would benefit more than the students identified. Time constraints, I can often group students from a variety of classes with a pull out model. As my caseload grows it is difficult to justify the amount of time needed for the classroom based model. (0000000087 Anonymous)

When I have taught in the gen ed setting, teachers would use that time to catch up on work, rather than work with me. Also, in the large group setting, those students with language weaknesses tend to get lost as the kid without deficits catch on quicker and respond faster. (0000000100 Anonymous)
Working with teachers with different styles; helping teachers to target objectives for language impaired children (0000000101 Anonymous)
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