

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

5-2015

The Promotion of Self-Determination: A Survey of General and Special Educators

Melanie P. Allen
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports>



Part of the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Allen, Melanie P., "The Promotion of Self-Determination: A Survey of General and Special Educators" (2015). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 675.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/675>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Plan B and other Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



THE PROMOTION OF SELF-DETERMINATION:A SURVEY
OF GENERAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATORS

by

Melanie P. Allen

A creative project submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

in

Special Education

Approved:

Robert L. Morgan, PhD
Chairperson

Marilyn Likins, PhD
Committee Member

Kathleen Oertle, PhD
Committee Member

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

2015

ABSTRACT

The Promotion of Self-Determination: A Survey
of General and Special Educators

by

Melanie P. Allen

Utah State University, 2015

Learning self-determination skills is critical for all students to ensure they advocate for themselves and participate in a seamless transition from the secondary school setting to college and career. This quantitative study surveyed 224 general education, 37 mild/moderate special education, 10 severe special education, 28 alternative high general educators, 5 alternative high special educators, 3 transition special educators' mild/moderate, and 8 special education severe teachers in a suburban school district in the western US. A rating scale and open-ended questions were used to assess the degree to which teachers provide students with instruction and require students to demonstrate self-determination/self-advocacy skills. A rating scale was used to determine the extent to which teachers use essential program characteristics. Teachers selected (a) strategies, (b) measurements of progress, and (c) curricula they used to teach self-determination. Findings demonstrated that teacher's valued and taught self-determination/self-advocacy skills within their curriculum. However, teachers used their own teacher-developed strategies and curricula rather than evidence-based strategies. The author discusses using essential program characteristics, multidisciplinary teams, and systematic procedures to address areas to strengthen within departments and across curriculum.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
SECTION	
ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions.....	6
Nature of the Study	7
Definition of Terms.....	8
TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Overview of Evidence-Based Practice and Self-Determination Studies	10
Overview of Selected Self-Determination Surveys	13
Purpose Statement.....	17
THREE: METHOD	17
Participants and Setting.....	17
Development of the Three-Part Questionnaire	17
Survey section #3 self-determination/self-advocacy	17
Survey section #2 essential program characteristics.....	18
Survey section #1 strategies, progress measurement, and curricula.....	19
Procedure	20
Pilot Study Procedure	21
Main Study Procedure.....	21
Data Analysis	23
Ethical Assurances	23
FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	24
Demographics, Certifications and Settings.....	24
Survey Section #3 Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy	29
Receive Instruction and Demonstrate Domain, Instruction	29
Receive Instruction and Demonstrate Domain, Application	33
Demonstration of Domains	36
Survey Section #2 Essential Program Characteristics	45

Survey Section #1, Strategies, Progress Measurements, Curricula.....	53
Teaching Strategies	53
Progress Measurement	58
Curricula	62
Limitations.....	69
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	69
Curricula Used	71
Essential Program Characteristics.....	71
Teaching Strategies	73
Progress Measurement	74
Open-ended Responses	74
Strategies and Progress Measurements	74
Curricula	75
Curricula and Application.....	76
Recommendations for Practice.....	76
Recommendations for Future Research	78
REFERENCES	79
APPENDICES	84
Appendix A.....	85
Appendix B.....	96
Appendix C.....	97
Appendix D.....	98
Appendix E	99

LIST OF TABLES

1	Gender of Participants.....	24
2	Years of Experience	25
3	Level of Education	25
4	Certification	25
5	Subject(s) Taught	26
6	Primary Teaching Assignment.....	27
7	Participants: All Teachers, Certification, and Setting.....	28
8a	All Teachers: Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations	30
8b	Means and Standard Deviations of Instruction and Demonstration Ratings by Certification	31
8c	All Teachers Mean Scores	32
9	Receive Instruction by Percent for Domains	34
10a	Demonstration by Percent for Domains	35
10b	Open-Ended Responses for Demonstration of Domains	36
11a	Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Using Specific Curricula.....	39
11b	Curriculum Used to Teach Domains: Make Choices, Solve Problems	40
11c	Curriculum Used to Teach Domains: Set Goals, Evaluate Options.....	41
11d	Curriculum Used to Teach Domains: Take Initiative, Accept Consequences.....	43
12a	Program Characteristics: Means and Standard Deviations According to Setting...45	
12b	Program Characteristics: Means and Standard Deviations According to Non- Standard Teacher Assignment.....	46
12c	Program Characteristics: Means and Standard Deviations according to All Teachers and Certifications.....	47

12d	Program Characteristics: Means and Standard Deviations According to Settings..	50
13a	Number and Percentage of Teaching Strategies by All Teachers.....	54
13b	Number and Percentage of Strategies by Certification.....	55
13c	Number and Percentage of Teaching Strategies by Standard Setting.....	56
13d	Number and Percentage of Strategies by Non-Standard Setting	57
14a	Number and Percentages of Progress Measurements for All Teachers	59
14b	Numbers and Percentages of Progress Measurement by Setting.....	60
15a	Numbers and Percentages of Curricula Knowledge –All Teachers.....	62
15b	Numbers and Percentages of Curricula Knowledge -Certification.....	63
15c	Numbers and Percentages of Curricula by Standard Setting	65
15d	Numbers and Percentages of Curricula by Non-Standard Setting.....	66
16	Numbers and Percentages Indicating Survey Helpful by Setting.....	68

Introduction

Learning self-determination/self-advocacy skills is critical for all students to self-advocate and create a seamless transition from the secondary school setting to the college or career of choice (Rowe et al., 2014). Without an empirical basis to guide the teaching process, teachers have no guidance about how to instruct student to engage in self-determination/self-advocacy (Peterson et al., 2013; Wills, 2008). As well, teachers and administrators need to recognize the importance of teaching self-determination/self-advocacy skills to all students, including students with disabilities. Lee, Wehmeyer, Palmer, Soukup, and Little (2008) found that incorporating self-determination/self-advocacy skills training in the general education resulted in a higher than expected rate of self-set goals for all students. As a result of these findings, the objective of the present study was to explore to what extent teachers across all education settings in Davis school district implement self-determination/self-advocacy skills as part of their curriculum and program structure.

Background of the Study

Rowe et al. (2014) conducted a Delphi study to establish operational definitions and program characteristics of evidence-based predictors in secondary transition for further research. For the purpose of the present study, the operational definition established by Rowe et al. for self-determination/self-advocacy was used: “Self-determination/self-advocacy is the ability to make choices, solve problems, set goals, evaluate options, take initiative to reach one’s goals, and accept consequences of one’s actions” (Rowe et al., 2014, p. 9).

The teaching of self-determination/self-advocacy skills has been found to be effective in the general education setting as well as in the special education setting. A study by Palmer et al. (2004) demonstrated the importance of teaching students who received special education services self-determination/self-advocacy skills to enable them to access the general education setting. In a study 4 years later by Lee et al. (2008), researchers and special education teachers identified general education curriculum that correlated with state and local standards and found that incorporating self-determination/self-advocacy strategies resulted in a higher than expected rate of self-set goals (Lee et al., 2008). Carter et al. (2008) contended that students may increase the number of opportunities to practice and use self-determined actions throughout the school day when general and special educators share instructional goals.

Wehmeyer, Agran, and Hughes (2000) conducted a national survey to obtain the opinions of transition special educators who taught students between the ages of 14 and 21. Wehmeyer et al. questioned if providing instruction related to self-determination/self-advocacy was compatible with the general curriculum, and to what extent students were provided with opportunities to learn and apply these skills in general education classrooms. Wehmeyer et al. found that although instruction of the component elements was regarded as important, results of the application of self-determination/self-advocacy had mixed results as only 22% of respondents said their students had Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals that addressed self-determination, 31% responded that none of their students had goals in this area, and 30% reported that students were not involved in their educational planning.

Carter et al. (2008) extended the Wehmeyer et al. (2000) study to include general educators. Carter et al. called on secondary educators to develop self-determination opportunities. In addition, Carter et al. recommended that future research should be directed to identifying evidence-based practices for monitoring self-determined behavior in the general education setting.

There is a need for intervention and instructional strategies that are feasible, effective, and relevant in general education classrooms at the high school level, as well as strategies that work for a broad range of students. . . . As this line of research continues to evolve, additional attention should be focused on identifying evidence-based practices for promoting self-determination behavior in general education contexts. (Carter et al., 2008, p. 67)

A 2012 Utah State Office of Education Transition Team Survey of Local Education Agencies (LEA) asked, “What challenges are you currently facing in providing transition services to our students with disabilities?” Respondents listed their greatest challenge as self-advocacy training for students (McCormick & McIlvenna, 2012, p. 9). The concern expressed by the LEA demonstrates a priority in teaching self-determination/self-advocacy skills. Teachers need to recognize the importance of teaching self-determination/self-advocacy skills to all students, including students with disabilities (Peterson et al., 2013; Wills, 2008).

In the Fall of 2012, all high school teachers employed in the Davis school district participated in one-day training on a variety of strategies that aligned with district, state, career readiness, and literacy standards that could be used across content and curriculum. Strategies were selected by a team of teachers in the district and presentations were standardized for delivery and posted on the district curriculum website. All teachers in each of the eight high schools received training together, meaning both special education and general education teachers across content and curriculum attended the workshops

together and were encouraged to use these strategies across departments and settings. One of the cross-curriculum strategies suggested was Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How (GIST), which was observed to enhance engagement in self-determination/self-advocacy skills.

In 2014-15, teachers in one high school social studies department comprised of four teachers who taught junior U.S. History decided to have a shared weekly current event assignment using the GIST strategy. Special education teachers were aware of this expectation and found that this assignment was the most frequently missed assignment at mid-term of the first term by students in the Applied Skills class (transition and homework support). A prompt work sheet to explicitly teach the GIST strategy for training self-determination/self-advocacy skills was developed by the special education teachers and accepted by all social studies teachers as a reasonable accommodation. All 28 students who were enrolled in the special education Applied Skills class were then explicitly taught to use this strategy with the worksheet, and it became a required classroom assignment in this setting. By the end of the second term only three students continued to use the prompt sheet while the rest of the students completed the assignment at the same level expected of their peers. Students were then prepared to self-determine weekly what they would choose to write, or know when to self-advocate and request assistance to complete the assignment independent of additional support. It is not known to what extent any of these strategies that may enhance self-determination/self-advocacy skills are being applied in the classroom of the Davis district.

Statement of the Problem

Without an empirical basis to guide the teaching process, teachers have no guidance in how to deliver instruction in self-determination/self-advocacy. In turn, students with mild/moderate disability, severe disability, or vulnerable and disconnected youth in general education classes may not receive the benefit of effective and systematic instruction in self-determination. As the literature began to establish a need for evidence-based practice, a survey was conducted in 2011 by the Utah State Office of Education that asked LEA representatives to determine what evidence-based practices were currently being used throughout the state. With regard to the construct of self-determination/self-advocacy skills, LEAs were asked “Do students have an opportunity to participate in self-advocacy/self-determination instruction and activities?” Results demonstrated the following: not implemented 11%, implemented sporadically 32%, implemented by many or a focus of training 32%, and school or district-wide consistent practice 26% (S. Loving, personal communication, February 13, 2015). Based on these results the present study was undertaken.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine to what extent teachers across education settings, value, teach, and use self-determination/self-advocacy concepts as part of their curriculum and program structure. Rowe et al. (2014) established one of the essential program characteristics was “collaboration with general education teacher to embed choices into the general curriculum and daily lessons and provide opportunities for student to practice self-determination skills” and set the stage for further research. The success of the previously described collaborative experience, with a shared strategy, was the impetus for the researcher to further investigate the findings of Carter et al. (2008) to

explore what other shared strategies might be “reasonably” implemented. Additional research was deemed appropriate to address whether or not teachers collaborate on strategies, teach students to self-monitor progress, and incorporate an evidence-based self-determination/self-advocacy curriculum.

Research Questions

While the existing research seems to support the importance and inclusion of teaching self-determination across education settings, researchers need to know more about LEA concerns regarding teachers' ability to provide self-determination/self-advocacy instruction to students with disability as this is their perceived greatest challenge to providing transition services. Research is needed to analyze the nature of the teachers' challenges related to self-determination. The study was divided into three sections. Survey Section #3 was a two-part query regarding whether teachers provide instruction or require students to demonstrate self-determination/self-advocacy skills. Survey Section #2 was a query regarding whether teachers use essential program characteristics as defined by Rowe et al. (2014). Survey Section #1 was a query regarding about what strategies, progress measurement, and evidence-based curricula teachers use and require students to generalize to settings outside the classroom. Based on these queries and discussion in previous sections, the following research questions drove the methodology of the study. Sections are addressed by order of the research questions and not by the order determined by the pilot study.

RQ1: To what extent do general education, mild/moderate special education, and severe special education teachers:

- a. Teach self-determination skills in their curricula as measured by a rating scale?

b. Require students to demonstrate self-determination skills as part of their curriculum as measured by application required of students across the term?

RQ2: What essential program characteristics do teachers use to assist students to develop self-determination skills across curriculum as measured by a rating scale?

RQ3: What strategies, progress measurements, or curriculum do teachers use to generalize the instruction to settings outside of the classroom as measured by teachers' selection of alternatives and responses to two open-ended questions?

Nature of the Study

The purpose of this project was to systematically replicate Carter et al. (2008) with the operational definition provided by Rowe et al. (2014) for self-determination/self-advocacy, and thus extend the literature based on the recommendations of Carter et al. (2008) to (a) “explore specific instructional or curricular strategies that education use to teach various self-determination skills in their class rooms” (p. 67), (b) use open-ended avenues to contribute detailed examples, and (c) use questions that ask if teachers value the domain and if they teach them (p. 67). The quantitative survey was intended to ask if (a) teachers teach skill domains based on Rowe et al. recommendations, and (b) require students to demonstrate these skill domains. Using the operational definition of self-determination/self-advocacy and the essential program characteristics established by Rowe et al., teachers across certifications and settings were asked what essential program characteristics they use as part of their classroom structure to generalize the instruction to settings outside of the classroom. This provided information to determine to what extent (a) general education teachers, (b) mild/moderate special education teachers, (c)

alternative high, and (d) severe special education teachers apply self-determination/self-advocacy skills as part of their curriculum.

Every teacher in the Davis school district received a letter of invitation either in person or electronically and resulted in a random selection of participants from among those in (a) general education, (b) special education, (c) alternative high, and (d) 18-22 transition education schools. The invitation to participate and survey were distributed by two methods. First, surveys were distributed by hand to teachers in staff meetings in two of the eight high schools, one of two alternative high settings, and the 18-22 special education program. Second, an electronic survey was distributed through Qualtrics, an electronic survey tool, in which teachers in six high schools, and one alternative high setting, were invited to participate via district email with a link to the electronic survey, which was identical to the paper survey. Details will be found in Section Three.

Definition of Terms

Individualized Education Program (IEP). “An IEP defines the individualized objectives of a child who has been found with a disability, as defined by federal regulations. The IEP is intended to help children reach educational goals more easily than they otherwise would.^[1] In all cases the IEP must be tailored to the individual student's needs as identified by the IEP evaluation process, and must especially help teachers and related service providers (such as paraprofessional educators) understand the student's disability and how the disability affects the learning process” (Kamens, 2004, p. 76).

Evidence-based practices. An evidence-based practice (EBP) is a teaching method used to teach a specific skill that has been shown to be effective based on high-quality research (Cook, Tankersly, & Landrum, 2009; Test, 2012).

Self-determination/self-advocacy. “Self-determination is the ability to make choices, solve problems, set goals, evaluate options, take initiative to reach one’s goals, and accept consequences of one’s actions” (Rowe et al., 2014, p.9).

Literature Review

Learning self-determination skills is essential for all students to ensure they advocate for themselves and participate in a seamless transition from the secondary school setting to a college and a career of choice. These skills are vital for students with disabilities. With no empirical basis to guide a teaching process for self-determination, teachers lack direction. Students with mild/moderate disability, severe disability, or vulnerable and disconnected youth in general education classes may not receive the benefit of effective and systematic instruction in self-determination; thus, the purpose of the study was to determine to what extent teachers in general education, mild/moderate special education, and severe special education promote self-determination concepts as part of their curriculum and program structure. The following review of literature was undertaken to determine the extent of relevant research.

The search of the literature included websites for the Common Core standards, Utah State Office of Education standards (Standards, U.C. (2013, June), and Davis District DESK standards, as well as EBSCO Host database (ERIC and Academic Search Primer), Google Scholar, articles recommended by committee members, and reference sections from relevant articles using the terms *evidence-based special education transition, self-determination, self-determination, Wehmeyer, transition, and transition outcomes*. After reading 21 articles, the search was narrowed to surveys conducted on self-determination. Using the term *self-determination survey; self-determination, survey, transition; self-determination, teacher survey, transition* did not produce any additional

surveys other than the two recommended by the committee. An additional search for self-determination surveys was conducted describing self-determination through the process of a student driven Individualized Education Program (IEP). Terms included: *student driven IEP; student driven IEP, Self-determination; student Driven IEP, self-determination, transition; student driven IEP, self-determination, transition, survey.*

Three additional surveys were located for a total of five. Three survey studies were selected as they provided empirical overview and rationale for (a) opinions of teachers regarding the value of self-determination, (b) promotion of self-determination with high school general and special education teachers, (c) operational definitions and program characteristics of self-determination.

Overview of Evidence-Based Practice and Self-Determination Studies

Educators have not emphasized the importance of research supporting evidence-based practices, which may be the primary reason for disappointing school outcomes (Cook, Smith, & Tankersley, 2012). Cook et al. issued a call to educators requesting that they insist on evidence-based practice research that is supported by a sufficient number of research studies that (a) are of high methodological quality, (b) use appropriate research designs that allow for assessment of effectiveness, and (c) demonstrate meaningful effect sizes such as that they merit educators' trust that the practice work. (p. 495) (Cook et al. (2012). Self-determination was found to be an evidence-based practice by Test, Fowler, Cease-Cook, and Bartholomew (2012) who compiled a review of the evolution of the legal and educational reform. Highlighted in this article were two literature reviews conducted by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC: Test et al., 2009). The first literature review was intended to identify evidence-based

practices taught to secondary students with disabilities. The review found 60 research-based practices. A second systematic review of literature isolated 16 in-school predictors of post-school success. In each review, self-determination was a prevalent construct found to be both an evidence-based practice as well as evidence-based in-school predictor.

A Delphi study, Rowe et al. (2014) operationalized the definitions for 16 evidence-based predictors previously recognized in secondary transition (in Test et al., 2009; 2012). The Delphi method relies on a panel of experts and uses multiple iterations designed to develop a consensus of opinion concerning a specific topic. The Delphi method has been used in disability-related fields to investigate several variables, including college readiness (Milsom & Dietz, 2009).

The overarching goal of Rowe et al. (2014) was to clarify the definitions of the 16 predictors of post-school success as well as to define them such that local educators could know what was necessary to develop, implement and evaluate secondary transition programs that were based on predictor research. Experts in secondary transition "reached consensus on an operational definition and a set of essential program characteristics for each of the 16 predictors" (p. 13). The Davis School District was not included in the Rowe et al. study.

The final operational definition for self-determination/self-advocacy was: "Self-determination is the ability to make choices, solve problems, set goals, evaluate options, take initiative to reach one's goals, and accept consequences of one's actions" (Rowe et al., 2014, p. 9).

The 10 essential program characteristics for self-determination/self-advocacy were defined as:

1. Utilize a student-driven IEP process to allow students to demonstrate self-awareness, goal setting, problem solving, and self-advocacy.
2. Collaborate with general education teachers to embed choices into the general curriculum and daily lessons and provide opportunities for student to practice self-determination skills.
3. Teach students to self-monitor self-determination skills (e.g., accommodation and modifications) and provide opportunities for student to practice the self-monitoring strategy.
4. Ensure all students, including those with significant disabilities, have a functional communication system to engage in choice making, problem solving, goal-setting, taking initiative to reach goals, and accepting consequences for one's actions.
5. Conduct age-appropriate transition assessments for student to learn about themselves, set goals, solve problems, use information, make decisions, and identify long-range goals.
6. Provide opportunities for students to develop self-awareness by engaging in honest and respectful discussions with student about their self-determination assessment responses.
7. Provide direct instruction in self-determination using a structured curriculum or evidence-based instructional strategy, with guided practice in natural school and community-based setting.
8. Foster the development of students' leadership skills.

9. Expect and support students to make many routine choice for themselves through the course of a school day.

10. Work collaboratively with students to facilitate achievement of their goals by informing them of their options and potential consequence of their choices (Rowe et al., 2014).

A student's ability to self-monitor in a given setting is essential to appropriately self-determine/self-advocate. Rowe et al.'s (2014) essential program characteristics nos. 3, 9, and 10 appear to relate to progress measurement. The use of progress measurements that are understood by both the student and the teacher may increase the collaborative relationship between the student and teacher. It is not know to what extent teachers in Davis District provide these essential program characteristics based on Rowe et al.'s (2014) operationally defined predictors.

Although the potential of identifying specific predictors is promising, the “existing research on predictor variables is correlational; and there has been minimal intervention research to demonstrate cause-and-effect” (Morgan & Riesen, in-press, p. 16). The prospect of identifying and measuring these predictors may benefit multidisciplinary teams as they create action plans for change (Rowe, 2014, p. 13). Therefore, the benefit to local multidisciplinary teams of the Delphi study by Rowe et al.(2014), was to operationally define both (a) predictors and (b) essential program characteristics required for further empirical research and local program implementation.

Overview of Selected Surveys

Wehmeyer, Agran, and Hughes (2000) conducted a national survey to obtain the opinions of transition special educators who taught students between the ages of 14

through 21. Researchers questioned if providing instruction related to self-determination was compatible with the general curriculum, and whether students were provided with opportunities to learn and apply these skills in general education classrooms (Wehmeyer et al., p. 58). Completed surveys from 1,219 special educators including responses from all 50 states were obtained. The survey was comprised of two sections. The first section included demographic information, grade level assignment, and disabilities served. The second section consisted of questions that asked respondents to rate their knowledge of the seven self-determination component elements, define the term, and identify all sources from which they had learned about the term. Elements included (a) choice-making, (b) decision-making, (c) problem-solving, (d) goal-setting and attainment, (e) self-advocacy, (f) self-management and self-regulation, and (g) self-awareness and self-knowledge. Findings indicated that 60% of secondary respondents were familiar with the concept of self-determination and rated instruction as “moderately important” or “very important.” Respondents also indicated that skills in self-determination would be “very helpful” as students transitioned to post-school settings, and would benefit students in their current settings as well. Self-report of teachers’ use of self-management strategies was encouraging and mirrored results of research conducted by Agran, Snow and Swaner (1999). The researchers found that although instruction of the components was regarded as important, results of the application of self-determination had mixed results as only 22% of respondents said their students had IEP goals that addressed self-determination, 31% responded that none of their students had goals in this area, and 30% reported that students were not involved in their educational planning. Further analysis of the data indicated that those who taught students with mild/moderate disability were less likely to

respond “Yes” to the response that self-determination provided “no benefit,” while teachers who taught those with more severe disabilities were more likely to respond, “Yes” to the “no benefit” option. The researchers provided additional evidence to promote self-determination for all students with disability, especially those with severe limitations.

Carter, Lane, Pierson, and Stang (2008) systematically replicated the Wehmeyer et al. (2000) survey. The purpose of the Carter et al. (2008) study was to extend the research of Wehmeyer et al. and included the use of the same or similar questions, but submit them to general as well as special educators. Questions pertained to how high school teachers evaluated the importance of providing instruction in each of the seven self-determination skill domains, to what extent high school teachers actually deliver instruction in each of these domains, if general and special educators shared similar priorities in the area of self-determination, and if similar opportunities existed for receiving self-determination instruction across diverse curricula areas. Participants were 340 educators in a Western state in three school districts across eight high schools. These secondary schools reflected a national representation with regard to size and socioeconomic level. Examples were provided to assist all teachers in understanding what each self-determination element/domain meant. Survey questions coupled with examples enabled respondents to evaluate their classroom without a specific reference to student disability status. Each domain had an additional question to ascertain the amount of time educators spent on each area of self-determination.

The findings of Carter et al. (2008) suggested three outcomes: (a) Educators recognized the importance of self-determination domains and were open to “adapting or

augmenting their curriculum in ways that support acquisition of these skills” (p. 64); (b) general and special educators both rated self-determination as important; and (c) educators ratings of the importance of self-determination correlated with the ratings of the amount of instructional time they allocated to teaching domain elements. Lacking from the Carter et al. (2008) study was a measurement “to which students receive high-quality instructional methods and materials . . . and whether instruction in self-determination was adapted, altered, or enhanced for students with disabilities” (p. 65).

Carter et al. (2008) inferred:

Students with disabilities may need much more explicit, systematic, and applied instruction to acquire some self-determination skills. Future research should document specific approaches to teaching skills that promote self-determined behavior in the general education classrooms, as well as the strategies educators use to adapt, augment, and alter the curriculum to help youth with disabilities access these critical learning opportunities. (p. 66)

The review of literature revealed a lack of consistency or application of pedagogy for teaching self-determination skills among high school populations. Without an empirical basis to guide the teaching process, teachers have no guidance in how to deliver instruction in self-determination. In turn, students with mild/moderate disability, severe disability, or youth in general education who are vulnerable and disconnected may not receive the benefit of effective and systematic instruction in self-determination. The review of literature did not reveal any studies of self-determination curricula or pedagogy in the Davis school district. Further research is needed to determine the curricula or pedagogy that can be used to teach self-determination/self-advocacy across teacher certifications and settings, which was the objective of the present study.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent teachers in general education, mild/moderate special education, severe special education, alternative high, and transition education value, teach or use self-determination concepts as part of their curriculum and program structure. The following is a description of the methods that were implemented to conduct the proposed study.

Method

Participants and Setting

All teacher participants in the study worked in the Davis school district of Utah. At the time of the study, the district had eight high schools, two alternative high school settings, and one transition education campus. All general education, special education, alternative high, and transition education teachers in the district were invited to participate. Administrators, related services, and non-certified positions were not included. This sample was selected to include all teachers who are responsible for assisting students as they prepare for transition from their general and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) setting to their post-high setting of choice.

Development of the Three-Part Questionnaire

Survey sections included the following: Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy, Essential Program Characteristics, and Strategies, Progress Measurements and Curricula.

Survey section #3 self-determination/self-advocacy. The structure of this section was derived from previous research, including replication with extension of questions previously asked. In this section, the survey format for Questions 1 and 2 was similar to questions found Wehmeyer et al. (2000) and Carter et al. (2008), but used an

operational definition from Rowe et al. (2014). To extend the Carter et al. (2008) research, teachers were provided the following statements to fill in the blank: (a) “My students receive instruction in (insert domain),” and “My curriculum includes opportunities for students to demonstrate their ability to (insert domain).” These questions offered teachers a rating scale from No Instruction (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), and Very High (5) instruction. (Appendix A contains the complete questionnaire).

Questions 3 through 8 asked teachers a series of questions developed from the concept of explicit instruction presented by Archer and Hughes (2011). Questions 3a-8a asked if students received instruction in each of the instructional domains (make choices, problem solve, set goals, evaluate options, take initiative to reach one’s goals, and accept consequences of one’s actions). Questions 3b-8b asked those who responded affirmatively to also indicate how the student is required to demonstrate what they learned in that domain. That is, respondents could choose from (a) curriculum unit, (b) curriculum unit and practice all term as part of the class structure, (c) students provide examples of where they are (insert domain) in real life throughout the term, or (d) other. Questions 3c – 8c asked teachers to identify their use of (a) teacher-developed plans, (b) published curriculum, (c) teacher-adapted published curriculum, and (d) teacher-adapted published curriculum. Questions 3b-8b and 3c-8c allowed for open-ended responses as recommended by Carter et al. (2008). (Appendix A contains the complete questionnaire).

Survey section #2 essential program characteristics. This section asked teachers to rate how often they used the essential program characteristics, operationally defined as important by Rowe et al. (2014), with a rating scale (1=Never, 5=Always).

Rowe et al. (2014) provided 10 essential program characteristics to support self-determination/self-advocacy. These characteristics had minor adaptations to a common language shared by general and special educators. Two of these essential characteristics were divided into two questions to provide clarity for a total of 12 questions. Similar to Carter et al. (2008), seven of the questions included an example to provide clarity.

Language was used in the section called Program Characteristics that sought to differentiate self-determination and self-advocacy. Questions two through six measured self-determination being taught by using language such as “receive instruction.” In questions seven through 11, language such as “demonstrate,” “apply,” and “accept” were used to measure demonstration of self-advocacy.

The operational definition from Rowe et al. (2014) was used throughout the survey to define self-determination/self-advocacy. The resulting survey for the present study was comprised of three sections. Section 1 addressed with Demographics, Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy, Section 2 addressed with Program Characteristics, and Section 3 addressed with Strategies, Progress Measurements and Curricula.

Survey section #1 strategies, progress measurement, and curricula. Two self-determination surveys (Carter et al., 2008; Wehmeyer et al., 2000) were systematically reviewed and analyzed for content and appropriateness of the questions. In addition, a survey available online and authored by Askvig (2013) was perused. Askvig was contacted directly and granted permission to extrapolate the list of self-determination curriculum cited in the article. A summary of this review of the three questionnaires produced an initial list of special education self-determination questions and curriculum.

Carter et al. (2008) made a case based on the literature that educators should make “efforts to ensure that youth are equipped to direct activities, align the activities with their personal goals, advocate for their preference and needs, make informed choice, decide for themselves how they will achieve their goals, and assume responsibility for their actions” (p. 55). Based on the recommendations of Carter et al., (a) Teaching Strategies, (b) Progress Measurements, and (c) Curricula were probed to “explore specific instructional or curricular strategies that education uses to teach various skills in their classrooms” (p. 67). Carter et al. and Wehmeyer (2015) recommended including all educators in such research. As a result, the present study included a search of the district curriculum website for language and content that would be relevant to all classroom settings. Teachers were asked to identify: (a) strategies used in the 1-day training and found on the website; (b) measurements of progress they used in the classroom, (c) curriculum they knew and used, from a provided list with the instructions to “Please mark *Know* if you have heard of the curricula, mark *Use* if you use the curricula, and mark *Unaware* if you are not familiar with the curricula.” These curricula were taken from the previously reviewed studies with the exception of three curricula used for planning and goal setting. These were: SMART Goals, 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens, and Utahfutures.org. These were commonly available in the high school setting and teachers throughout the district have used these to assist students with learning to set goals.

Procedures

A letter asking permission to engage in the study was sent to the Principals of the schools selected for participation in the study (Appendix A). Additionally, consent was obtained from the district special education director and eight high

school administrations. Once permission was received, an application to approve the research project was submitted to the Institutional Review Board. The application was approved after which a letter and consent form asking potential participants to participate in the study was presented in person or sent by email to the teachers (Appendix B).

Pilot study procedure. The pilot study had three objectives: (a) to administer the questionnaire to a small number of participants to refine the questions, (b) to observe the procedure, and (c) to conduct a preliminary data analysis to determine the efficacy of the methodology (Yin, 2011).

Seven teachers who were not in the participant pool were selected to participate in the pilot study. Feedback on the questionnaire was obtained in each of the certification and setting categories. Pilot teachers answered questions regarding each section of the survey such as what items/questions are not clear, how would you clarify, and were you able to differentiate items and rationale/intent. Based on this feedback the survey was broken into sections and minor adjustments were incorporated. None of the results from the pilot test were incorporated into the body of data obtained from the main study.

Main study procedure. To obtain the sample, two methods were offered: paper and pencil, and an electronic version. The survey instruments were administered anonymously. School administrators chose whether their staff would participate by paper and pencil or through an electronic format. Principals were encouraged to allow their special education teachers to participate by paper and pencil method.

Teachers in two traditional schools, one alternative high and the 18-22 special education school settings participated by filling out a paper and pencil survey distributed

in staff meetings to general and special education staff. The researcher presented to these high school teachers the following information:

1. The purpose of the survey.
2. Informed consent form.
3. Instructions regarding how to complete the survey.

The electronic version of the survey was preferred at the remaining six schools and one alternative high with two administrations asking their special and general education staff to participate electronically. There was no duplication of electronic and paper copies of the survey by special educators.

All teachers in two high schools, general educators in six high schools and one alternative high participated electronically with special education teachers in four high school settings participating with paper copies. The high school administrator or department head were previously trained by the researcher and followed a prepared script and checklist to ensure consistency. These same instructions were used in the survey email to general educators in these settings.

The electronic survey was delivered via district email with a link to Qualtrics. An initial email was sent to all high school general/special education teachers. As no identifying information was collected, all potential online participants received two follow up reminder emails at 1 week intervals. The email expressed appreciation to those who had responded and encouraged participation for those who had not yet completed the survey.

Data Analysis

Demographic data were analyzed descriptively. Because of the small n in many of these groups, this information was combined into certifications and settings.

Questions with rating scale responses were grouped according to response and included the calculation of means and standard deviations. Open-ended questions were grouped and coded by similar responses to ascertain patterns. Two of the open-ended questions produced very short responses and were not included in the results of the study as it was deemed of little value. Data analysis were completed by the researcher and analyzed descriptively with tables showing (a) frequencies of responses, (b) percentages, and (c) means and standard deviations on rating scores.

Ethical Assurances

Academy of Management (2011) defined three principles that should govern the code of ethics relative to research efforts summarized here as responsibility, integrity, and respect for people's rights and dignity. Care was taken to ensure that the participants understood the nature of the study and that their contribution was voluntary. No repercussions existed if participants declined or withdrew from the study. No information regarding participation was communicated to the Davis school district. Confidentiality of data was maintained at all times. These conditions were communicated to participants prior to their participation in the survey.

Although the survey included demographic questions for the purpose of categorizing the responses, no identifying features relative to participants were included. Respondents were provided with the option to terminate the survey at any time; however,

only surveys with all questions in a given section answered were included in the analysis of data, with the exception of eight outliers in Section #2 that all came from the general education population. All accumulated data relevant to the study will be retained in a secure environment for 5 years, after which it will be destroyed.

Results and Discussion

Demographics, Certifications and Settings

This survey was completed by 224 general education, 37 mild/moderate special education, 10 severe special education, 28 alternative high general educators, five alternative high special educators, three transition special educators' mild/moderate, and eight special education severe teachers in a suburban school district in the Western U.S. Slightly more females responded to the survey compared to males. (see Table 1).

A fairly even distribution was represented in the number of years taught, with 0-5 and 6-10 years representing 43% of the participants (see Table 2).

Teacher's level of education was nearly evenly represented with just over half having completed a bachelor's degree and the rest having completed a master's degree or higher. (see Table 3).

Table 1

Gender of Participants

Gender	Frequency	% of total respondents
Male	146	45
Female	175	55

Table 2

Years of Experience

Years	Frequency	% of total respondents
0-5 years	73	23
6-10 years	65	20
11-15 years	36	11
15-20 years	53	17
21-25 years	42	13
26+ years	52	16

Table 3

Level of Education

Degree	Frequency	% of total respondents
Bachelors	168	52
Masters	152	47
Doctorate	1	0

Table 4

Certification(s)

Certification	Frequency	% of total respondents
General education	255	79
SPED Mild/Moderate	51	16
SPED Severe	17	5
Other	32	10

Note: Respondents could select multiple categories.

“Other” was examined for patterns and found that a proportionate number of responses were represented in each certification (see Table 4). These responses were not used for further analysis; rather, question 6 was used instead as the “other” ($n=6$ rather than $n=32$).

Teachers represented subjects across the curriculum content areas (see Table 5). “Other” involved mostly Business, CTE, and Drivers Education. Question 6 was used instead as the “other” ($n=6$ rather than $n=88$).

Table 5

Subjects(s) Taught

Subject Area	Frequency	% of total respondents
Humanities	10	3
Language Arts	89	28
Mathematics	68	21
Sciences	51	16
Social Studies	64	20
Foreign Language	13	4
Physical Education	25	8
Related Arts	32	10
Vocational	51	16
Other	88	27

Note: Respondents could select multiple categories.

Table 6

Primary Teaching Assignment

Assignment	Frequency	Total % potential respondents
General education	224	46
SPED Mild/Moderate	32	82
SPED Self-contained Mild/Moderate	5	71
SPED Severe	10	76
SPED Co-teaching in General education	0	0
Alt. High General education	28	87
Alt. High SPED Mild/Moderate	5	83
Alt. High SPED Severe	0	0
18-22 SPED Mild/Moderate	3	100
18-22 SPED Severe	8	100
Other	6	0

General education teachers represented the majority of respondents, although only 46% of general educators responded to the survey. Higher response rates were obtained from mild/moderate, severe special education, alternative high, and 18-22 special education respondents. Although 100% of 18-22 special education teachers participated, caution should be given to the results due to the overall low number of participants.

Each of the three sections of the survey was analyzed by the number of participants that completed each section (see Table 6). Due to the low n in several categories original responses were grouped into the following; All Teachers, Certification, and Settings.

All Teachers. This category included all participants in the survey.

Certifications. This category was comprised of (a) general education, general education and alternative high general education teachers; (b) mild/moderate special education; mild/moderate special education, mild/moderate self-contained, mild/moderate 18-22; and (c) severe; severe, 18-22 severe.

Settings. Participant responses were grouped as either *Standard*; (a) general education, standard high school setting; (b) Special education; mild/moderate special education, mild/moderate self-contained, severe, and standard high school setting; *Non Standard*; (c) Alternative high; alternative high general education, alternative high special education, non-standard high school setting, and (d) 18-22 special education; 18-22 mild/moderate, 18-22 severe, non-standard high school setting.

Table 7

Participants: All Teachers, Certification, and Setting

Assignment	Section #3 <i>n</i>	Section #2 <i>n</i>	Section #1 <i>n</i>
Total for Participants			
All Teachers	285	303	315
Total for Certification			
General education	198	242	252
M/M Special Education	38	43	47
Severe	17	18	18
Total for Setting			
General education	N/A	215	224
Special Education	N/A	46	47
Alternative High	N/A	31	33
18-22 SPED	N/A	11	11
Other <i>n</i> =6 not included			

The difference in participation number in each section was due to outliers, which included participants who either did not complete the section on the questionnaires, missed a question on the questionnaires, or dropped out electronically.

As demonstrated in Tables 1-7, teachers in the Davis district represented a cross section of all subjects taught, number of years of experience, all certifications, and settings. Demographic information was regrouped by *certification* and *setting* to examine relevant findings.

Survey Section #3 Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy (Note: Results are discussed in order of research questions rather than the order of the survey as determined by the pilot study).

Receive instruction and demonstrate domain, instruction. Tables 8a, 8b, and 8c present data on instruction and demonstration of different domains.

The researcher found that *All Teachers* rated self-determination/self-advocacy domains as a high priority with 60% reporting that they valued providing instruction in these domains. Only 10% indicated they did not value this type of instruction.

Accept consequences was the highest rated domain with most respondents reporting that they provided instruction and asked students to demonstrate skills. This was followed by the domain *solve problems*. All other domains were averaged less than 70% with *set goals* having the lowest mean in both providing instruction and student demonstration of the domain.

Table 8a

All Teachers: Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations

Domains	Low (1-2)		Moderate (3)		High (4-5)		M (SD)
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Make Choices							
Instruction	34	11%	81	28%	171	60%	3.66 (.95)
Demonstration	17	6%	60	21%	210	73%	3.93 (.83)
Solve Problems							
Instruction	9	3%	64	22%	213	74%	4.02 (.81)
Demonstration	7	3%	55	19%	225	79%	4.11 (.76)
Set Goals							
Instruction	38	10%	103	36%	145	51%	3.51 (.96)
Demonstration	43	11%	90	31%	164	66%	3.61 (.98)
Evaluate Options							
Instruction	27	10%	89	31%	170	60%	3.71 (.90)
Demonstration	24	8%	82	29%	181	63%	3.73 (.98)
Take Initiative							
Instruction	27	2%	82	29%	178	62%	3.73 (.93)
Demonstration	22	8%	70	39%	187	63%	3.82 (.91)
Accept Consequences							
Instruction	10	4%	45	16%	231	91%	4.11 (.82)
Demonstration	8	3%	49	17%	230	80%	4.09 (.77)

Other *n*=5 not included

Results were grouped and presented by (a) percentages, and (b) rankings across domains. Data showed a range of 51-73% which was similar to Carter et al. (2008). Both studies showed *problem solving* had a high ranking. In Carter et al. (2008), *set goals* was ranked fourth of seven domains. This study found that the domain *set goals* was ranked sixth of six with regard to instruction and demonstrate. These responses were further examined by mean scores of *All Teachers*, and by *Certification*.

Table 8b

Means and Standard Deviations of Instruction and Demonstration Ratings by Certification

Instructional Domains	All Teachers	General Education	SPED M/M	SPED Severe
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Make Choices				
Instruction	3.66 (0.95)	3.57 (0.95)	3.81 (0.96)	4.17 (0.70)
Demonstrate	3.93 (0.83)	3.91 (0.82)	3.93 (0.94)	4.11 (0.83)
Solve Problems				
Instruction	4.02 (0.81)	4.04 (0.81)	4.02 (0.90)	3.83 (0.85)
Demonstrate	4.11 (0.76)	4.14 (0.77)	4.01 (0.96)	3.94 (0.99)
Set Goals				
Instruction	3.51 (0.96)	3.53 (0.96)	3.54 (1.00)	3.00 (1.08)
Demonstrate	3.61 (0.98)	3.64 (0.96)	3.64 (1.00)	3.11(1.18)
Evaluate Options				
Instruction	3.71 (0.90)	3.77 (0.89)	3.59 (0.97)	3.17 (0.92)
Demonstrate	3.73 (0.88)	3.76 (0.87)	3.76 (0.98)	3.28 (0.95)
Take Initiative				
Instruction	3.73 (0.93)	3.77 (0.92)	3.74 (0.98)	3.11 (0.96)
Demonstrate	3.82 (0.91)	3.85 (0.89)	3.88 (0.96)	3.17 (0.98)
Accept Consequences				
Instruction	4.11 (0.82)	4.09 (0.82)	4.19 (0.77)	4.11 (1.02)
Demonstrate	4.09 (0.77)	4.09 (0.75)	4.07 (0.89)	3.94 (0.99)
<i>n=</i>	281	221	42	18

When examining *teacher certification* and *setting*, mean scores were similar. Data are presented by *teacher certification* as they represent a higher number of responses than by individual teaching assignment or setting (Table 8b). Caution should still be taken in interpreting severe certification data due to the low number of responses.

Mean scores for *All Teachers* ranged from 3.51 to 4.11. The difference between *instruction* and *demonstrate* had a range of only .02-.09 in each domain, with the exception of *set goals*, which had the greatest mean difference between instruction and demonstration of the domain with a difference of .27. This finding may indicate that teachers teach and require students to demonstrate self-determination/self-advocacy domains that they value.

Severe respondents' scores were similar to general education and mild/moderate special education respondents for the domains *make choices*, *solve problems*, and *accept consequences*. Three domains had a greater than -.5 differences, which were *set goals*, *evaluate options*, and *take initiative*.

Table 8b and 8c showed that *solve problems* and *accept consequences* are both the highest ranked and *set goals* continued to be the lowest ranked.

As shown in Tables 8a, Table 8b, and Table 8c, *All Teachers* responded similar to Carter et al. (2008) in that instruction and demonstration of *self-determination/self-*

Table 8c

*All Teachers Mean
Scores*

Instruction	<i>M</i>	Demonstration	<i>M</i>
Accept Consequences	4.11 (0.82)	Solve Problems	4.11 (0.77)
Solve Problems	4.02 (0.81)	Accept Consequences	4.09 (0.76)
Take Initiative	3.73 (0.93)	Make Choices	3.93 (0.91)
Evaluate Options	3.71 (0.90)	Take Initiative	3.82 (0.88)
Make Choices	3.66 (0.95)	Evaluate Options	3.71 (0.93)
Set Goals	3.51 (0.96)	Set Goals	3.61 (0.98)

advocacy domains were something they valued as high priorities. Unlike Carter et al. (2008) and Wehmeyer (2000) who found *set goals* was rated as a moderate priority, the Davis district ranked it sixth out of six domains. This finding was similar to Toma (2002).

While teachers reported that they valued the instruction and demonstration of *self-determination/self-advocacy* domains it was not known to what extent teachers used evidence-based curriculum or required students to demonstrate these skills. Table 9 shows how many teachers in each certification taught *self-determination/self-advocacy* domains. Tables 10a and 10b revealed to what extent teachers (a) used evidence-based curriculum and/or (b) required students to demonstrate these skills throughout the term.

Receive instruction and demonstrate domain, application. Teachers in this study showed a similar pattern consistent with findings previously stated (see Table 8) with regards to *solve problems* and *accept consequences* as high, and *set goals* as low (see Table 9).

As shown in Table 10a, very few teachers across certification and across each domain reported teaching *self-determination/self-advocacy* as a “Unit”. Rather, teachers were typically divided between “Practice all term,” and “Use in real-life.” Consistently across each domain, percentage scores increased for “use in real-life” as the teacher certification, or an increased need for specialized service, increased. Although participants in all certifications addressed *self-determination/self-advocacy* domains; it became evident that the greater the student service need, the greater the proportions of teacher instruction in the domain and the required application for students to

Table 9

Receive Instruction by Percent for Domains

Instructional Domains	Responses	General Education		SPED Mild/Moderate		SPED Severe	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Make Choices	Yes	161	73%	36	86%	17	94%
	No	59	27%	6	14%	1	6%
Solve Problems	Yes	198	90%	38	90%	16	89%
	No	22	10%	4	10%	2	11%
Set Goals	Yes	133	60%	31	74%	9	50%
	No	87	40%	11	26%	9	50%
Evaluate Options	Yes	167	76%	34	81%	11	61%
	No	53	24%	8	19%	7	39%
Take Initiative	Yes	136	62%	31	74%	8	44%
	No	84	38%	11	26%	10	56%
Accept Consequences	Yes	176	80%	34	81%	16	89%
	No	44	20%	8	19%	2	11%
Total Responses <i>n</i> =		220		42		18	

Table 10a

Demonstration by Percent for Domains

Demonstrate/Practice Domain	General Education		SPED M/M		SPED Severe	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Make Choices						
Teach as Unit	13	8%	6	17%	1	6%
Practiced all Term	59	37%	7	19%	3	18%
Use in Real Life	81	50%	21	58%	10	59%
Total Responses = 201	153		34		14	
Solve Problems						
Teach as Unit	22	11%	5	13%	0	0%
Practiced all Term	82	41%	10	26%	3	19%
Use in Real Life	88	44%	22	58%	10	63%
Total Responses = 242	192		37		13	
Set Goals						
Teach as Unit	25	19%	2	6%	1	11%
Practiced all Term	52	39%	12	39%	3	33%
Use in Real Life	51	38%	15	48%	4	44%
Total Responses = 165	128		29		8	
Evaluate Options						
Teach as Unit	34	20%	6	18%	1	9%
Practiced all Term	75	45%	11	32%	2	18%
Use in Real Life	55	33%	14	41%	7	64%
Total Responses = 205	164		31		10	
Take Initiative						
Teach as Unit	22	16%	3	10%	0	0%
Practiced all Term	51	38%	5	16%	2	25%
Use in Real Life	59	43%	21	68%	6	75%
Total Responses = 169	132		29		8	
Accept Consequences						
Teach as Unit	27	15%	3	9%	0	0%
Practiced all Term	67	38%	8	24%	3	19%
Use in Real Life	76	43%	21	62%	11	69%
Total Responses = 216	170		32		14	

Note: One response for each category whose response was YES to Q 3b-8b.
Total counted responses as Other $n=2-8$ was not included

demonstrate and practice in real life situations. General education teachers may assume that students can generalize content in the classroom setting to real life and therefore, provide less explicit instruction.

Demonstration of domains. When open-ended responses were analyzed, one response to *Accept Consequences* indicated that a Level System was used to help students demonstrate this domain by mild/moderate education. All other questions seemed to fit within the parameters of the questions and did not lend additional information when coded.

Table 10b

Open-Ended Responses for Demonstration of Domains

Domain	Setting and Assignment (M/M, Self-C M/M, Severe)
--------	--------------------------------------------------

Make Choices

General Education

Class problems require one to make a choice.
Verbally tell of choices they have made and will make.
Process of elimination to determine what the best choice
Curricular context as well as career choice context.

Special Education 10-12 grade

M/M	The student is taught life skills as it pertains to the current lesson.
Self-C M/M	Non-sequential lessons particularly dealing with prioritization.
Severe	Decisions about daily wants and needs. Chose what to do next, what activities to participate in.

Alternative High

They must determine by their choices progress grade for the week.
Choices and their consequences are embedded in district texts.
Skill groups using *Aggression Replacement Training*.

Special Education 18-22

Employment, Internship, Community Choices

Solve Problems

General Education

Student provide real life examples throughout the term.

Analysis of the situation, possible outcomes, actions .

Real life patterns.

Special Education 10-12 grade

Various assignments as associated with the lesson.

No response given.

M/M
Self-C M/M

Non-sequential lessons particularly dealing with prioritization.

Severe

Daily problem solving opportunities.

Generate situations from their day to day activities.

Alternative High

Reflect on term's assignments - set goals for coming term.

Special Education 18-22

Career and Independent Goals.

Set Goals**General Education**

Set goals at the beginning of the term.

Teacher guided activity.

Special Education 10-12 grade

Model the process.

Students are constantly problem .

Measure by tracker and observations.

M/M

Daily opportunity.

Self-C M/M

Trackers.

Severe

District texts.

Alternative High

Aggression Replacement Training.

Special Education 18-22

Career and independent goals.

Evaluate Options**General Education**

Model the process.

Problem solving.

Special Education 10-12 grade

No response given.

M/M

Self-C M/M

Non-sequential lessons particularly dealing with prioritization.

Severe

Daily problem solving opportunities.

Generate situations from their day to day activities.

Alternative High

Students are required to plan assignments, attendance, etc.

Aggression Replacement Training.

Special Education 10-12 grade

	No response given
Take Initiative	
	General Education
	Instruction offered as lesson early in year.
	Updates often and modifications if needed.
	"What do you need to do in order for _____ to happen?"
	The first step is determining the first step, and then take action.
	Updates often and modifications if needed.
	Special Education 10-12 grade
M/M	Various assignments as associated with the lesson.
	Individual goals each term.
Self-C M/M	No response given.
Severe	No response given.
	Alternative High
	Group home sessions and groups help support these goals.
	Special Education 18-22
	No response given.
Accept Consequences	
	General Education
	No response given.
	Special Education 10-12 grade
M/M	Self-developed/case by case.
	Level system.
Self-C M/M	Non-sequential lessons particularly dealing with prioritization.
Severe	Day to day situation.
	Use student's life to teach them to accept consequences.
	Daily opportunity to practice.
	Alternative High
	Group home sessions and group help support these goals.
	The very nature of our school teaches choices and consequences.
	<i>Aggression Replacement Training.</i>
	Special Education 18-22
	No response given.

When teachers were asked, "The curriculum or method I use to teach (insert domain)" they reported using their own teacher-developed curricula over evidence-based published curricula. General education teachers responded to indicate that they used their own curriculum with a range of 77%-88% across *self-determination/self-advocacy*

domains. Mild/moderate special education respondents also reported high rates of using their own curricula. Severe special education reported using their own curricula at lower rates with more variability.

Similar to Table 10a, the more specialized the setting, the more likely the teacher reported using evidence-based curricula. Teachers who work in more specialized settings may be more familiar and understand the value of using evidence-based curriculum.

Tables 11b, 11c, and 11d show responses to open-ended responses according to each domain and will be discussed after all three tables are presented.

Table 11a

Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Using Specific Curricula

Curriculum Used	General Education		SPED M/M		SPED Severe	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Make Choices						
Teacher Developed	129	80%	24	67%	12	71%
Published Curriculum	8	5%	4	11%	1	6%
Teacher-Adapted	15	9%	6	17%	2	12%
Responses = 214	161		36		17	
Solve Problems						
Teacher Developed	166	84%	28	74%	12	75%
Published Curriculum	6	3%	4	11%	1	6%
Teacher-Adapted	18	9%	4	11%	1	6%
Responses = 240	190		36		14	
Set Goals						
Teacher Developed	103	77%	23	74%	4	44%
Published Curriculum	12	9%	1	3%	1	11%
Teacher-Adapted	11	8%	5	16%	3	33%
Responses = 163	126		29		8	
Evaluate Options						
Teacher Developed	145	87%	28	82%	7	64%
Published Curriculum	6	4%	2	6%	1	9%

Teacher-Adapted	12	7%	2	6%	2	18%
Responses = 205	163		32		10	
Take Initiative						
Teacher Developed	114	84%	24	77%	5	63%
Published Curriculum	5	4%	1	3%	1	13%
Teacher-Adapted	11	8%	5	16%	1	13%
Responses = 167	130		30		7	
Accept Consequences						
Teacher Developed	155	88%	25	74%	11	69%
Published Curriculum	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Teacher-Adapted	9	5%	4	12%	1	6%
Responses = 207	166		29		12	

Note: One response for each category whose response was YES to Q 3c-8c.
Total counted responses as Other $n=1-10$ was not included

Table 11b

Curriculum Used to Teach Domains: Make Choices, Solve Problems

Domain responses to 3c-8c	Make Choices (3c)	Solve Problems (4c)
Teacher Developed $n=$	129	166
No curriculum requested	No response required	No response required
Published Curriculum $n=$	8	6
General Education	District Text(s)	District Text(s)
	NEFE Financial Planning	NEFE Financial Planning
	Dave Ramsey	Problem/Solution Essay
	SMART	
	State provided curriculum	
	Transmath	
M/M Special Education	District Text(s)	No response given
	Executive Function Skills	
	Carnegie	
	Gradpoint	
Alternative High	No response given	No response given
18-22 Special Education	Circles	No response given
	Job Smart	
	Make Choices	Solve Problems
Teacher Adapted $n=$	15	8
General Education	District Texts	District Texts
		NEFE Financial Planning

		Take Charge Today (FEFE) Carnegie Why Try? Cognitive Reasoning Love and Life Empowerment
M/M Special Education	No Responses listed	No Responses listed
Severe		Life Centered Education Aggression Replacement
Alternative High		No response was listed
18-22 Special Education	Life Centered Education 10 Sigma	
Other	9	8
General Education	Classroom Instruction Real Life Experiences Classroom Choices State Competencies	Journals Projects Real Life Experiences NATEF.org State Curriculum Collaboration with Teachers
M/M Special Education	No response given	No response given
Severe	No response given	No response given
Alternative High	7 Habits	Anger Replacement Training
18-22 Special Education	School-wide model Trackers Natural teaching moments	Reality Therapy No response given

District texts listed include: Holt, Winston, Reinhardt, Prentice Hall

Table 11c

Curriculum Used to Teach Domains: Set Goals, Evaluate Options

	Set Goals (5c)	Evaluate Options (6c)
Domain responses to 3c-8c		
Teacher Developed <i>n</i> =	103	145
No curriculum requested	No response required	No response required
Published Curriculum <i>n</i> =	12	6
General Education	District Text(s)	District Text(s)
	NEFE Financial Planning	NEFE Financial Planning
	Dave Ramsey	Dave Ramsey

		SMART State provided curriculum Financial Lit for Teens 7 Habits	Financial Lit for Teens 7 Habits
M/M Special Education Alternative High 18-22 Special Education		No response given No response given Circles Job Smart Set Goals	Carnegie Math No response given Circles Job Smart Evaluate Options
Teacher Adapted General Education	<i>n=</i> 11	SMART Goals Take Charge Today (FEFE) Why Try? Cognitive Reasoning Love and Life Empowerment	12 District Texts
M/M Special Education Severe Alternative High 18-22 Special Education		No Responses listed Life Centered Education SMART Goals	Why Try? Life Centered Education Cognitive Reasoning Love and Life Empowerment Life Centered Education SMART Goals Evaluate Options
Other General Education	7	No response given	4 NATEF.org Class Environment
M/M Special Education Severe Alternative High 18-22 Special Education		Student input for IEP goals No response given Anger Replacement Training Reality Therapy No response given	No response given No response given Anger Replacement Training Reality Therapy No response given

District texts listed include: Holt, Winston, Reinhardt, Prentice Hall

Table 11d

Curriculum Used to Teach Domains: Take Initiative, Accept Consequences

	Take Initiative (7c)	Accept Consequences (8c)
Domain responses to 3c-8c		
Teacher Developed <i>n</i> =	114	155
No curriculum requested	No response required	No response required
Published Curriculum <i>n</i> =	5	2
General Education	District Text(s)	District Text(s)
	NEFE Financial Planning	NEFE Financial Planning
	Financial Lit for Teens	Financial Lit for Teens
	7 Habits	7 Habits
M/M Special Education	No response given	No response given
Alternative High	No response given	No response given
18-22 Special Education	Circles	
	Job Smart	
	Take initiative	Natural Consequences
Teacher Adapted <i>n</i> =	11	9
General Education	District Texts	District Texts
	Financeintheclassroom.org	Love and Life Empowerment
M/M Special Education	Why Try?	Why Try?
Severe	Life Centered Education	Life Centered Education
	Anger Replacement Training	
	Anger Control Chain	
Alternative High	Why Try?	
	Reconnecting Youth	
	Cognitive Reasoning	
	Love and Empowerment	
18-22 Special Education	Life Centered Education	Life Centered Education
	Take initiative	Natural Consequences
Other	6	10
General Education	NATEF.org	NATEF.org
		State curriculum
		Student choice options
		Extra credit
		Class environment
		Grades
M/M Special Education	No response given	No Response Given
Severe	Level System	Natural teaching moments

Alternative High	Anger Replacement Training Reality Therapy	Anger Replacement Training Reality Therapy
18-22 Special Education	Life Center Education	Trackers

Note: More than one response could be given
District texts included Holt, Winston, Reinhardt, Prentice Hall

Teacher responses in Tables 11b, 11c, 11d, “Please name the curricula” demonstrated that there was limited evidence-based curricula that were used across settings. Severe and 18-22 special education respondents indicated they were more likely to use evidence-based curricula than mild/moderate special education, or the general education respondents. Use of curriculum with shared features were demonstrated across *self-determination/self-advocacy* domains (e.g. make choices, solve problems, set goals) rather than for each domain. This may imply that teachers use the same curriculum to teach each of the domains and may indicate a lack of understanding of how to approach teaching each of self-determination/self-advocacy domains with evidence-based curriculum as previously demonstrated in Survey Section #3.

Four district texts were named as well as reference to district and State curricula. This finding may support the growing view in the literature that self-determination can and should be taught in the general education setting and that the skills needed to become self-determined can and do align with general education content (American Institutes of Research, 2014; Bartholomew, Papy, McConnell, & Cease-Cook, 2015; Eisenman, Pell, Poudel, & Pleet-Odel, 2014).

Survey Section #2 Essential Program Characteristics

This section of the study was to establish what *essential program characteristics* teachers used to assist students in developing self-determination/self-advocacy skills in the Davis District. Table 12a and 12b provide results of teachers according to (a) *standard* and (b) *non-standard* teaching assignment. Table 12c presents differences between mean scores grouped by *certifications* and Table 12d shows results grouped according to *settings*.

Table 12a

Means and Standard Deviations According to Setting

Program Characteristics	General Education m (SD) n=215	SPED M/M m (SD) n=31	SPED M/M Self-Cont. m (SD) n=5	SPED Severe M (SD) n=10
1. Structured Curriculum	3.76 (0.96)	3.74 (0.89)	3.60 (1.14)	3.10 (1.45)
2. Identify Need	3.82 (0.97)	4.13 (0.81)	4.00 (0.71)	3.30 (0.67)
3. Inform Options	4.07 (0.91)	4.10 (0.91)	3.80 (1.30)	3.70 (1.16)
4. Self-Monitor	4.10 (0.82)	4.23 (0.92)	4.60 (0.55)	3.80 (0.79)
5. Request Assistance	4.27 (0.84)	4.10 (0.98)	4.80 (0.45)	4.10 (1.10)
6. Assessments	3.44 (1.13)	3.55 (1.03)	3.40 (1.52)	3.50 (1.27)
7. Honest Discussion	3.25 (1.28)	3.87 (0.86)	2.80 (1.79)	3.80 (1.14)
8. Apply Results	3.63 (1.01)	3.45 (1.03)	3.40 (1.52)	3.90 (0.90)
9. Routine Choices	3.94 (1.02)	3.53 (1.07)	3.40 (0.89)	3.60 (0.97)
10. Consequence/Reward	4.17 (0.76)	3.77 (1.01)	4.20 (0.45)	4.10 (0.57)
11. Leadership	3.44 (0.97)	3.17 (0.83)	3.20 (1.10)	3.60 (0.97)
12. Collaboration	3.39 (1.12)	3.57 (1.01)	3.60 (1.14)	3.80 (0.92)

Note: Scale = Never (1), Seldom (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)

Table 12a shows teachers assigned to the traditional high school setting demonstrated similar mean scores +/-0.5 compared to general education, mild/moderate special education and mild/moderate self-contained with the exception of “accept consequences rewards in the natural setting.” This response may be an expected response as this setting has restricted access to the natural setting. Severe teachers had +/- 0.5 in the use of “structured curriculum, identify need, and collaboration.

Table 12b

Means and Standard Deviations According to Non-Standard Teacher Assignment

Program Characteristics	Alt High	Alt High	18-22 SPED	18-22 SPED
	Gen Ed.	Mild/Mode	m/m	Severe
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
	<i>n=27</i>	<i>n=4</i>	<i>n=3</i>	<i>n=8</i>
1. Structured Curriculum	3.30 (1.30)	3.25 (0.50)	4.67 (0.58)	3.50 (1.31)
2. Identify Need	3.74 (1.20)	4.75 (0.50)	4.67 (0.58)	3.00 (1.77)
3. Inform Options	3.67 (1.11)	4.75 (0.50)	4.67 (0.58)	3.63 (1.69)
4. Self-Monitor	4.07 (0.83)	4.50 (0.58)	4.00 (1.00)	3.50 (1.69)
5. Request Assistance	3.89 (1.28)	4.25 (0.50)	4.67 (0.58)	3.86 (1.45)
6. Assessments	3.26 (1.06)	2.75 (1.26)	4.67 (0.58)	3.50 (1.31)
7. Honest Discussion	3.19 (1.27)	2.75 (1.71)	4.67 (0.58)	3.38 (1.69)
8. Apply Results	3.52 (1.26)	3.25 (1.26)	4.00 (0.00)	2.88 (1.64)
9. Routine Choices	3.15 (1.23)	4.25 (0.50)	4.33 (1.15)	3.25 (1.28)
10. Consequence/Reward	3.85 (0.91)	4.50 (0.58)	5.00 (0.00)	4.00 (1.41)
11. Leadership	3.42 (0.86)	4.00 (1.15)	4.33 (0.58)	2.88 (0.99)
12. Collaboration	3.96 (0.92)	3.75 (1.50)	2.33 (2.31)	1.75 (1.49)

Note: Scale = Never (1), Seldom (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)

Table 12b illustrates much higher and lower mean scores in these non-traditional assignments with tighter (SD) in alternative high, special education, and 18-22 mild/moderate settings. With such a small n , these scores were grouped into certification and setting, to look for further patterns with a greater n .

Table 12c shows that overall mean scores across (a) *all teachers* and (b) *certifications* demonstrated no difference to minimal difference between program characteristic mean totals. The mean of 3.7 indicated that teacher respondents reported

Table 12c

Means and Standard Deviations According to All Teachers and Certifications

Program Characteristics	All Educators M (SD) $n=309$	General Education M (SD) $n=239$	Mild/Moderate SPED M (SD) $n=43$	Severe SPED M (SD) $n=18$
	1. Structured Curriculum	3.70 (1.02)	3.71 (1.00)	3.74 (0.90)
2. Identify Need	3.84 (1.00)	3.81 (0.99)	4.20 (0.77)	3.16 (1.24)
3. Inform Options	4.03 (0.97)	4.02 (0.94)	4.16 (0.92)	3.66 (1.37)
4. Self-Monitor	4.10 (0.86)	4.10 (0.82)	4.27 (0.85)	3.66 (1.23)
5. Request Assistance	4.22 (0.92)	4.22 (0.90)	4.23 (0.89)	4.00 (1.22)
6. Assessments	3.45 (1.12)	3.42 (1.11)	3.53 (1.12)	3.50 (1.24)
7. Honest Discussion	3.33 (1.27)	3.24 (1.28)	3.69 (1.15)	3.61 (1.37)
8. Apply Results	3.60 (1.06)	3.62 (1.03)	3.46 (1.05)	3.44 (1.42)
9. Routine Choices	3.79 (1.07)	3.84 (1.07)	3.64 (1.03)	3.44 (1.09)
10. Consequence/Reward	4.11 (0.82)	4.13 (0.78)	3.97 (0.94)	4.05 (0.99)
11. Leadership	3.43 (0.95)	3.43 (0.95)	3.33 (0.92)	3.27 (1.01)
12. Collaboration	3.45 (1.15)	3.45 (1.11)	3.50 (1.17)	2.88 (1.56)
Overall M	3.75	3.70	3.80	3.50

Note: Scale = Never (1), Seldom (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)

that they “sometimes” to “usually” incorporated self-determination/self-advocacy program characteristics into their curriculum. Further examination of mean scores of *All Teachers*, with a ranking of a 4 or higher defined as “usually,” showed that the most frequently used essential program characteristics were:

SQ5. Students receive self-determination/self-advocacy instruction on how they can contact me in a variety of ways to *request assistance* or ask questions and are asked to demonstrate they can do this.

SQ10. My program allows students to learn from and *accept consequences/rewards* within the natural school and community setting.

SQ4. Students receive instruction to self-monitor their academic progress and are provided *opportunities to request help or ask questions*.

SQ3. My program works collaboratively with the student to promote self-determination/ self-advocacy by *informing them of their options* and the potential consequences of their choices.

In addition, language used in the survey questions sought to differentiate self-determination and self-advocacy. Survey questions two through six were designed to determine if students received instruction in self-determination: Q2-6 self-determination for *All Teachers* had three of the highest ranked essential program characteristics which were, SQ3, SQ4 and SQ5.

The lowest mean program characteristics for (a) general education, (b) mild/moderate special education and (c) alternative high settings were:

SQ7. My program provides the opportunity for students to *have an honest and respectful discussion* about their assessment results.

SQ8. My program helps student *apply the results* of their assessments to gain experience and prepare now to meet their future goals.

SQ11. My program fosters self-determination/self-advocacy through the *development of student leadership skills*. All setting respondents, except for the severe disabilities setting, rated that they struggled with being honest with students about the results of their assessments, yet they reported higher rates for helping students apply the results of their assessments. Although teachers rated this essential program characteristic much higher, it still fell -0.5 or greater below the highest ranked essential program characteristic in each setting.

For special educators, the application of these assessments should relate to post-high and transition outcomes, and would be expected to be higher. It is disconcerting that the ranking for both mild/moderate special education (ninth of 12) and 18-22 year special education (eleventh of 12) was low. Application of assessments may help determine strengths, needs, wants and preferences, and is a mandated focus of special education law. As demonstrated in Section #3, it may be that special education teachers are largely unaware of assessments that can be used.

In addition, survey questions used language that sought to differentiate self-determination and self-advocacy. Questions seven through 11 were designed to measure whether students demonstrated self-advocacy. Questions 7-11 self-advocacy for *All Teachers* had three of the lowest ranked essential program characteristics which were, SQ7, SQ8 and SQ11. As Q2-6 had three of the highest ranked responses and Q7-11 had three of lowest ranked response, this finding appears to indicate that teachers may

provide instruction somewhat more frequently than they require students to demonstrate these skills.

The next six categories had a range of mean scores of 3.45-3.84, which showed no difference in essential program characteristic use.

Data grouped into setting (see Table 12d) indicated the mean scores ranged from 1.91 (Collaboration) to 4.27 (Request Assistance). Mean scores near or above 4 “usually use” coincided across both (a) *certifications* (see Table 12 c) and (b) *settings* (see Table 12d) with the most commonly used program characteristics.

Table 12d

Means and Standard Deviations According to Settings

Program Characteristics	General	SPED	Alt	18-22
	Education	High	High	SPED
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
	212	46	31	11
1. Structured Curriculum	3.76 (0.95)	3.59 (1.06)	3.29 (1.21)	3.82 (1.25)
2. Identify Need	3.82 (0.97)	3.93 (0.82)	3.87 (1.17)	3.45 (1.69)
3. Inform Options	4.07 (0.91)	3.98 (0.99)	3.81 (1.10)	3.91 (1.51)
4. Self-Monitor	4.10 (0.82)	4.17 (0.87)	4.13 (0.80)	3.64 (1.50)
5. Request Assistance	4.27 (0.83)	4.17 (0.97)	3.94 (1.20)	4.10 (1.28)
6. Assessments	3.44 (1.12)	3.52 (1.11)	3.19 (1.07)	3.73 (1.55)
7. Honest Discussion	3.25 (1.22)	3.20 (2.04)	3.13 (1.31)	3.73 (1.55)
8. Apply Results	3.63 (1.02)	3.54 (1.08)	3.48 (1.24)	3.18 (1.47)
9. Routine Choices	3.94 (1.02)	3.53 (1.01)	3.29 (1.21)	3.55 (1.29)
10. Consequence/Reward	4.17 (0.76)	3.89 (0.88)	3.94 (0.89)	4.27 (1.27)
11. Leadership	3.44 (0.96)	3.27 (0.88)	3.50 (0.90)	3.27 (1.19)
12. Collaboration	3.39 (1.12)	3.62 (0.98)	3.93 (0.98)	1.91 (1.64)

Note: Scale = Never (1), Seldom (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)

When looking across all *certifications* and *settings*, the essential program characteristic:

SQ12. My program allows both general and special education teachers to *collaborate on strategies and curriculum*

Respondents reported “usually or always” in: (a) General education (49%); (b) special education (59%); and (c) alternative high (73%). Results for the severe *certification* (see Table 12c) and for 18-22 special education *settings* (see Table 12d) *produced noticeably low mean scores and were* further examined as students in the severe setting often attend the 18-22 special education setting. For the purposes of additional analysis, the researcher used the percentage of responses to evaluate this program characteristic. These percentages were not shown in table form, but revealed that teachers with severe certifications responded with “seldom or never” (38%), and with “usually or always” (38%) while 18-22 special education respondents reported “seldom or never”. This response came entirely from the severe setting.

Section #2 sought to determine to what extent teachers in the Davis district use essential program characteristics. While collaboration is a well-researched construct in the literature, the overall average mean indicates that this is not one of the strongest essential program characteristics for severe and 18-22 special education. Additional attention was drawn to this category based on the extremely low mean in both severe and 18-22 special education respondents. With the additional analysis by percentage, equally divergent scores were found by respondents in severe setting “usually or always” or “seldom to never” collaborate with general education. While the “seldom to never” are reflective of Wehmeyer et al. (2000), it is possible that the mean score is a reflection of

how the question was worded, or it may be that students in these settings typically have more specialized service time in a setting separate from the general education population.

A search of the district website indicates that students in the 18-22 special education settings have opportunities to prepare to transition to adult roles within the community. *Collaboration* within the community setting, or with same age peer tutors in the high school, may occur at a higher rate than with general education teachers.

Additionally, results describe instruction that is provided by the teacher (Q2-6), and that the allowing of natural consequences/rewards are commonly used, rather than requiring a clear demonstration of self-determination/self-advocacy by the student (Q7-11), indicate that students receive instruction in self-determination/self-advocacy at a slightly higher rate than they are required to demonstrate these skills. Teachers may need additional information on feasible strategies they can use that allow students to demonstrate these domains. This would support the recommendation of Carter et al. (2008):

There is a need for intervention and instructional strategies that are feasible, effective, and relevant in general education classrooms at the high school level, as well as strategies that work for a broad range of students. . . . As this line of research continues to evolve, additional attention should be focused on identifying evidence-based practices for promoting self-determination behavior in general education contexts. (p. 67)

While teachers reported they were teaching these skills, it was not clear to what extent they were using shared strategies, progress measures and evidence-based curricula. Knowledge of evidence-based instructional strategies may make use of evidence-based

curricula feasible. Effective and relevant strategies should be used in the Davis district to create action plans for change.

Survey Section #1 Teaching Strategies, Progress Measurements, Curricula

This section determined to what extent teachers taught students to utilize shared strategies, provide progress measurements, and incorporate evidence-based curriculum in their pedagogy. In 2012, all general education and special education high school teachers in Davis district participated in a teaching strategies training. Neither the alternative high school nor 18-22 special education teachers participated in this training. Teaching Strategies by *All Teachers* (Table 13a) were analyzed for usage and frequency with further attention given to strategies had a response of 40% or higher, and was compared across *certification* and *settings* (Tables 13b, 13c, 13d).

Teaching Strategies. Teaching strategies that received a 40% or higher response by *All Teachers* included (a) writing prompts, (b) anticipation guides or guided notes, and (c) Venn diagrams. Because general education had a significantly higher number of participants, the use of teaching strategies was further examined across certification and settings. The entire strategy was reported if at least one certification or setting had a 40% or higher response.

Table 13a

Number and Percentage of Teaching Strategies by All Teachers

Instruction	Total	% of total
Anticipation Guides or Guided notes	188	59%
Argument, Claim, Evidence, Warrant	118	37%
Argument, S.M.E.L.L.	16	5%
2-3 Column Notes	51	16%
Cornell Notes	63	20%
Carousel Brainstorming	38	12%
Flash Cards or Quizlet	91	29%
GIST, WH Questions	81	25%
K-W-L	117	37%
Non-Stop Writing	51	16%
Text Annotation and Coding	74	23%
Venn Diagrams	139	44%
Vocabulary Graphic Organizer	115	36%
SDLMI	12	4%
SMART Goals	82	26%
SQ3R	44	14%
Writing Prompts	190	60%
Other (please specify)	51	16%

Respondents $n=318$. More than one response could be selected.

The most frequently used teaching strategies for general education were the same as those for All Teachers (see Table 13a). Mild/moderate special education report with 40% or higher: (a) writing prompts, (b)Venn Diagrams, (c) anticipation guides, (d) K-N-W (Know, Want to Know, Learned), (e) Argument, Claim, Evidence, Warrant, (f) SMART Goals and (g) Vocabulary Graphic Organizers. Mild/moderate special education, and severe special education respondents show they use also use (g) GIST (WH questions).

Table 13b

Number and Percentage of Strategies by Certification

Teaching Strategies	Gen. Ed.		M/M SPED		Severe	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Anticipation Guides or Guided notes	160	63%	24	53%	4	22%
Argument, Claim, Evidence, Warrant	96	38%	19	42%	3	17%
Argument, S.M.E.L.L.	13	5%	3	7%	0	0%
2-3 Column Notes	39	15%	10	22%	2	11%
Cornell Notes	52	21%	10	22%	1	6%
Carousel Brainstorming	33	13%	5	11%	0	0%
Flash Cards or Quizlet	72	29%	17	38%	2	11%
GIST, WH questions	51	20%	22	49%	8	44%
Know, Want to Know, Learned	92	37%	19	42%	6	33%
Non-Stop Writing	43	17%	6	13%	2	11%
Text Annotation and Coding	63	25%	8	18%	3	17%
Venn Diagrams	110	44%	25	56%	4	22%
Vocabulary Graphic Organizer	92	37%	20	44%	3	17%
SDLMI	10	4%	2	4%	0	0%
SMART Goals	60	24%	19	42%	3	17%
SQ3R*	36	14%	8	18%	0	0%
Writing Prompts	146	58%	38	84%	6	33%
Other (please specify)	36	14%	29	29%	2	11%
Response <i>n</i> =	252		45		18	

Note: Respondents could select multiple categories.

*Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review

Table 13c

Number and Percentage of Teaching Strategies by Standard Setting

Teaching Strategy	General Education		Special Education	
Anticipation Guides or Guided notes	144	64%	25	53%
Argument, Claim, Evidence, Warrant	87	39%	21	45%
Argument, S.M.E.L.L.	12	5%	1	2%
2-3 Column Notes	32	14%	11	23%
Cornell Notes	41	18%	6	13%
Carousel Brainstorming	29	13%	2	4%
Flash Cards or Quizlet	62	28%	13	28%
GIST, WH Questions	39	17%	22	47%
K-W-L	79	35%	20	43%
Non-Stop Writing	39	17%	6	13%
Text Annotation and Coding	53	24%	10	21%
Venn Diagrams	97	43%	28	60%
Vocabulary Graphic Organizer	75	34%	17	36%
SDLMI	9	4%	2	4%
SMART Goals	54	24%	18	38%
SQ3R	29	13%	7	15%
Writing Prompts	128	57%	30	64%
Other (please specify)	32	14%	5	11%
Response <i>n</i> =	224		47	

All standard high school settings reported at 40% or higher that they used: (a) anticipation guides or guided notes; (b) Venn diagrams; (c) writing prompts; (d) argument, claim, evidence, warrant; and (e) K-N-W (Know, Want to Know, Learned). General education respondents also used vocabulary graphic organizers, and special education used GIST (WH questions).

Table 13d

*Numbers and Percentages of Strategies
Used by Non-Standard Setting*

Teaching Strategy		Alternative High		18-22 SPED
Anticipation Guides or Guided notes	18	55%	1	9%
Argument, Claim, Evidence, Warrant	10	30%	0	0%
Argument, S.M.E.L.L.	3	9%	0	0%
2-3 Column Notes	8	24%	0	0%
Cornell Notes	16	48%	0	0%
Carousel Brainstorming	7	21%	0	0%
Flash Cards or Quizlet	15	45%	1	9%
GIST, WH Questions	17	52%	3	27%
K-W-L	15	45%	3	27%
Non-Stop Writing	4	12%	2	18%
Text Annotation and Coding	10	30%	1	9%
Venn Diagrams	14	42%	0	0%
Vocabulary Graphic Organizer	21	64%	2	18%
SDLMI	1	3%	0	0%
SMART Goals	8	24%	2	18%
SQ3R	8	24%	0	0%
Writing Prompts	27	82%	5	45%
Other (please specify)	12	36%	2	18%
<i>n</i> =	33		11	

Respondents *n*=318. More than one response could be selected.

Non-standard high school settings reported that 18-22 special education uses only writing prompts with 40% or higher. Alternative high reports uses; (a) Writing prompts (b) K-N-W (Know, Want to Know, Learned; and (c) GIST (WH questions), (d) vocabulary graphic organizer , (e) Anticipation Guides (f) Cornell notes (g) flash cards or Quizlet.

Tables 13a, 13b, 13c and 13d show teaching strategies that could be used across certifications and settings in this district are (a) writing prompts, (b) anticipation guides, (c) K-W-L (Know, Want to Know, Learned), (d) Venn diagrams, and (e) GIST (WH questions).

Further research in each school setting may allow teams to identify strategies that could be shared across settings specific to that school.

Open-ended responses to “other teaching strategies” provided five responses from general education and six from special education, with alternative high and 18-22 special education respondents providing no “other” responses. When grouped and coded, no similarities were found to group or discuss.

Progress Measurement. Percentage totals across *all teacher* responses indicated that the most often used measurements were: (a) grades, (b) curriculum-based assessments, and (c) skill-building exercises/activities. As general education had a higher number of the total responses, measurements of progress was further analyzed across *settings* (Table 14b).

When examined across *settings* with a response of 60% or above: General education respondents indicated they used: (a) grades, (b) curriculum-based assessment, and (c) skill-building. Special education respondents’ report they used: (a) curriculum-based assessments, (b) grades, (c) progress reports/tracking, (d) curriculum-based measures, and (e) self-monitor. The 18-22 SPED setting report they used: (a) curriculum-based assessments, (b) curriculum based measures, (c) progress reports/tracking, and (d) self-monitor. Alternative high did not report the use of any

Table 14a

Number and Percentages of Progress Measurements for All Teachers

Progress Measurement	<i>n</i> =	% of total respondents
AP Tests	64	20%
Concurrent Enrollment	65	20%
Curriculum-Based Assessments	246	77%
Curriculum-Based Measurements	162	51%
Fluency Timings	50	16%
Grades	263	83%
Learning Probes (bell quiz)	137	43%
Portfolio	84	26%
Progress Charts	54	17%
Progress Reports, tracking	127	40%
Proficiency Skills	111	35%
Skill Certification (e.g. CTE Skill Certificate, etc.)	67	21%
School, District, State, National Competitions	51	16%
Skills USA	7	2%
State License	11	3%
State Test	97	31%
Term Project	140	44%
Self-Monitor	154	48%
Self-Awareness	116	36%
Self-Knowledge	115	36%
Skill-Building Exercises/Activities	190	60%
Other (please specify)	16	5%

Note: Respondents could select more than one category.

Response *n*=318

Table 14b

Numbers and Percentages of Progress Measurement by Setting.

Progress Measurement	General Education		Special Education		Alternative High		18-22 SPED	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
AP Tests	63	28%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Concurrent Enrollment	61	27%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%
C-B Assessments*	169	75%	41	87%	23	52%	10	91%
C-B Measurements**	108	48%	30	64%	13	30%	9	82%
Fluency Timings	14	6%	24	51%	7	16%	4	36%
Grades	199	89%	37	79%	19	43%	3	27%
Learning Probes	104	46%	19	40%	11	25%	1	9%
Portfolio	62	28%	6	13%	13	30%	2	18%
Progress Charts	22	10%	17	36%	10	23%	5	45%
Progress Tracking	68	30%	32	68%	14	32%	8	73%
Proficiency Skills	88	39%	8	17%	11	25%	1	9%
Skill Certification	57	25%	1	2%	6	14%	1	9%
Competitions***	47	21%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%
Skills USA	7	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
State License	10	4%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%
State Test	80	36%	9	19%	0	0%	1	9%
Term Project	114	51%	15	32%	10	23%	0	0%
Self-Monitor	108	48%	28	60%	13	30%	3	27%
Self-Awareness	88	39%	12	26%	13	30%	2	18%
Self-Knowledge	92	41%	9	19%	12	27%	1	9%
Skill-Building Exercises	138	62%	22	47%	23	52%	3	27%
Other (please specify)	7	3%	5	11%	1	2%	2	18%
Total Responses	1706		320		200		56	
Response by setting <i>n</i> =	224		47		44		11	

Note: Respondents could select more than one category.

* Curriculum - Based Assessments

** Curriculum - Based Measurements

*** School, District, State, National Competitions

above 60%. The top three progress measurements for alternative high were: (a) curriculum-based assessments, (b) skill-building exercises, and (c) grades.

Table 14a and 14b indicate that respondents across *all teachers and across settings* used (a) grades, and (b) curriculum-based assessments. Respondents reported assisting students self-monitor their grades. It would appear that *all settings* use progress tracking, except that high school general education teachers used skill-building exercises. These two strategies may conceptually measure the same thing and differences in responses may be due to language that is familiar to the setting rather than a difference in the measurement of progress that is used (i.e., it may be that progress reports actually track skill building exercises).

The term project progress measurement appeared to be used by more than half of all general education teachers, but only used by 32% mild/moderate special education, 23% of alternative high, and 0% in 18-22 special education teachers. Term projects often ask students to independently demonstrate their knowledge and do not have required due dates. Often this progress measurement is weighed equal to or more heavily than daily bell quizzes, and explicit instruction may not be given due to the nature of the independent nature of the term project.

Teachers were given the opportunity to fill in an open-ended response of "Other." Due to the small response, results are listed here rather than in table form. General education teachers noted they also used: (a) team-building activities, (b) labs, and (c) industry tests to measure progress. Mild/moderate special education setting provided 10 additional progress measurements: (a) task analysis, (b) IEP goals, (c) graphing GPA, (d) graphing percentages, (e) grade checks, (f) status reports, (g) SRI testing, (h) planner

check, (i) direct instruction, and (j) discrete trial. This may indicate that the mild/moderate special education setting is well aware the importance of tracking measure progress. Alternative High listed online learning as an additional method to measure progress. Special education teachers in 18-22 programs added behavior trackers in addition to the progress measures listed in the survey.

Curricula. Data were grouped and analyzed by (a) all teachers, (b) certification, (c) standard settings, and (d) non-standard settings (see Tables 15a, 15b, 15c, and 15d).

Table 15a

Numbers and Percentages of Curricula Knowledge –All Teachers

Curriculum	Unaware	%	Know	%	Use	%
All Teachers						
Utahfutures.org	109	34	151	48	56	18
Take Charge Today	284	90	26	8	6	2
SMART Goals	119	38	109	34	88	28
Choice Maker*	293	94	23	7	0	0
NEXT S.T.E.P.	256	93	50	16	10	3
Steps to Self-Determination	282	81	27	9	7	2
Take Charge for Youth	272	89	35	11	9	3
SLDMI**	274	86	36	11	6	2
Whose Future is it, Anyway?	282	87	33	10	1	0
Go 4 IT . . . NOW!	297	94	17	5	2	1
Student-Led IEPs	187	59	100	32	29	9
7 Habits***	69	22	192	61	55	17

Respondents $n= 316$

Note: Respondents should select one category for each curriculum option.

*Choice Maker Instructional Series

**Self-Determined Learning Model of Instruction

***7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens

As indicated by the data, *All Teachers* reported that they were largely unaware of any of the evidence based curriculum. Evidence-based curricula is largely unknown to teachers with the exception of *Student-Led IEP's: A Guide for Student Involvement*, where teachers reported “Use” only 9% of the time with 32% reporting that they “Know” it, or 59% reporting that they were “Unaware.” All other evidence-based curricula were reported being used less than 3%.

Table 15b

Numbers and Percentages of Curricula Knowledge -Certification

Curriculum	Unaware	%	Know	%	Use	%
General Education						
Utahfutures.org	98	40	120	48	30	12
Take Charge Today	222	90	21	8	5	2
SMART Goals	92	37	84	34	72	30
Choice Maker*	231	93	17	7	0	0
NEXT S.T.E.P.	218	88	28	11	2	1
Steps to Self-Determination	225	91	17	7	6	2
Take Charge for youth	212	85	28	11	8	3
SLDMI**	217	88	26	10	5	2
Whose Future is it, Anyway?	226	91	21	8	1	0
Go 4 IT . . . NOW!	234	94	13	5	1	0
Student-Led IEPs	155	63	70	28	23	9
7 Habits***	53	21	155	63	41	16
Special Education						
Utahfutures.org	4	9	19	43	21	48
Take Charge Today	38	86	5	11	1	2
SMART Goals	16	36	15	34	13	30
Choice Maker*	39	89	5	11	0	0
NEXT S.T.E.P.	28	64	13	30	3	7
Steps to Self-Determination	37	84	6	14	1	2
Take Charge for youth	39	89	4	9	1	2

SLDMI**	34	77	9	20	1	2
Whose Future is it, Anyway?	36	82	8	18	0	0
Go 4 IT . . . NOW!	41	93	2	5	1	2
Student-Led IEPs	18	41	21	48	5	11
7 Habits***	6	14	27	61	11	15
Special Education - Severe						
Utahfutures.org	7	39	9	50	2	11
Take Charge Today	18	100	0	0	0	0
SMART Goals	9	50	7	39	2	11
Choice Maker*	17	94	1	6	0	0
NEXT S.T.E.P.	7	39	8	44	3	17
Steps to Self-Determination	15	83	3	17	0	0
Take Charge for youth	17	94	1	6	0	0
SLDMI**	17	94	1	6	0	0
Whose Future is it, Anyway?	14	78	4	22	0	0
Go 4 IT . . . NOW!	16	89	2	11	0	0
Student-Led IEPs	10	56	8	44	0	0
7 Habits***	9	50	8	44	1	6

Note: Respondents should select one category for each curriculum option.

*Choice Maker Instructional Series

**Self-Determined Learning Model of Instruction

***7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens

Table 15b shows that the most frequently used goal setting curriculum across *certifications*, is curriculum that is commonly available in the high schools, and not mentioned in evidence-based self-determination/self-advocacy surveys. Responses by *certification* indicate that general education and special education teachers respond that they use; (a) Utahfutures.org, (b) SMART Goals, and (c) 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens. Teachers with severe certification use (a) Utahfutures.org, (b) SMART Goals, and (c) NEXT S.T.E.P.. The NEXT S.T.E.P. curriculum is the only curriculum cited by teachers in this survey that has been shown to be evidence-based in the self-determination/self-advocacy literature.

Table 15c

Numbers and Percentages of Curricula by Standard Setting

Curriculum	Unaware		Know		Use	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
General Education						
Utahfutures.org	94	43%	103	47%	24	11%
Take Charge Today	201	91%	15	7%	5	2%
SMART Goals	80	36%	74	33%	67	30%
Choice Maker*	208	94%	13	6%	0	0%
NEXT S.T.E.P.	195	88%	24	11%	2	1%
Steps to Self-Determination	202	91%	13	6%	6	3%
Take Charge for youth	190	86%	23	10%	8	4%
SLDMI**	195	88%	21	10%	5	2%
Whose Future is it, Anyway?	203	92%	17	8%	1	0%
Go 4 IT . . . NOW!	209	95%	11	5%	1	0%
Student-Led IEPs	142	64%	58	26%	21	10%
7 Habits***	48	22%	140	63%	33	15%
Special Education						
Utahfutures.org	5	11%	22	47%	20	43%
Take Charge Today	41	87%	5	11%	1	2%
SMART Goals	17	36%	18	38%	12	26%
Choice Maker*	42	89%	5	11%	0	0%
NEXT S.T.E.P.	27	57%	16	34%	4	9%
Steps to Self-Determination	39	83%	7	15%	1	2%
Take Charge for youth	42	89%	4	9%	1	2%
SLDMI**	37	79%	9	19%	1	2%
Whose Future is it, Anyway?	37	79%	10	21%	0	0%
Go 4 IT . . . NOW!	44	94%	2	4%	1	2%
Student-Led IEPs	20	43%	23	49%	4	9%
7 Habits***	7	15%	29	62%	11	23%

Note: Respondents should select one category for each curriculum option.

*Choice Maker Instructional Series

**Self-Determined Learning Model of Instruction

***7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens

Table 15d

Numbers and Percentages of Curricula by Non-Standard Setting

Curriculum	Unaware		Know		Use	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Alternative High						
Utahfutures.org	6	19%	18	58%	7	23%
Take Charge Today	25	81%	6	19%	0	0%
SMART Goals	14	45%	11	35%	6	19%
Choice Maker*	27	87%	4	13%	0	0%
NEXT S.T.E.P.	27	87%	4	13%	0	0%
Steps to Self-Determination	27	87%	4	13%	0	0%
Take Charge	26	84%	5	16%	0	0%
SLDMI**	26	84%	5	16%	0	0%
Whose Future is it, Anyway?	27	87%	4	13%	0	0%
Go 4 IT . . . NOW!	29	94%	2	6%	0	0%
Student-Led IEPs	16	52%	13	42%	2	6%
7 Habits***	7	23%	17	55%	7	23%
18-22 Special Education						
Utahfutures.org	4	36%	5	45%	2	18%
Take Charge Today	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%
SMART Goals	6	55%	3	27%	2	18%
Choice Maker*	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%
NEXT S.T.E.P.	4	36%	5	45%	2	18%
Steps to Self-Determination	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%
Take Charge	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%
SLDMI**	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%
Whose Future is it, Anyway?	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%
Go 4 IT . . . NOW!	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%
Student-Led IEPs	5	45%	5	45%	1	9%
7 Habits** *	6	55%	4	36%	1	9%

Note: Respondents should select one category for each curriculum option.

*Choice Maker Instructional Series

**Self-Determined Learning Model of Instruction

***7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens

General Education and special education respondents in the *standard setting* reported they use (a) SMART Goals, (b) UtahFutures.org, and (c) 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens.

Non-standard settings show that the alternative high settings report that they use (a) UtahFutures.org, (b) SMART Goals, and (c) 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens, while the 18-22 special education respondents indicate they use (a) Utahfutures.org (b) SMART Goals; and equal use of (c) Utah futures (d) Take Charge Today, and (e) NEXT S.T.E.P. curriculum.

Tables 15a, 15b, 15c and 15d reveal the highest response percentage for “Use” across certifications or setting was Utahfutures.org by special education teachers in the standard high school setting. The next closest percentage was SMART Goals. When examined by certification, SMART Goals were used nearly equally by general education and mild/moderate special education. This goal setting method may have a strong possibility for further collaboration and implementation, however it does not appear in the evidence based self-determination/self-advocacy literature.

The use of curriculum across *settings* revealed that Utahfutures.org, SMART Goals, and 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens were used to varying degrees in all settings but the 18-22 special education, used NEXT S.T.E.P. rather than SMART Goals. The NEXT S.T.E.P curriculum is an evidence based goal setting curriculum that was designed to help the special education population with setting and achieving transition goals. Although the percentage in all settings is twenty eight percent or less, it would appear that teachers who use these curriculum is striving to teach self-determination/self-advocacy strategies.

Table 16

Numbers and Percentages Indicating Survey Helpful by Setting

	General Education		Special Education		Alternative High		18-22 SPED		Total
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Not at all Helpful	63	32%	0	0%	9	30%	2	18%	74
Slightly Helpful	50	26%	13	29%	5	17%	0	0%	68
Somewhat Helpful	63	32%	25	56%	13	43%	6	55%	107
Very Helpful	17	8%	3	7%	3	10%	2	18%	25
Extremely Helpful	0	0%	4	9%	0	0%	1	9%	5
<i>n=5</i> Other	<i>M= 2.18</i>		<i>M= 2.96</i>		<i>M= 2.33</i>		<i>M= 3.00</i>		
	<i>n=193</i>		<i>n=45</i>		<i>n=30</i>		<i>n=11</i>		<i>n=279</i>

Table 16 illustrates that general education and alternative high found the survey slightly helpful, whereas special education mild/moderate and 18-22 special education found this survey somewhat helpful. A greater than .62 difference between general education and 18-22 special education respondents indicated that special education settings do recognize the importance of teaching self-determination concepts more than the general education and alternative high teachers. However, with a mean of 3.00, it would appear that there is a need to continue to develop and train *all teachers* in the importance and use of evidence-based, strategies, progress measurements, and curriculum as well as to use multidisciplinary teams to plan and carry out action plans that facilitate the program characteristics that allow and encourage self-determination/self-advocacy of the students they teach.

Limitations

The findings in this study provide data to represent the perspectives of educators in Davis School District in Utah. This sample may not represent the results of school districts in other settings, and therefore, findings cannot be generalized to other settings. The researcher recommends that further research be conducted in each school by multidisciplinary teams in order to analyze and determine strategies, progress measures, and curricula that they can implement in their individual setting.

Another limitation to this study was the low response rate for each certification and setting. The percentage response rate was much higher for the special education, alternative high, and 18-22 respondents than the general education respondents.

While not an inherent limitation, to streamline the calculation of data for each of the certifications and settings, it is recommended that if this study should be replicated, question 4, "What is your certification(s)?" should include only the selections (a) general education, (b) special education, and (c) severe education, and not include the response "other". Question 6a should be changed to, "What is your primary teaching assignment setting?" with the responses being (a) general education, (b) special education 10-12, (c) alternative high 10-12, and (d) 18-22 special education, to streamline data analysis.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Teachers in the Davis district represented a cross section of all subjects taught, number of years of experience, all certifications, and settings. Across *certification*, mean scores revealed that the priorities of general education and mild/moderate special education respondents were comparable, and show the areas that students receive the most instruction, as well as how the student was required to demonstrate the instruction were: accept consequences, solve problems, make choices, with take initiative and set

goals significantly lower. While teachers reported that they valued the instruction and demonstration of self-determination/self-advocacy domains, it was not known to what extent teachers used evidence-based curriculum or required students to demonstrate these skills throughout the term.

Teachers identified differences in the importance of the instructional domains and variations occurred across *certifications*. The order and priority of domains, as measured by the number of teachers whose students received instruction and were asked to demonstrate the domain, followed the same pattern and ranked in the same priority as when they were asked which domains they valued.

All *certifications* taught self-determination/self-advocacy domains. However, the greater the service needed, the greater the percentages of teachers teaching the domain and requiring students to apply or demonstrate it in real life situations. It may be that general education teachers assume that students can bridge the gap between the classroom setting and real life, and consequently less explicit instruction is provided. In addition, the use of evidence-based curriculum is most likely to be used by teachers with a severe special education certification. This finding supports Carter et al. (2008) in that “these skills are taught somewhat informally, with limited direct instruction. Students with disabilities may need much more explicit, systematic, and applied instruction to acquire some self- determination skills” (p .66) It would appear that the severe setting respondents valued the use of explicit instruction and evidence-based curriculum.

Data from the survey indicate that the more specialized the setting, the more likely a student will be required to apply the self-advocacy/self-determination domain to

“Use in real life.” This may also infer that explicit instruction is more likely given in the severe setting.

Curricula used. Teacher responses regarding curricula indicated little commonality across settings (e.g. general education, mild/moderate special education etc.). Any commonality in what teachers used was demonstrated in self-determination/self-advocacy domains (e.g. make choices, solve problems, set goals). This supports the findings in this study that teachers primarily use their own teacher-developed curriculum or use the same curriculum to address each of the targeted self-advocacy/self-determination domains. Open-ended responses provided a small snapshot of curricula teachers in the Davis district actually implemented. This finding is reminiscent of the comment by Carter et al. (2008) that, “for many students with disabilities, there may be a substantial disconnect between the intended curriculum and the received curriculum in inclusive classrooms” (p. 65). However, the small response rate in the present research prevents generalization.

Essential program characteristics. General education, mild/moderate special education and alternative high respondents indicated they taught the self-determination/self-advocacy skills: (a) *request assistance*, (b) *accept consequences/rewards in the natural setting*, (c) *self-monitor, request or ask questions*, (d) *informing them of their options consequences of their choices*. These same respondents rated that they struggled with being honest with students about the results of their assessments, yet they reported higher rates for helping students apply the results of their assessments. Although teachers rated this essential program characteristic much higher, it was rated -0.5 or greater below the highest ranked essential program characteristic in each setting.

For special educators, the application of these assessments should relate to post-high and transition outcomes and would be expected to be higher. It is disconcerting that the ranking for both mild/moderate special education (ninth of 12) and 18-22 year special education (11th of 12) ranked this low. Yet, application of assessments to determine strengths, needs, preferences is a mandated focus of the special education law. As demonstrated earlier, it may be that special education teachers are largely unaware of assessments that can be used.

While collaboration is a well-researched construct in the literature, the overall average mean indicates that this is not one of the strongest essential program characteristics for severe and 18-22 special education respondents. Additional attention was drawn to this category based on the low mean for both severe and 18-22 special education respondents. With the additional analysis by percentage, equally divergent scores of 38% were found as teachers in severe setting with either “usually or always” or seldom to never collaborate with general education. While the “seldom to never” are reflective of Wehmeyer (2000), it is possible that the mean score is a reflection of how the question was asked, or it may be that students in these settings typically have more specialized service time in a setting separate from the general education population.

A search of the Davis district website indicated that students in the 18-22 special education settings have opportunities to prepare to transition to adult roles within the community. Collaboration within the community setting, or with same age peer tutors in the high school may occur at a higher rate than with general education teachers.

Results described instruction that was provided by the teacher, and allowed natural consequences/rewards, rather than requiring a clear demonstration of self-

determination/self-advocacy by the student. Respondents indicated that students received instruction in self-determination/self-advocacy at a higher rate than they were required to demonstrate these skills. Teachers may need additional information on feasible strategies they can use that allow students to demonstrate these domains. This would support the recommendation of Carter et al. (2008),

There is a need for intervention and instructional strategies that are feasible, effective, and relevant in general education classrooms at the high school level, as well as strategies that work for a broad range of students. . . . As this line of research continues to evolve, additional attention should be focused on identifying evidence-based practices for promoting self-determination behavior in general education contexts. (Carter et al., 2008, p. 67)

While teachers reported they were teaching these skills, it is not known to what extent teachers were using evidence-based strategies, progress measures and evidence-based curricula. An understanding of what evidence-based instructional strategies are may help efforts going forward. Inservice training on available evidence-based curricula is needed.

Teaching strategies. The findings in this study indicated that (a) writing prompts, (b) anticipation guides, (c) K-W-L (Know, Want to Know, Learned), (d) venn Venn diagrams, and (e) GIST (WH questions) may be shared strategies that could be used across certifications and settings in this district. GIST questions are similar to questions incorporated in Wehmeyer's well researched SDLMI model and have been used across all settings (Wehmeyer et al, 2000). This may be an evidence-based curricula

for teams to consider. Further research in each school setting may allow teams to identify strategies that could be shared across settings specific to that school.

Progress measurement. Teachers in this study used grades and curriculum-based assessments to assist students as they self-monitor their grades. It would appear that all settings used progress reports with high school general education teachers using tracking or skill-building exercises, which may measure the same construct, and differences in responses may be due to language that is familiar to the setting rather than a difference in the measurement of progress that is used (i.e., it may be that progress reports actually track skill building exercises).

Open-ended responses. For general education, and alternative high, settings fell within the already provided responses. Mild/moderate special education setting provided 10 additional progress measurements: (a) task analysis, (b) IEP goals, (c) Graphing GPA, (d) graphing percentages, (e) grade checks, (f) status reports, (g) SRI testing, (h) planner check, (i) direct instruction, and (j) discrete trial. This may indicate that this setting is well aware the importance of, and uses multiple methods, to use track and measure progress. 18-22 special education listed behavior trackers as an additional measurement.

Strategies and progress measurements. The use of progress measurements such as grades, curriculum-based assessments, and self-monitoring, were used to increase the collaborative relationship between teacher and student. This collaboration may be amplified as the student will know and understand when they should ask for help, based on their ability to self-monitor their progress and make routine choices for themselves. The data in this section may provide some strategies and progress measurements that

could be shared across setting and to provide a starting point that address the concerns of Carter et al. (2008) as:

There remains a pressing need for intervention and instructional strategies that are feasible effective, and relevant in general education class room at the high school level as well as strategies that work for a broad range of students. Therefore, educators should couple strategy use with careful data collection and progress monitoring to ensure that students are benefitting maximally from instructional efforts directed at this area.(Carter et al., 2008, p. 66).

Mild/moderate special education teachers could contribute extensive understanding of methods that can be used to track and measure progress to local multidisciplinary teams.

Curricula. The highest percentage of respondents using an evidence-based strategy was general education with Student-Led IEPs: *A Guide for Student Involvement* Student-Led IEPs. This was followed by NEXT S.T.E.P, and Take Charge for the Future.

Across certifications and settings, the most frequent goal-setting curriculum was Utahfutures.org by special education teachers in the standard high school setting. When examined by certification, SMART Goals were used nearly equally by general education and mild/moderate special education respondents. This goal setting method may have a strong possibility for further collaboration and implementation.

The use of curriculum across settings revealed that Utahfutures.org, SMART Goals, and 7 Habits of highly Effective Teens were used to varying degrees in all settings but the 18-22 special education respondents used NEXT S.T.E.P. rather than SMART Goals. The NEXT S.T.E.P curriculum is an evidence-based goal-setting curriculum that

was designed to help the special education population with setting and achieving transition goals.

Curricula and application. Results demonstrated that teachers were “sometimes” to “usually” teaching self-determination/self-advocacy domains in their classes. However this finding did not demonstrate that they were using evidence-based, validated curricula or materials. Teachers also indicated that they “usually” used essential program characteristics. Although teachers were generally unaware of available assessments, they reported, to some extent, helping students apply the results of their assessments. However, they did not actually teach students the goal setting process.

Collaboration was an area that results were unexpectedly low among severe and 18-22 special education setting respondents. All other settings indicated that they “usually or always” collaborate. While this finding revealed a need for improvement, it would seem to demonstrate that progress has been made since the Wehmeyer (2000) study, but aligns closely with the findings of Carter et al. (2008). Previous studies have shown collaboration with general education to be an important link, as well as the NSTTAC indicating that this may be a predictor in post-secondary education and employment, and align with the evidence provided by Wehmeyer (2013) that validates the benefit of collaboration with self-determination skills for all students, especially those with severe limitations.

Recommendations for Practice

Teachers consistently ranked the domain *set goals* as the domain that students received the least instruction and was the domain least often required by teachers to have students demonstrate. Results indicated that this may have been due to the lack of

awareness of curriculum and assessments that can facilitate honest and respectful discussions with students. Opportunities to learn of these assessments and curricula should be made available.

Additionally; (a) teacher education programs may benefit from understanding that teachers in the field have little familiarity with evidence-based curricula that may increase student understanding and application in self-determination/self-advocacy, especially the domain of goal setting. Student teachers may benefit from opportunities to learn of shared self-determination/self-advocacy strategies, progress measurements and curriculum options to incorporate in their pedagogy and share with future multidisciplinary teams, (b) adult services/agencies, such as Vocational Rehabilitation, may benefit from understanding that students applying for services may not have explicit training or experience in how to independently set and achieve goals. Addressing these recommendations may increase transition outcomes.

Findings from this study demonstrated that evidence-based strategies can align with general education content requirements and support the finding of Rowe et al. (2015) that “college and career ready goes beyond academics and must include self-determination skill development” (p. 1). Continued collaboration on a local level identifying and implementing the use of shared strategies across curricula may enhance the students’ ability to know when and how to request additional assistance. Using operationally defined essential program characteristics, multidisciplinary teams can systematically evaluate and address areas to strengthen within departments and across curriculum. Research has shown that interventions that were systematically implemented

across the school increased self-determination in students (Shogren et al., 2014). Carter et al. (2008) made a case based on the literature that educators should make

“efforts to ensure that youth are equipped to direct activities, align the activities with their personal goals, advocate for their preference and needs, make informed choice, decide for themselves how they will achieve their goals, and assume responsibility for their actions” (Carter et al., 2008, p. 55).

The use of evidence-based pedagogy has the potential to strengthen the teaching process. In turn, students across all settings may receive the benefit of effective and systematic instruction in self-determination/self-advocacy.

Recommendations for Future Research

Teachers may need access and training on what evidence-based strategies and curricula are available. The results of this study support the need for additional research and teacher education on available evidence-based curriculum.

The Davis district website indicates that in the 18-22 special education transition program occurs according to a customized plan of action. The general population could be considered as the point of collaboration. This could be further explored in additional research to see if collaboration with the general population is occurring.

The sharing of strategies in a given setting may allow general educators to continue to teach self-determination/self-advocacy with the support of special education. This may necessitate the need for the development, dissemination and participation in additional in-service and training to develop and implement shared strategies.

References

- ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT CODE OF ETHICS. (2011). *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1299-1306.
- Agran, M., Snow, K., & Swaner, J. (1999). Teacher perceptions of self-determination: Benefits, characteristics, strategies. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 34, 293-301.
- American Institutes of Research. (2014). *Definitions of college and career readiness: An analysis by state*. Washington, D.C.: American Institutes of Research, College and Career Readiness Center.
- Archer, A. L., & Hughes, C. A. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Askvig, B.A., Weathers, R., & Burt, S. (2013). *Secondary special education teachers' perception of and use of self-determination curricula and strategies*. Technical report. Minot, ND: North Dakota Center for Persons with Disabilities.
- Bartholomew, A., Papy, C., McConnell, A., & Cease-Cook, J. (2015). Embedding secondary transition in the common core State Standards. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 75(1), 55-70.
- Carter, E., Lane, K., & Stang, K. (2008). Promoting self-determination for transition-age youth; Views of high school general and special educators. *Exceptional Children*, 75(1), 55-70
- Cook, B. G., Smith, G. J., & Tankersley, M. (2012). Evidence-based practices in education. *APA educational psychology handbook*, 1, 495-528.

- Cook, B. G., Smith, G. J., & Tankersley, M. (2009). Determining evidence-based practices in special education. *Exceptional Children, 75*(3), 365-383.
- Denney, S. C., & Daviso, A. W. (2012). Self-determination: A critical component of education. *American Secondary Education, 40*(2), 43-51.
- Eisenman, L. T., Pell, M. M., Poudel, B. B., & Pleet-Odle, A. M. (2014). "I think I'm reaching my potential" students' self-determination experiences in an inclusive high school. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals, 2165143414537349*
- Fowler, F. J. (2009). *Survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hughes, C., & Carter, E. W. (2012). *The new transition handbook: Strategies high school teachers use that work!* Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Kamens, M. W. (2004). Learning to Write IEPs A Personalized, Reflective Approach for Preservice Teachers. *Intervention in school and clinic, 40*(2), 76-80.
- Lee, S. H., Wehmeyer, M. L., Palmer, S. B., Soukup, J. H., & Little, T. D. (2008). Self-determination and access to the general education curriculum. *The Journal of Special Education, 42*(2), 91-107.
- Loving, S. (2012). *USOE-SES transition strategic plan*. Strategic planning work group. Salt Lake City: Utah State Office of Education Special Education Services. Retrieved September 21, 2014, from <http://schools.utah.gov/sars/DOCS/transition/transtrplan.aspx>
- McCormick, S., & McIlvenna, M. (2012). *Utah State Office of Education special education section, transition team survey of local education agencies*. University of Utah. Salt Lake City: Center for Public Policy & Administration. Retrieved

September 21, 2014, from <http://www.schools.utah.gov/sars/DOCS/transition/03-12nasrpt.aspx>

Milsom, A., & Dietz, L. (2009). Defining college readiness for students with learning disabilities: A Delphi study. *Professional School Counseling, 124*, 315-323.

Morgan, R. L., & Riesen, T. (in press). *Promoting successful transition to adulthood for students with disabilities*. New York: Guilford Press.

Mujis, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Palmer, S. B., Wehmeyer, M. L., Gipson, K., & Agran, M. (2004). Promoting access to the general education curriculum by teaching self-determination skills. *Exceptional Children, 70*(4), 427-439.

Peterson, L. Y., Burden, J. P., Sedaghat, J. M., Gothberg, J. E., Kohler, P. D., & Coyle, J. L. (2013). Triangulated IEP transition goals. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 45*(6), 46-57.

Rowe, D. A., Mazzotti, V. L., & Sinclair, J. (2015). Strategies for teaching self-determination skills in conjunction with the common core. *Intervention In School & Clinic, 50*(3), 131-141. doi:10.1177/1053451214542043

Rowe, D. A., Alverson, C. Y., Unruh, D. K., Fowler, Fowler, C. H., Kellems, R., & Test, D. W. (2014). A Delphi study to operationalize evidenced-based predictors in secondary transition. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals, 61*(9), 2-14. doi:10.1177/2165143414526429

- Schminke, M. and Ambrose, M. L. (2011), *Retracted: Ethics and Integrity in the Publishing Process: Myths, Facts, and a Roadmap*. Management and Organization Review, 7: 397–406. doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2011.00248.x
- Standards, U. C. (2013, June). <http://schools.utah.gov/CURR/langartelem/Core-Standards/ELAColorStandards.aspx>. Retrieved from <http://www.schools.utah.gov/core/>: <http://schools.utah.gov/CURR/langartelem/Core-Standards/ELAColorStandards.aspx>
- Shogren, K. S., Plotner, A. J., Palmer, S.B., Wehmeyer, M. L., & Paek, Y. (2014). Impact of the self-determined learning model of instruction on teacher perceptions of student capacity and opportunity for self-determination. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 49(3), 440-448.
- Test, D. W. (2012). *Evidenced-based instructional strategies for transition*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Test, D. W., Fowler, C. H., Richter, S. M., White, J., Mazzotti, V., Walker, A. R., & Korterling, L. (2009). Evidenced-based practices in secondary transition. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 32(2), 115-128.
doi:10.1177/0885728809336859
- Test, D. W., Fowler, C. H., Cease-Cook, J., & Bartholomew, A. (October, 2012). College and career ready standards and secondary transition planning for students with disabilities: 101.[http://nsttac.org/National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center](http://nsttac.org/National%20Secondary%20Transition%20Technical%20Assistance%20Center), 1-51.

- Thoma, C., Nathanson, R., Baker, S., & Tamura, R. (2002). Self-determination: What do special educators know and where do they learn it? *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(4), 242-247.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., Agran, M., & Hughes, C. (2000). A national survey of teachers' promotion of self-determination and student-directed learning. *The Journal of Special Education, 34*(2), 58-68.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., & Abery, B. H. (2013). Self-determination and choice. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 51*(5), 399-411.
- Wehmeyer, M. L. (2015). Framing the future self-determination. *Remedial and Special Education, 36*(1), 20-23.
- Wills, J. (2008). *Preparing all youth for academic and career readiness: Implications for high school policy and practice*. Center for Workforce Development Institute for Educational Leadership. Washington D. C.: National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth, Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York: Guilford Press.

Appendices

Appendix A: Survey of Educators in Davis District

The purpose of this survey is to determine to what extent students receive instruction in self-determination. Self-determination means making choices, setting goals, solving problems, and making decisions. Also, this survey asks questions regarding use of both teacher-developed and published curriculum practices.

Demographic Information

(Information is for statistical and classification purposes only. Your responses are anonymous.)

1. What is your gender?
 - a) Male b) Female

2. How many years total have you been teaching?
 - a) 0-5 years b) 6-10 years c) 11-15 years d) 15-20 years e) 21-25 years f) 26+

3. What is your highest degree completed
 - a) Bachelor's b) Master's c) Doctorate

4. What is your certification(s)? (Please mark all that apply)
 - a) General Education b) SPED Mild/Moderate d) SPED Severe e) Other (please specify)

5. What is your subject area? Select all that apply.

a) Humanities	e) Social Studies	h) Related Arts
b) Language Arts	f) Foreign Language	i) Vocational
c) Mathematics	g) Physical Education	j) Other (please specify)
d) Sciences		

6. What is your primary teaching assignment setting?
Rank from 1-6 with 1 being the primary setting.

— General Education	— Alternative High General Education
— Mild/Moderate	— Alternative High Special Education
— Self-Contained Mild/Moderate	— Mild/Moderate
— Severe	— Transition Special Educator Mild/Moderate
— Co-Teaching in General Education	— Transition Special Educator severe
	— Other (Please specify)

Teaching Strategies

Please mark all strategies that students receive instruction on in your classroom:

Strategy

- Anticipation Guides or Guided notes
- Argument, Claim, Evidence, Warrant
- Argument, S.M.E.L.L.
- 2-3 Column Notes
- Cornell Notes
- Carousel Brainstorming
- Flash Cards or Quizlet
- GIST, WH questions (who, what, when, where, why)
- K-W-L (Know, Want to Know, Learned)
- Non-Stop Writing
- Text Annotation and Coding (physically, highlighting text sections)
- Venn Diagrams
- Vocabulary Graphic Org
- SDLMI, Self-Determined Learning Model of Instruction
- SMART goals
- SQ3R, Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review
- Writing Prompts
- Written Conversation

Other Strategies: (please specify)

Progress Measurements

Please mark all measurements that you and the student use to determine their progress with:

Measurements:

- AP Tests
- Concurrent Enrollment
- Curriculum -based assessments
- Curriculum-based measurement
- Fluency timings
- Grades
- Learning probes (bell quiz)
- Portfolio
- Progress charts
- Progress reports, tracking
- Proficiency skills
- Skill Certification (e.g., CTE skill certificate etc.)
- School, District, State, National competitions
- Skills USA
- State license
- State Test
- Term project
- Self-monitor
- Self-awareness
- Self- knowledge
- Skill building exercises/activities

Other: (please specify)

Curricula

Please mark **Know** if you have heard of the curricula, mark **Use** if you use the curricula, and mark **Unaware** if you are not familiar with the curricula.

Use Know Unaware Curricula

- | | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Utahfutures.org |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Take Charge Today |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | SMART Goals |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Choice Maker Instructional Series |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | NEXT S.T.E.P.:
Student Transition and Educational Planning |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Steps to Self-Determination: A Curriculum to Help
Adolescents Learn to Achieve their Goals. |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Take Charge for the Future |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | A Teachers guide to Implementing the Self-Determined
Model of Instruction (SLDMI) |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Whose Future is it, Anyway?
A Student Directed Transition Process |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Go 4 IT . . . NOW! |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Student-Led IEPs: A Guide for Student Involvement |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | Other (please specify): |

Section #2**Program Characteristics to Support Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy**

Please complete the following by rating:

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

For the purpose of this survey, **the definition for Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy is:**

The ability to make choices, solve problems, set goals, evaluate options, take initiative to reach one's goals, and accept consequences of one's actions.

1. My program teaches students self-determination/self-advocacy using a structured curriculum with guided practice.

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

2. Students **receive instruction** in self-determination/self-advocacy to identify what they need.
(e.g. "if you are missing more than one assignment you need to come and see me: before/after school, during lunch tutorial" or "If you receive less than a 70% on the test I want to work with you before Friday. Come and see me").

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

3. My program works collaboratively with the student to promote self-determination/self-advocacy by **informing** them of their **options and the potential consequences** of their choices.
(e.g. Students receive instruction on where to find assignment requirements, what my late work policy is, and I electronically post due dates/project timelines ahead of time).

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

4. Students **receive instruction to self-monitor** their academic progress and are **provided opportunities to request help or ask questions**. (e.g. progress reports, learning probes, bell quizzes, etc.)

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

5. Students **receive** self-determination/self-advocacy **instruction** on how they can contact me in a variety of ways to request assistance or ask questions and are asked to demonstrate they can do this.
(e.g. sending an email, raising hand, visiting with me once during the term during tutorial, before school, during lunch, after school etc.)

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

6. Students **receive** age-appropriate self-determination/self-advocacy **assessments** in my class to increase their knowledge about their future goals to enable the student to learn about themselves. Assessments such as: Utahfutures.org, curriculum based measures, skill based proficiency, department based assessments etc.

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

7. **Students have the opportunity** to have an honest and respectful discussion about their results from Utahfutures.org, curriculum based measures, skill based proficiencies, and department based assessments etc.

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

8. My program helps **students apply the results of their assessments** to gain experience now to meet these future goals. (e.g. guidance or assistance in scheduling homework, progress, competitions, classes etc. to develop skill or meet these areas of interest.)

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

9. My program **supports** self-determination/self-advocacy of **the student as they make routine choices** for themselves through the course of my class. (e.g. Students can electronically access assignment requirements, due dates etc. ahead of time or when they are not in class.)

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

10. My program allows **students to learn from and accept consequences/rewards** within the natural school and community setting. (e.g. due dates are firm with allowance for accommodations).

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

11. My program fosters self-determination/self-advocacy through the **development of student leadership skills.**

(e.g. Students have opportunities to participate in leadership roles)

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

12. My program allows both general education and special education teachers to collaborate on strategies and curriculum.

Never (1) Seldom (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (4) Always (5)

Section #3**Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy Questions**

Please use the following rating scale:

No Instruction (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), Very High (5)

For the purpose of this survey, **the definition for Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy is:**

The ability to make choices, solve problems, set goals, evaluate options, take initiative to reach one's goals, and accept consequences of one's actions.

1. My students receive instruction in how to:

Make Choices	1	2	3	4	5
Solve problems	1	2	3	4	5
Set Goals	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluate options	1	2	3	4	5
Take initiative to reach ones goals	1	2	3	4	5
Accept consequences of one's actions	1	2	3	4	5

Please use the following rating scale:

No Instruction (1), Low (2), Moderate (3), High (4), Very High (5)

2. My curriculum includes opportunities for students to demonstrate their ability to:

Make Choices	1	2	3	4	5
Solve problems	1	2	3	4	5
Set Goals	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluate options	1	2	3	4	5
Take initiative to reach ones goals	1	2	3	4	5
Accept consequences of one's actions	1	2	3	4	5

Please continue on the next page.

This section asks questions regarding the use of both teacher-developed and published curriculum practices.

MAKING CHOICES

3. a. Within your curriculum does the student *receive instruction and practice on making choices*?

- Yes
- No

b. If yes, the student *receives instruction on making choices*, I require:

- making choices as a curriculum unit
- making choices to be practiced all term as part of my class structure
- students to provide examples of where they make choices in real life throughout the term
- Other: (please specify)

c. The curriculum or method I use to teach making choices is:

- Teacher developed plans
- Published curriculum (please name the curricula)
- Teacher-adapted published curriculum (please name the curriculum you adapted)
- Other: (please specify)

SOLVING PROBLEMS

4. a. Within your curriculum does the student *receive instruction and practice solving problems*?

- Yes
- No

b. If yes, the student *receives instruction and practice on solving problems*, I require:

- solving problems as a curriculum unit
- solving problems to be practiced all term as part of my class structure
- students to provide examples of where they are solving problems in real life throughout the term
- Other: (please specify)

c. The curriculum or method I use to teach solving problems is:

- Teacher developed plans
- Published curriculum (please name the curricula)
- Teacher-adapted published curriculum (please name what you adapt)
- Other: (please specify)

SETTING GOALS

5. a. Within your curriculum does **the student receive instruction and practice setting goals**?

- Yes
- No

b. If yes, the student *receives instruction and practice setting goals*, I require:

- setting goals as a curriculum unit
- setting goals to be practiced all term as part of my class structure
- students to provide examples of where they are setting goals in real life throughout the term
- Other: (please specify)

c. The curriculum or method I use to teach setting goals is:

- Teacher developed plans
- Published curriculum (please name the curricula)
- Teacher-adapted published curriculum (please name what you adapt)
- Other: (please specify)

EVALUATING OPTIONS

6. a. Within your curriculum does the student *receive instruction and practice evaluating options*?

- Yes
- No

b. If yes, the student *receives instruction and practice evaluating options*, I require:

- evaluating options as a curriculum unit
- evaluating options to be practiced all term as part of my class structure
- students to provide examples of where they are evaluating options in real life throughout the term
- Other: (please specify)

c. The curriculum or method I use to teach evaluating options is:

- Teacher developed plans
- Published curriculum (please name the curricula)
- Teacher-adapted published curriculum (please name what you adapt)
- Other: (please specify)

TAKING INITIATIVE

7. a. Within your curriculum does the student *receive instruction and practice* **taking initiative to reach one's goals?**

- Yes
- No

b. If yes, the student *receives instruction and practice* taking initiative to reach one's goals,

I require:

- taking initiative to reach one's goals as a curriculum unit
- taking initiative to reach one's goals to be practiced all term as part of my class structure
- students to provide examples of where they are taking initiative to reach one's goals in real life throughout the term
- Other: (please specify)

c. The curriculum or method I use to teach students to take initiative to reach one's goals is:

- Teacher developed plans
- Published curriculum (please name the curricula)
- Teacher-adapted published curriculum (please name what you adapt)
- Other: (please specify)

ACCEPTING NATURAL CONSEQUENCES

8. a. Within your curriculum does the student *receive instruction and practice*

accepting the natural consequences/rewards of one's actions?

- Yes
- No

b. If yes, the student *receives instruction and practice* accepting the natural consequences/rewards of one's actions, I require:

- accepting the natural consequences/rewards of one's actions as a curriculum unit
- accepting the natural consequences/rewards of one's actions to be practiced all term as part of my class structure
- students to provide examples of where they accepting the natural consequences/rewards of one's actions in real life throughout the term
- Other: (please specify)

c. The curriculum or method I use to teach natural consequences/rewards is:

- Teacher developed plans
- Published curriculum (please name the curricula)
- Teacher-adapted published curriculum (please name what you adapt)
- Other: (please specify)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Optional Question:

I found this survey to be: Not at all Slightly Somewhat Very Extremely
Helpful Helpful Helpful Helpful Helpful
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Appendix B: Checklist for Treatment Integrity

Used at: In-person Presentation at school A and B

Used by: Administrator conducted survey at school C, D, E, F

IN-PERSON PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS:

- _____ Explain the purpose of the survey
- _____ Read the District and IRB approval statements
- _____ Explain that participation is voluntary
- _____ State that completion of the survey is estimated to take 15 minutes
- _____ Ask for and respond to any additional questions or clarification
- _____ Thank those in attendance and those who will participate
- _____ Distribute the surveys
- _____ Gather the surveys
- _____ Put surveys in sealed envelope and return to the Staff Observer
- _____ Obtain list of those not in attendance

Administrator signature _____

Staff observer signature _____

Appendix C: Email to Principals

Hello Principals name,

Please forward this email to all general education teachers in your building. Special educators will receive a paper and pencil copy of this survey in their team meeting. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at mallen@dmail.net. This survey has been approved Utah State University IRB and Logan Toone in the Davis School District research department.

Best regards,

Melanie Allen

Appendix D: Email to Teachers Participating Electronically

Dear Teachers,

My name is Melanie Allen and I am a teacher at Syracuse High.

The purpose of this survey is to identify instruction that you are currently providing students as they learn to; make choices, problem solve, set goals etc.

This anonymous online survey will ask about a) strategies, b) progress measurements, and c) curriculum that you already use in your classroom.

This survey will take approximately 15 minutes. Thank you for your participation.

Follow this link to get started:

https://usu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_cO4FzzVOwI4TJDD. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding the survey. This survey will complete requirements for a Special Education M.Ed., Transition emphasis degree through Utah State University and has been approved by the USU Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Logan Toone in the Davis District research department.

Melanie Allen

mallen@dmail.net

Appendix E: Letter of District Support



Davis School District

Special Education Department • Kathy Chisholm, Director

Learning First!

April 6, 2015

RE: Master Project Survey

Melanie Allen
Syracuse High School
Davis School District

Dear Melanie,

Thank you for providing me with the documents that relate to your Master's Project on self-determination/self-advocacy. I have reviewed the abstract, survey, and methods document you sent to me. This letter is in support of your survey and Masters Project.

Self-determination/self-advocacy is a vital skill for any student to possess as they leave school and enter the adult world, whether that be in employment of higher education. It is even more important for students with disabilities. We know from the failure rates of students with disabilities that gaining these skills will increase the numbers of student in post high education settings and also in maintaining employment.

I have long advocated and shared information regarding curriculum and instruction in this area. I look forward to the results of your survey so that we can see exactly what is happening in our district. Where the bright spots are, how we can build on them and where we need to focus our efforts.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kathy Chisholm".

Kathy Chisholm