

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

---

12-2021

## Examining General Education Teacher Perceptions of Individualized Education Program Accommodations

Riley Johnson  
*Utah State University*

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



Part of the [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Johnson, Riley, "Examining General Education Teacher Perceptions of Individualized Education Program Accommodations" (2021). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 1618.  
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/1618>

This Creative Project 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](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



EXAMINING GENERAL EDUCATION TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF  
INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM ACCOMMODATIONS

by

Riley Johnson

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

MASTER OF EDUCATION

In

Special Education

Approved:

---

Kaitlin Bundock, Ph.D.  
Major Professor

---

Karen Hager Martinez, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

---

Nicole Pyle, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

---

Dr. Richard Cutler, Ph.D.  
Interim Vice Provost  
of Graduate Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Logan, Utah  
2021

**Abstract**

This study examines general education teacher perceptions of IEP accommodations and their suggestions for relevant training to support diverse learner needs. Accommodations have been defined as adaptations or changes to educational environments and practices designed to help students overcome challenges presented by their disabilities. An electronic survey was sent to general education teachers across the four high schools in Cache County School District. The survey included a variety of questions regarding teachers' perceptions of accommodations and their involvement in the IEP process. The results showed a variety of explanations and expand the knowledge base of various perceptions of this important aspect of the IEP process.

*Keywords:* IEP, disability, accommodations, stakeholders, perception

### **Introduction**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004 mandates that students with disabilities receive appropriate supports, accommodations, and curriculum modifications to facilitate their academic success in the least restrictive environment (*Section 1462 (b) (2) (A) (ii)*, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act., 2019). This law, in tandem with the expectations of the Utah Core Standards adopted in 2008, encourages assured academic achievement in critical content areas for *all* students (Utah Education Association, 2021). All is the key word, emphasizing the importance of an inclusive education with curriculum adapted to meet individual student needs. One way to create such a learning environment is by way of accommodations. The term accommodation has been defined as adaptations or changes to education environments and practices designed to help students overcome challenges presented by their disabilities (Laprairie et.al, 2010). Typically, accommodations fall within four categories: presentation (ex: text to speech or human reader), response (ex: oral response or use of graphic organizer), setting (ex: preferential seating, small group), and timing or scheduling (ex: extended time). Modifications are an adjustment to an assignment or a test that changes the standard or what the test or assignment is supposed to measure (ex: use of a word bank on an assessment, providing a different level of an assessment, etc.) (Laprairie et. all, 2010).

Students with disabilities or learning differences are entitled to receive accommodations in their least restrictive environment as determined by their Individualized Education Program (IEP). Each student's IEP is developed by the IEP team, which by law should include the parent(s), student (required at and above age 16), special educator, administrator, and general education teacher, with the goal of helping the student make adequate progress on personalized goals and successfully participate in the general education curriculum. Accommodations are a

large part of the discussion and should be determined with input from all members of the team. This is the ideal, but not always the reality due to many factors such as team involvement in the process, expertise of team members in discussing accommodations, and fidelity of implementation (Hodgson, Lazarus, Thurlow, 2011).

Much of the research to date has focused on legal requirements of inclusive education, guides for providing accommodations, and ideas for professional development to support collaboration between special and general education teachers (Kern et al., 2019; Krones, 2016, Larsen et al., 2019, 2001; Steffes, 2010). One study focused on the attitudes of general education English teachers toward providing accommodations to students who qualified for special education services under the category of autism (Krones, 2016). These findings showed teachers had various levels of understanding regarding accommodations and autism. While that study was specific to students receiving services under the category of autism and teacher perceptions of accommodations, few other studies have been conducted to examine general education teachers' perceptions of accommodations for students receiving special education services specifically at the high-school level. This study seeks to build off past findings and gather further information regarding general education perceptions of accommodations, training regarding accommodations and supporting diverse learner needs. It is anticipated that this study will provide information valuable for guiding training or professional development that general education teachers may access to understand their role in the IEP process and improve implementation of the IEP.

### **Literature Review**

I reviewed literature on this topic through EBSCO Host using the following search terms: secondary AND teacher AND accommodations AND IEP (yielded 30 results). The search was limited to secondary teachers because this study will focus on the IEP process and

accommodations within a high-school context only. Accommodations was also a key term to limit the number of results regarding other aspects of the IEP process. To select the articles reviewed here, I first evaluated whether the articles related to special and/or general education teachers' perceptions of accommodations by reviewing their titles. I reviewed the abstracts of any articles that appeared relevant based on their titles. I then reviewed the full text of any articles whose abstracts appeared to be relevant. I included studies that were conducted in the United States, were published in English, and related to general education teachers' perceptions of accommodations for students receiving special education services. Due to the low numbers of studies conducted on this topic, I included dissertations in addition to peer-reviewed articles. I excluded studies that met the above criteria but focused primarily on teachers' perceptions of the overall IEP process, rather than specifically accommodations. I also excluded studies conducted before 2004, because that is the year in which the most recent update to IDEA occurred. Four sources serve as the key literature referred to in this study: two dissertations (Krones, 2016; Steffes, 2010), and two research studies on general education teacher perspectives of accommodations (Kern et al., 2019; Larsen et al., 2019).

Larsen and colleagues (2019) conducted a study in which they interviewed twelve teachers, three English learner (EL), six special education, and three general education teachers who taught students in 4<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades, and asked them catalog the accessibility features and accommodations used in class that were helpful to students, identify reasons that certain accessibility features and accommodations were and were not used, and explore barriers to the effective use of accessibility features and accommodations. The researchers also interviewed students with IEPs or those who had been identified as ELs and were in grades 4-12, regarding their opinions of the accommodations they receive in classrooms and on statewide exams

(Larsen, et al, 2019). Students described the accessibility features and accommodations they accessed as helpful, especially technological devices. The students demonstrated their understanding of accommodations by choosing one they use frequently. Teachers across categories noted that for students to receive the benefits of an accommodation it was dependent on teacher willingness to implement the accommodations, educator understanding and willingness to seek out supports for students, teacher and specialist willingness to collaborate and make decisions about implementation, and allocation of resources to support students with special needs (Larsen, et al, 2019). Based on these results, the authors recommend that all educators become informed of what accessibility features and accommodations are available and identify meaningful supports that meet the needs of their students, including students with IEPs and ELs. They also noted that teachers need professional development to learn about providing accommodations, and to keep up with the advances in technology that make learning more accessible for diverse learners.

One dissertation reviewed teachers' perceptions of providing accommodations for students with Asperger Syndrome (Krones, 2016). Six high school general education teachers that had between 3-20 years of teaching experience answered questions through surveys and interviews, participated in observations, and wrote journal reflections regarding their perceptions of the IEP process and providing accommodations to students in English classes. The results showed that the general education teachers have a desire to build a rapport with diverse learners, but feel accommodations are not clearly stated on the IEP. Some teachers viewed IEPs as a legal cover for special education teachers and felt like the document did not describe the individual needs of a student. One teacher noted that the accommodations listed on the IEP tended to be very generic and did not match with how a student presented. She would follow the

general accommodations, but also “do her own thing” (Krones, 2016, p. 100). Another teacher noted that it is difficult to support a classroom of thirty students when there is one student who needs consistent attention and help. The follow up with a case manager and parents is also overwhelming (Krones, 2016, p. 104). This supports the assertion that teachers are well intentioned but may feel underprepared and overwhelmed at the prospect of delivering accommodations to students with IEPs, resulting in diverse learner needs being overlooked or IEP accommodations not being implemented correctly (Hodgson et al., 2011).

Another study (Kern et. al, 2016) focused on evaluating the consistency of accommodations in classroom and testing settings for secondary level students with emotional and behavioral concerns. The researchers evaluated IEPs from 54 high schools to investigate the types of classroom and testing accommodations received by high school students with emotional and behavioral problems. Findings suggest that accommodation selection is poorly understood and a highly imprecise practice. Among the 222 participants, the most frequent accommodations were setting accommodations. Setting accommodations were provided to 176 (80%) students in the classroom and 180 (82%) students on state/district-wide assessments, timing/scheduling was provided to 182 (82%) students in the classroom and to 129 (58%) students on state/district-wide assessments, and presentation was provided to 123 (55%) students in both the classroom and on state/district-wide assessments. All other accommodations were provided to fewer than 50% of students.

Kern and colleagues (2019) also found that there was high variability about the students who received accommodations based on disability category, school, and grade level, and that there was overall a lack of clarity regarding accommodations that often results in a mismatch between student performance and intended outcome of the accommodation (Kern et. al,



2019). Apart from presentation and setting accommodations, students who received services under the category of OHI were less likely to receive accommodations on state/district-wide assessments compared to students who received services under the categories of SLD or ED. Some teachers are unsure how to suggest appropriate accommodations for students, while others feel unwilling because of lack of understanding as to how various disabilities affect students in the classroom. Based on the results the researchers suggest teachers

Another dissertation reviewed English and math teacher perceptions of accommodations in inclusive secondary settings (Steffes, 2010). Teachers from 337 public high schools in the state of Colorado were invited to participate in the study. Eight general education teachers from both urban and rural high schools with varying experience levels (3-12 years of teaching) participated in a series of 3 interviews regarding providing accommodations for students with learning disabilities. The researcher noted teachers needed to be reminded what constituted a student with a learning disability. Teachers noted feeling that the current accommodation implementation system is broken since they are the individuals responsible for implementing accommodations, but they are not given the information they need to perform the task (Steffes, 2010). The systems used to make general education teachers aware of students with IEPs and their accommodations varied from school to school; some teachers were made aware of student needs through a common grade system, some needed to ask for information from the special ed teacher themselves, while others never heard anything from teachers or admin even when they reached out for information (Steffes, 2010). Teachers suggested ways to improve the system so they could help students more efficiently. They noted the desire of a resource bank and training to help them understand how to better implement accommodations in their classrooms as well as

the benefit of having access to a paraprofessional who knows the students and understands how to implement accommodations.

When asked about the priority teachers place on providing accommodations with regard to their other daily duties many teachers noted class sizes, multiple sections of classes, and years of experience as barriers to providing accommodations. As teachers had more experience with their content, it was easier to focus on differentiation and individualization. Teachers in both content areas noted the benefit accommodations provide to students. A common consensus amongst the participants is that accommodations help students perform better on tests, and even noted end of level assessments, and makes it possible for a student to show progress that would be difficult without the support provided by an accommodation (Steffes, 2010). These findings show a need for further research to identify supports that will bridge the gap between special education and general education teachers and support students with IEPs.

### **Problem Statement**

These important studies lay the groundwork for this research project centered around general education teacher perceptions of accommodations in secondary settings. General education teachers want to provide accommodations but can feel excluded from the IEP process or under prepared to join the team in that capacity. To address this problem, further research is needed to identify effective solutions for improving practice in collaborating with general education teachers and ensuring that they are implementing student accommodations in feasible and effective ways. Prior research has examined general educator perceptions of IEP accommodations in a narrow way, focusing on teachers of content areas (Steffes, 2010), accommodations for students receiving services under specific disability categories (Krones, 2016), and often across sometimes a wide range of grade levels (Larsen, et al, 2019). However, a

district wide survey of all general educators' perceptions of IEP accommodations has yet to be conducted. Such a survey may reveal additional findings related to other variables of interest (e.g., subject of classes, types of accommodations, etc.) that may be useful for guiding professional development and teacher preparation. Therefore, this study seeks to build off past studies by surveying high-school general education teachers to identify perspectives and needs of this vital stakeholder group. The information gained from this study has the potential to improve the collaborative process related to identifying and implementing accommodations for diverse learners in high schools.

## **Method**

### **Purpose Statement and Research Question**

The purpose of this study was to gather data on general education teacher perceptions of IEP accommodations and identify (a) solutions to improve their involvement in the accommodation selection process, as well as (b) strategies to train teachers about providing IEP accommodations.

My research questions include:

1. What are general education teachers' perceptions regarding their experiences implementing IEP accommodations in the general education classroom setting?
2. What additional training or support do general education teachers identify as being relevant to their provision of IEP accommodations?

### **Participants**

This study included participants from the four high schools in Cache County Utah School District. A total of approximately 264 general education teachers were eligible to complete the survey. The survey was distributed to the department heads of each high school in the district. Each department head used their school listserv to share the survey with the general education teachers within their high school. Teachers were eligible to participate in the survey if they taught a general education course and taught at least one student with an IEP in any class period.

### **Exclusion Criteria**

General education teachers were excluded from the survey if they did not interact with a student who had an IEP and participated in at least one general education course. Special education teachers and related service personnel were not eligible to participate in the study. Respondents answered screening questions to determine their eligibility for the study.

### **Dependent Variables and Response Measurement**

The dependent variables included participants' responses to the survey questions regarding IEP accommodations and the training required to provide accommodations to students with IEPs. I collected demographic information, perceptions of accommodations, and suggestions for improvement regarding general education teachers' provision of IEP accommodations. Demographic questions included level of education, degree type, years of experience, content, and subject area. Participants answered a variety of question types (multiple choice, rating scale, open ended) regarding commonly provided accommodations and their preparedness to provide them to students with IEPs in classroom environments.

### **Survey Instrument**

The survey was developed and conducted using Qualtrics survey software (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) and was divided into several sections. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix A. Section I includes a definition of accommodations (Laprairie et al., 2010) as well as demographic questions. Section II collected respondents' perceptions of accommodations. Section III collected respondents' perceptions regarding their preparation to implement accommodations.

The survey was created by two researchers (student researcher and supervising faculty member) based on questions posed in similar prior research (Krones, 2016, Larsen et al., 2019), as well as first-hand experience working in public schools as special education teachers. The researchers first created a draft of questions that related to the two main research questions. They revised these questions based on feedback from two faculty members to ensure clarity and improve accuracy of measurement.

### **Procedures**

1. Following USU Institutional Review Board approval, I contacted Cache County School District representatives to seek approval for the study, and to ensure that district and/or school staff were willing to assist with survey distribution.
2. Following these approvals, I sent an email to the department heads of each high school in the district who then used the school listserv to share the survey with general education teachers. The email message sent to department heads included the purpose of the study, a link to the survey, instructions on how to complete the survey, as well as a copy of the informed consent document. The email is included in Appendix B.
3. A follow-up email was sent out to department heads one week after the initial email to remind participants to complete the survey.
4. In the survey, participants were first given an opportunity to review the informed consent form and indicate whether they would like to participate. No incentives were offered for teachers to complete the survey. If they chose not to participate, they were routed to a “thank-you” message and exited the survey.
5. Participants then answered screening questions and were directed to the end of the survey if they provided any “no” responses.
6. Following the screening questions, participants provided demographic information, and then answered questions in the following sections: Section II: questions about general education teacher perceptions of accommodations and Section III: questions about preparation.
7. Privacy and confidentiality: Apart from the question on the survey related to providing consent to participate, all survey responses were anonymous.

Respondents were only required to answer the screening questions; respondents had the choice to skip any questions as they complete the survey. To minimize risk of violation of confidentiality, all data was maintained on a password protected computer and in a secure file on Box.com.

### **Data Analysis**

Data were collected over a three-week period. Across all sections of the survey, data were analyzed based on the type of question asked. For rating scale questions, I analyzed the data by calculating means and standard deviations for each question. For multiple choice questions, I analyzed the data by calculating frequencies. For open-ended response questions, the data were analyzed by identifying common themes and counting how often these themes occurred.

Qualitative data was analyzed using the following steps (Taylor-Powell & Renner, 2003):

1. Read and analyze data carefully. Identify quality data and identify potential bias.
2. Focus the analysis using my research questions.
3. Categorize the data and identify themes, patterns, or categories.
4. Identify patterns and connections between categories or themes.
5. Interpret the data by using graphic organizers or outlines to determine the importance or implication of the data.

A second researcher independently reviewed and categorized the data and identified themes, patterns, or categories. The two researchers compared categories, noting any discrepancies. They discussed their categorization until consensus was reached.

## Results

### Respondents

The survey was sent to four department heads at high schools in the Cache County School District who were then requested to send the survey to the staff at their respective schools. Approximately 264 general education teachers were eligible to take the survey. A total of 27 current employees attempted the survey; 19 of these were general education teachers. This equates to a 7% response rate. Based on review of consent documents it appears the respondents came from one high school. Based on that, the response rate for this sub population (for one high school) was 29%. The most common respondents were general education teachers (70%,  $n = 19/27$ ), followed by related service personnel (15%,  $n = 4/27$ ), special education teachers (7%,  $n = 2/27$ ) and other personnel (7%,  $n = 2/27$ ). Only general education teachers that had students with IEPs in their classes were eligible to complete the survey, so 19 teachers completed the survey.

### Demographics

Table 1 displays the demographic information for survey respondents. All 19 general education teachers that completed the survey taught students with IEPs at the time of survey completion. Almost half of the teachers had completed bachelor's degrees (42%,  $n=8/19$ ) while the other half have completed master's degrees (47%,  $n=9/19$ ) as well. Of the teachers that completed the survey 16% ( $n=3/19$ ) had taught for 1-2 years, 16% ( $n=3/19$ ) 3-5 years, 16% ( $n=3/19$ ) 6-10 years, and over half (52%,  $n=10/19$ ) had taught for eleven or more years.

Teachers instructed in a wide variety of content areas; English (27%,  $n= 6/22$ ) social studies/history (23%,  $n= 5/22$ ); science (18%,  $n= 4/22$ ); math (9%,  $n=2/22$ ) and art, foreign language, physical education, ESL, and performing arts/media (5%,  $n=1/22$ ). While there were



only nineteen respondents on this question, it is likely that at least three teachers taught classes in more than one department which explains the  $n$  of 22 instead of 19.

**Table 1**

*Demographics of Respondents*

Variables	$n$	%
Education Level ( $n = 19$ )		
Master's	9	47%
Bachelor's	8	42%
Bachelor's degree in progress	1	5%
Master's degree in progress	1	5%
Years of Experience ( $n = 19$ )		
11+	10	52%
1-2	3	16%
3-5	3	16%
6-10	3	16%
Content Area ( $n = 22$ )		
English	6	27%
Social Studies/History	5	23%
Science	4	18%
Math	2	9%
Art	1	5%
Foreign Language	1	5%
Physical Education	1	5%
ESL	1	5%
Performing Arts/Media	1	5%

**Teachers' Experiences Implementing IEP Accommodations**

Table 2 displays general education teachers' perceptions regarding their experiences implementing IEP accommodations in the general education classroom setting. Of the teachers who completed the survey the highest number of respondents indicated 47% ( $n = 9/19$ ) reported having between 3-5 students per class period in their general education courses. Teachers in Cache County are involved in collaborative teaching efforts in mathematics and English. Out of the 19 teachers that completed the survey, four co-taught with special educators, one co-taught with a general educator, and 14 taught independently all day. As far as communication with

special education teachers is concerned, 53% ( $n= 10/19$ ) of general education teachers reported communicating at least once per trimester with special education teachers regarding accommodations, 37% ( $n= 7/19$ ) communicate on a weekly basis, and the remainder are evenly split between communicating daily or never regarding accommodations. Teachers were asked to select the three accommodations they provide most frequently. Table 3 includes teacher responses on a question for which they were asked to rank which accommodations they use most frequently in their classrooms. Two of the top accommodations reported were preferential seating (63%,  $n=12/19$ ) and extended time (37%,  $n=7/19$ ). The least frequently used accommodations were speech to text and text to speech (37%,  $n=7/19$ ).

There are times when it is difficult to provide accommodations to students. When asked about instances in which teachers do not provide accommodations to students the most common response was that students do not ask for support (36%,  $n= 12/33$ ) The second reason teachers reported was that they did not have enough time (30%,  $n= 10/22$ ). Sixty percent ( $n= 12/20$ ) of teachers recognized school wide practices that help them implement accommodations, 5% ( $n= 1/20$ ) reported benefitting from department practices, and 35% ( $n= 7/20$ ) of teachers utilized independent practices. Teachers reported how they determine whether accommodations are successful. The most common signs of accommodation success reported by teachers were an increase in student success when the accommodation is used versus when it is not (32%,  $n=16/50$ ), student is passing the class (30%,  $n=15/50$ ), student passes assignments (22%,  $n=11/50$ ), the student continues to request the accommodation (12%,  $n=6/50$ ), teacher evaluates performance with or without the accommodation (2%,  $n=1/50$ ), and student engagement increases (2%,  $n=1/50$ ).

**Table 2***Teachers' Experiences Implementing IEP Accommodations*

Variables	<i>n</i>	%
Number of students with IEPs per class period ( <i>n</i> = 19)		
9-12	10	53%
1-2	3	16%
3-5	3	16%
6-8	3	16%
Co-teaching ( <i>n</i> =19)		
No	14	74%
With special education teacher	4	21%
With a general education teacher	1	5%
With an aide	0	0
Frequency of communication with special education ( <i>n</i> = 19)		
Once per trimester	10	53%
Weekly	7	37%
Never	1	5%
Daily	1	5%
Top three accommodations provided most frequently ( <i>n</i> = 57)		
Preferential Seating	16	28%
Extended time	15	26%
Tests/quizzes in the testing center or resource room	13	23%
Allow oral answers	2	4%
Calculator	2	4%
Copy of lecture notes	2	4%
Tests/quizzes read aloud	1	2%
Reasons teachers might not provide accommodations ( <i>n</i> = 33)		
Student doesn't ask for it	12	36%
Not enough time	10	30%
Student doesn't need it	5	15%
Not applicable	3	9%
Not enough training	2	6%
Other: Difficult with large class size IEP student base	1	3%
Obstacles encountered when providing accommodations ( <i>n</i> = 43)		
Student does not want to use accommodations	15	35%
Overwhelmed by variety of accommodations asked to provide	8	19%
Teacher unsure how to implement an accommodation	8	19%
Teacher does not feel accommodations are helpful	5	12%
Teacher unaware of accommodations	4	9%
None	2	5%
Other: Assess they need more, but don't know how to get it	1	2%
Practices to help implementation of IEP accommodations ( <i>n</i> = 20)		
School wide	12	60%
Teacher implements own practices	7	35%

Department wide	1	5%
No	0	0%
Signs accommodations are successful ( $n= 50$ )		
Student has success with accommodations vs. without	16	32%
Student is passing	15	30%
Student passes assignment	11	22%
Student continues to request accommodations	6	12%
Teacher evaluates student performance with and without accommodation	1	2%
Other: Student engagement increases	1	2%

**Table 3**

*Teacher Ranking of Accommodations Used Most Frequently ( $n=19$ )*

Accommodations	Ranking												
	Most Feasible (1)					to			Least Feasible (13)				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Preferential Seating	12	3											1
Speech-to-text					1	1			2	1	7	4	
Extended time		2	7	1	2	2			1			1	
Tests/Quizzes read aloud		2		1	2	4	1	3			2	1	
Text-to-speech				1	1			1	1	7	4	1	
Allow oral answers				3	1		6	2	2	1		1	
Calculator	3	1	1	1	1	2		1	1		1	4	
Reduce assignment length		1	1		3	1	3	1	2	3		1	
Provide breaks during class		1		3	2	3	1	2	2	2			
Behavior plan/reinforcement system						1	1	4	4	2	1	3	
Copy of peer or lecture notes		5	2	2		2	3	2					
Other:	1												15
Tests/quizzes read in the testing center		1	5	4	3		1		1		1		

*Note.* Cells in the table include number of respondents who ranked an accommodation the corresponding number; 1 represents most feasible, 13 represents least feasible.

*Open-Ended Questions Related to Implementation of IEP Accommodations*

Teachers were asked open ended questions regarding their perceptions of implementation of IEP accommodations. Seventeen respondents answered the question, “In your opinion, are accommodations necessary for students with IEPs? Explain why or why not.” Common themes found within answers to the questions were that accommodations were necessary (16) because they were helpful (8), or that it depended if accommodations were necessary (5) because some students use them as a crutch (2). Feasibility of implementing accommodations (2) and collaboration with sped (2) were also addressed in this question. Table 4 includes specific examples of teacher responses and the frequencies of each. Example responses in each table of open-ended responses (Tables 4, 5, 6, and 8) were chosen based on which answers best reflected the theme. A decision about each example was reached through agreement between myself and a secondary researcher. As we discussed themes, some teacher’s responses were categorized under more than one theme.

**Table 4**

*In your opinion, are accommodations necessary for students with IEPs? Explain why or why not.*

*(n=16)*

Theme	n	Examples
Needed	16	“Yes. Accommodations help students with IEPs be successful in school.”
Depends	5	“Yes and no. I allow pretty much everybody preferential seating if needed, calculators and I don’t dock points for late work. The only difference is kids with IEPs. I do give a longer retake deadline.”
Crutch	2	“Often they are. But there are also many times where they aren’t and hinder the student’s ability to challenge themselves and progress. If something is hard or extra hard for them, they have an easy out. Whereas if something is harder for you than others, normally more work is needed and that helps create a more resilient person.”
Helpful	8	“Absolutely. If a student has an IEP and has needed intervention when it comes to learning it’s only appropriate that we follow-up that intervention with any accommodations needed for the student to better succeed.”
Feasibility	2	“I think they are necessary, but sometimes they are too difficult to achieve in the amount of time given.”
Collaboration with SPED	2	“Accommodations are necessary for students with IEPs because it is their personal path to success. It may be different than most, but it is possible to be successful with their specific learning issues and as a teacher I can definitely guide them through their challenges with the help of Special Education teachers and accommodations.”

Fourteen respondents answered the question, “In your typical teaching day, what helps you implement accommodations? These can be things you do individually, or formal/informal support you get from others at your school.” Common themes found within these answers revolved around three general ways teachers received support: collaboration with special

education teachers (5), student self-advocacy (5), universal design (3), and personal systems (3).

Table 5 includes specific examples of teacher responses.

**Table 5**

*In your typical teaching day, what helps you implement accommodations? These can be things you do individually, or formal/informal support you get from others at your school. (n= 14)*

Theme	<i>n</i>	Examples
Collaboration with special education	5	<p>“Support from the testing center”</p> <p>“Support from special education teachers”</p>
Student self-advocacy	5	<p>“Just knowing what the accommodations is, is very helpful.”</p> <p>“It is helpful when students with accommodations can advocate for themselves. I teach Advanced Placement and Concurrent Enrollment classes when I have students with accommodations, they don’t request to use them, but I provide all the notes and do guided notes in my class, so I think that helps the students. Quizzes and test in my class are critical thinking-based questions and I allow students to use notes. It is nice to have the testing center when needed and to have students be given accommodations on the AP test as needed as well.”</p>
Universal Design	3	<p>“I implement a lot of these accommodations to my whole class.”</p>
Personal Systems	3	<p>“I review IEP’s as I am lesson planning to make sure that I have thought of everything. I utilize peer help at each group table. I provide Directed studies instructors any items prior to or just after a lesson to assist them in providing additional support for the students.”</p>

Sixteen respondents answered the question, “What would make implementing students’ IEP accommodations more feasible in your classes?” Common themes found within these answers revolved around collaboration between special and general education (6), student self-

advocacy (7), and time management (2). Table 6 includes specific examples of teacher responses.

**Table 6**

*What would make implementing students' IEP accommodations more feasible in your classroom? (n= 15)*

Theme	<i>n</i>	Examples
Collaboration with special education	6	“Getting student IEP information/accommodations before each trimester starts in order to prepare”
Student self-advocacy	8	“It takes too long to look them all up individually and then after looking them up, I forget the next day. How can I access it easier and remember better? Have it all summarized on a page somewhere? Also, have students tell me if they want to go to the testing center. Student requests”
		“Direction from the student as to what accommodation is needed when.”
		“What if students wrote letters to their teachers requesting specific accommodations each trimester? I think students who have IEPs don't always need all of the accommodations all of the time but it might be helpful for them to individualize what they need in each class once they settle into the course and understand expectations. I would love for the students to write me an email or note asking for what they need specifically.”
Time management	2	“More time”
		“More time to change assignments and tests”

### **Training or Support Teachers Reported as Relevant**

Table 7 displays general education teachers' desires for support or training that would be relevant to their provision of IEP accommodations. Teachers reported that they had taken part in at least one of the following types of trainings: collaboration with colleagues (33%, *n*= 16/49),



college/university classes (27%,  $n= 13/49$ ), district professional development (14%,  $n= 7/49$ ), school-wide professional development (10%,  $n=5/49$ ) research (8%,  $n= 4/49$ ), conferences (6%,  $n= 3/49$ ), and statewide professional development (2%,  $n=1/49$ ). Most teachers (47%,  $n= 9$ ) reported that they received training regarding IEP accommodations 1-2 years ago; 21% ( $n=4/19$ ) had never received any training, followed by 16% ( $n= 3/19$ ) of teachers who had received training the same year the survey was conducted. A small percentage (5%,  $n= 1/19$ ) reported that they received training within the last 3-5 years and lastly 11% ( $n= 2/19$ ) reported that they had not received training in 6 or more years. A majority (84%,  $n= 16/19$ ) of teachers said they would be interested in attending training regarding providing IEP accommodations. The teachers rated the following training options as most to least valuable: professional development (43%,  $n=7/16$ ), coaching and mentoring (25%,  $n=4/16$ ), professional learning communities (19%,  $n= 3/16$ ) and support for attending conferences and workshops (13%,  $n= 2/16$ ).

**Table 7***Training or Support Teachers Reported as Relevant*

Variables	<i>n</i>	%
Last time teacher received training about IEP accommodations ( <i>n</i> =19)		
1-2 years ago	9	47%
I have not received any training on these topics	4	21%
This school year	3	16%
6+ years ago	2	11%
3-5 years ago	1	5%
Interest in attending training about providing IEP accommodations ( <i>n</i> =19)		
Yes	16	84%
No	3	16%
Training desired to be provided and determined most valuable to teachers ( <i>n</i> =16)		
Professional Development	7	44%
Coaching/Mentoring	4	25%
PLCs	3	19%
Support for attending conferences/workshops	2	12%
Trainings teachers have been involved in regarding IEP accommodations ( <i>n</i> =49)		
Collaboration with colleagues	16	33%
College/university classes	13	27%
District professional development	7	14%
School professional development	5	10%
Research (internet, journal articles)	4	8%
Conferences	3	6%
State professional development	1	2%

*Open-Ended Questions Related to Training or Support*

Thirteen respondents answered the question, “If you were to seek, or if your school/district was to provide more training on IEP accommodations, what information would help you most?” Common themes within this answer were implementation of IEP accommodations (5), better understanding of IEPs (2), balancing other needs and teaching obligations (2), and student confidentiality (2). Table 8 includes specific examples and frequencies of the answers to this question.

**Table 8**

*If you were to seek, or if your school/district was to provide more training on IEP*

*accommodations, what information would help you most? (n= 13)*

Theme	<i>n</i>	Examples
Implementation of IEP accommodations	9	<p>“I would like to know effective strategies that other teachers have used when implementing IEP accommodations”</p> <p>“More creative and helpful ways to implement the common accommodations”</p>
Better understanding of IEPs	2	<p>“Better examples of implementation Understanding of the reasons IEPs are provided.”</p> <p>“Better understanding of ways these students learn differently and how I can provide learning experiences that enhance them while not reducing the engagement of other students. Best practices to assist these students to success”</p>
Balancing other student needs and teaching obligations	2	<p>“It is helpful for me to ask questions about specific students to teachers to know how to help them Knowing how to make time for all these students needs while working with the other 97% of my students”</p>
Student confidentiality	2	<p>“How to keep increased pace in class with a lot of students with IEPs”</p> <p>“How to communicate better with the kids because sometimes I feel they don’t use the accommodation because they are embarrassed.”</p> <p>“Ways to implement IEP accommodations without embarrassing or exposing student to others.”</p>

## Discussion

### Key Findings

Key findings in the survey focused on general education teachers' perceptions of IEP accommodations and training related to providing IEP accommodations. Results fell within five major themes: the types of accommodations provided, need for accommodations, feasibility of providing accommodations, implementation of IEP accommodations, and training needed. The consensus across the general education teachers that were surveyed indicates that they view IEP accommodations as important, and desire training and support from special education teachers, administrators, and district officials to help them manage this role in their jobs.

### *Types of Accommodations Provided*

General education teachers across multiple content areas noted three accommodations that they provided most frequently in their classrooms: preferential seating (28%, n= 16/57), extended time (26%, n= 15/57), and tests and quizzes in a testing center or resource room (23%, n= 13/57). Two of those, preferential seating and testing in an alternate location, are considered setting accommodations. Extended time is considered a timing/scheduling accommodation. This supports research by Kern and colleagues (2019) that stated the most frequent accommodations provided to students in their study were setting and timing accommodations. Their study also noted all other accommodations were provided to fewer than 50% of students. In this study, respondents reported that the other six accommodations were provided to students less than 6% of the time.

### *The Need for Accommodations*

One major question regarding general education teacher perceptions of IEP accommodations is whether they are perceived as necessary for students in the first place. Prior

research has confirmed that teachers in both English and math content areas noted the benefit accommodations provide to students (Steffes, 2010). In this study 16 out of 17 teachers identified on an open-ended question that accommodations are needed and useful in the classroom, writing comments like, “accommodations are necessary for students with IEPs because it is their personal path to success. I can guide them through their challenges with the help of Special Education teachers and accommodations,” or “Absolutely. If a student has an IEP and has needed intervention in when it comes to learning, it’s only appropriate that we follow up that interventions with any accommodations needed for the student to better succeed.”

On the same open-ended question 7 out of 17 teachers identified feeling accommodations were a crutch to students (2 teachers) or that it depended on a situation whether they are needed for a student (5 teachers). When asked what obstacles teachers encountered regarding providing IEP accommodations, 5 out of 19 teachers noted that in general they, the teachers, do not feel accommodations are helpful. In prior research general education teachers reported feeling that accommodations are not clearly stated on the IEP or tend to be generic and do not match with how a student presents in class (Krones, 2010). One teacher who said the need for accommodations depends made a similar response and said they could “provide more of what would assist with learning if [they] had a bigger picture of the needs.” Another teacher responded that the necessity of accommodations “depends on how the student uses the accommodations.” Another teacher said accommodations are often necessary, but many times “hinder a student’s ability to challenge themselves. If something is hard, they have an easy out.”

These responses signify a a potential disparity in teacher understanding about the purpose of accommodations for students with IEPs. As referenced in prior literature, accommodations are adaptations or changes to education environments and practices designed

to help students overcome challenges presented by their disabilities (Laprairie et.al, 2010). Teachers who stated they feel accommodations are necessary referenced the need to support students individually through providing accommodations that can help them overcome challenges. Those teachers who were unsure or reticent to provide accommodations referenced them as a crutch or dependent on how the student uses the accommodations. It is important to note these differences in understanding can have a meaningful impact on how a student accesses curriculum in a teacher's class and points to a need for training and support on the purpose of accommodations.

### ***Feasibility and Managing Teacher Needs***

When asked where they see implementing IEP accommodations on their priority list 84% ( $n= 16/19$ ) of general education teachers felt that responsibility was either very important (37%,  $n= 7/19$ ) or important (47%,  $n= 9/19$ ). When considering the findings of the needs for accommodations together with these responses, the results may indicate that in theory a large majority of teachers find IEP accommodations necessary and important, but this does not always translate to practice, especially in a secondary setting when teachers often have 35+ students in a classroom for five class periods per day, and an average of 3-5 students in each classroom that require IEP accommodations.

While many general education teachers reported feeling IEP accommodations were important and needed, their perception regarding the feasibility of implementing accommodations in the classroom was complex. One teacher noted, "I think they are necessary, but sometimes they are too difficult to achieve in the amount of time given." In fact, 12% ( $n= 2/17$ ) of teachers that participated in the survey relayed the same feeling. The top two obstacles teachers faced when implementing accommodations in the classroom revolved around being

unsure how to implement accommodations (18%,  $n= 8/43$ ) and perceiving students did not want to use accommodations (35%,  $n=15/43$ ).

In prior research (Krones, 2010) a teacher commented that it is difficult to support a classroom of thirty students when there is one who needs consistent attention and help. Teachers reported similar feelings in the survey, reporting feelings like, “I think they [accommodations] are necessary, but sometimes too difficult to achieve in the amount of time given.” Another teacher reported wanting training on “how to keep an increased pace in class with a lot of students with IEP’s.” Another teacher commented she wants to know “how to make time for all these student’s needs while working with the other 97% of my students.” The results of the current study are similar to those of Krones (2010). Even with 60% ( $n= 12/20$ ) of the teachers surveyed in the current study commenting there are school-wide practices in place to help them implement IEP accommodations, 84% ( $n= 16/19$ ) of teachers still commented about wanting training when it comes to implementing accommodations in their classrooms. These concerns from general education teachers bring to light the importance of training and support for teachers with multiple levels of experience. Literature referenced (Krones, 2010) the difficulties new teachers face when supporting diverse learners, but in this study 53% ( $n=10/19$ ) of teachers had a decade or more of teaching experience. This finding indicates that consistent training and support may be needed to help novice and experienced teachers adapt to the changing needs of students, especially those who require accommodations.

### ***Implementation and Collaboration with Special Education***

The results from this study show a need for greater collaboration between special educators and general educators specifically regarding implementation of accommodations. Only four respondents (21%,  $n= 4/19$ ) reported co-teaching with a special education teacher and 14

(74%,  $n= 14/19$ ) reported not co-teaching at all. Additionally, only seven respondents (37%,  $n= 7/19$ ) reported communicating weekly with special education teachers about IEP accommodations outside of IEP meetings, and ten respondents (53%,  $n= 10/19$ ) reported communicating once per trimester. When asked what made providing accommodations more feasible in the classroom, 5 out of 14 respondents on an open ended question indicated that collaboration with special education teachers was helpful. On another open-ended question about what would make accommodations more feasible to implement in the classroom, 6 out of 16 respondents suggested support and collaboration from special educators to improve general education teacher implementation of IEP accommodations. Respondents commented that receiving IEPs the first week of school or getting information before about accommodations before each trimester starts would be helpful. One teacher respondent, “Have [accommodations information] summarized on a page somewhere. Have students tell me if they want to go to the testing center.” This particular response highlights a break down in communication between special education and general education teachers because in the system this district uses for attendance, each student with an IEP has an icon next to their name and that icon has the information about what accommodations the student should receive as well as contact information for their case manager. This also highlights the need to discuss a student’s role in advocating for accommodations versus a teacher’s role in providing the accommodations regardless of what a student asks for. Results indicate that there is potentially frustration and confusion that would create difficulty for implementing IEP accommodations, but this could be addressed effectively through collaboration.

Prior research indicates both a need for collaboration between special educators and general educators, as well as the value of doing so. In a study from Kern and colleagues (2019),



results showed there was high variability about the students who received accommodations based on disability category, school, and grade level, and that there was overall a lack of clarity regarding accommodations that often results in a mismatch between student performance and intended outcome of the accommodation (Kern et. al, 2019). Another study's results elaborate that for students to receive the benefits of an accommodation it was dependent on teacher willingness to implement the accommodations, educator understanding and willingness to seek out supports for students, teacher, and specialist willingness to collaborate and make decisions about implementation, and allocation of resources to support students with special needs (Larsen, et al., 2019). As stated in the paragraph above, these studies along with the results of this survey show these areas of weakness have the potential to be addressed through establishing effective, on-going, meaningful collaboration between general and special educators.

### ***Training***

In the survey, 16 respondents (84%) noted they were interested in attending training regarding providing IEP accommodations, and seven (44%) said professional development would be the most valuable training. Nine out of thirteen respondents (69%) on an open-ended question stated training regarding implementing IEP accommodations would be the most helpful topic. Some suggestions mirrored results of prior research (e.g., Larsen et al., 2019), such as, "effective strategies other teachers have used when implementing IEP accommodations" or "better understanding of ways these students learn differently and how I can provide learning experiences that enhance them while not reducing the engagement of the other students." The professional development topics that respondents suggested in this study align with areas noted as important in prior research. For example, Larsen and colleagues (2019) recommend that all educators become informed of what accessibility features and accommodations are available and

identify meaningful supports that meet the needs of their students, including students with IEPs and ELs. Multiple researchers (Kern et al., 2019; Krones, 2016, Larsen et al., 2019, Thurlow 2001; Steffes, 2010) stated similar suggestions regarding supporting general education teachers and their needs to provide IEP accommodations in a classroom.

### **Limitations**

Several limitations to this study should be considered. First, the small sample size ( $n=19$ ) and the fact that the survey was distributed to one school district within one state limits the generalizability of the results. Additionally, this survey only included the perceptions of one stakeholder group, so the results cannot be generalized to other stakeholders (e.g., special education teachers, administrators, parents). Second, distribution of the survey was not easily monitored and potentially limited the number of responses on the survey; it is unclear which department heads distributed the survey to the general education teachers at their schools. Due to small sample sizes, it was not feasible to conduct statistical analyses to determine whether teacher demographic factors were associated with different responses. For example, one area that has been examined in prior research is the difference between more and less experienced teachers. It was not possible to analyze the data in this survey across teacher experience levels because there were unequal group sizes across experience level categories (see Table 1). Additionally, it should be noted that this survey took a broad look at accommodation provision, rather than looking at accommodation provision based on specific subject areas, grades, or disability classifications.

### **Recommendations for Research**

Given that this study identified collaboration between general and special education teachers as a prevalent theme across multiple questions in the survey, it would be relevant to

conduct future research regarding special education teachers' perceptions of accommodations to look for overlap and differences in their perceptions of accommodations and systems to support students with disabilities. Examining areas with and without overlap between these two teacher groups would be valuable because it could provide insight as to how these two groups of teachers can collaborate more effectively to support students.

Though it was only a prevalent theme across two open-ended questions, researching the role of student self-advocacy and self-determination in the effectiveness of providing accommodations, especially in a secondary setting, could provide valuable insights. The role of the student as a decision maker in their education becomes much more important in a secondary setting, especially as students reach the age of majority and play a guiding role in their own IEP. As such, additional research may also look at comparing the student self-advocacy role across different grade or school levels.

From a general education perspective, it would be relevant to investigate how accommodations are developed, understood, and implemented regarding students' 504 plans or for students without disabilities. Understanding how strategies are put in place for students receiving Tier 2 supports (i.e., students in need of targeted support but who are not yet receiving special education services) may lend suggestions to general education teachers as to how best involve students with more significant learning needs or accommodations. Additionally, this information could help guide the implementation of school-wide systems for accommodations, which have the potential to address some of the barriers noted by teachers in this study, as well as prior research.

**Implications for Practice**

While the scope of this survey is limited to 19 respondents, these findings do still provide meaningful implications for practice for teachers, administrators, and district officials in one school district. District officials and administrators should note 84% of teachers who responded to this survey are interested in receiving training regarding providing accommodations and 68% find providing accommodations to be important when considering their daily tasks as a teacher. The combination of these two findings indicates that a lack of satisfactory accommodation provision might have more to do with a lack of training and school-level supports, as opposed to a lack of desire to implement meaningful accommodations. Based on the results of this survey research, some topics that might be valuable to prioritize in professional development include implementation of IEPs, balancing multiple student needs in a classroom, better understanding of IEPs, and building rapport with students.

Collaboration between special and general education teachers was a common theme among three out of four open ended questions which implies this relationship is vital to the success of students with IEP accommodations. If implementing an IEP with fidelity is valued legally and ethically in a school district, administration and district officials have a responsibility to evaluate the systems currently in place on a department, school-wide, and district level and to provide training and collaboration time to teachers. Schools and districts would benefit from reviewing their professional development schedules to see how much attention is being paid to supporting teachers in understanding their role in providing a continuum of services school-wide. This would involve evaluating the instruction given to both general and special education teachers.

One of the systems that would benefit from an evaluation would be the school-wide Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) plan to first identify if this model is in place for behavior and academics and second to identify areas of success or breakdown, particularly when providing Tier 2 or small group instruction. If general education teachers report being unsure how to provide accommodations in their Tier 1 (i.e., core general education) instruction, it is likely teachers struggle to provide instruction in those areas as well.

Teachers also express feeling overwhelmed by the number of accommodations that they need to provide in each class period, and the amount of time needed to sufficiently prepare lessons. At a secondary level the master schedule is complex, but it is likely possible for administrators to intentionally place students with certain accommodations in specific class periods with teachers who can specialize in providing targeted supports. If scheduling decisions took accommodation provision into account, it is likely that teacher satisfaction and student outcomes would improve.

### **Conclusion**

This study examined general education teacher perspectives on providing IEP accommodations in the general education setting. The results demonstrate a need for general education teacher training on how to provide accommodations, and time for special and general education teachers to collaborate to support students. Based on these results I recommend that researchers investigate other stakeholder perspectives of IEP accommodations and that district and school officials carefully consider implementing school-wide practices to support teachers in effectively providing IEP accommodations to students with disabilities.

## References

- Hodgson, J. R., Lazarus, S. S., Thurlow, M. L., National Center on Educational Outcomes, Council of Chief State School Officers, & National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE). (2011). Professional Development to Improve Accommodations Decisions--A Review of the Literature. Synthesis Report 84. *National Center on Educational Outcomes, University of Minnesota*.
- Kern, L., Hetrick, A. A., Custer, B. A., & Commisso, C. E. (2019). An Evaluation of IEP Accommodations for Secondary Students with Emotional and Behavioral Problems. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 27(3), 178–192.
- Krones, M. P. (2016). High School General Education English Teachers' Perception of IEP Accommodations for Students with Asperger Syndrome [ProQuest LLC]. In ProQuest LLC.
- Laprairie, K., Johnson, D. D., Rice, M., Adams, P., & Higgins, B. (2010). The Top Ten Things New High School Teachers Need to Know about Servicing Students with Special Needs. *American Secondary Education*, 38(2), 23–31.
- Qualtrics. (2020). (August-December 2020). Provo, Utah, USA. Available from:  
<https://www.qualtrics.com>
- Section 1462 (b) (2) (A) (ii)*. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (2019, November 7).  
<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/statute-chapter-33/subchapter-iv/part-b/1462/b/2/A/ii>.

Steffes, L. A. (2010). General Education Teachers' Perceptions of Accommodations for Students with Learning Disabilities in Inclusive Secondary Classrooms [ProQuest LLC]. In

*ProQuest LLC.*

Taylor-Powell, E., & Renner, M. (2003). Analyzing Qualitative Data. University of Wisconsin-Extension, Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.

<https://deltastate.edu/docs/irp/Analyzing%20Qualitative%20Data.pdf>

Thurlow, M. L., Thompson, S. J., Walz, L., & Shin, H. (2001).

Utah Education Association. Common Core Standards | Utah Education Association.

[https://www.myuea.org/members\\_only/member\\_resources/common\\_core\\_standards.aspx](https://www.myuea.org/members_only/member_resources/common_core_standards.aspx)

#:~:text=They%20were%20adapted%20for%20use,developing%20aligned%20assessments%20(SAGE).

**Appendix A**  
General Education Teacher Survey

**Part I****Demographic Information**

1. What **best** describes you? (*What is your primary role in your current teaching position?*)
  - a. General education teacher (*Any content area, including core content, ESL, CTE, arts, electives, etc.*) (*if this is selected, continue; any other options selected, exit survey*)
  - a. Special education teacher
  - b. Related service personnel (*SLP, paraprofessional, behavior tech, etc.*)
  - c. Counselor
  - e. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. Do you have students with IEPs in your class?
  - a. Yes (*If yes, continue*)
  - b. No (*If no, exit survey*)
  - c. I don't know (*if this is selected, exit survey*)
  
3. What is the highest level of education you have obtained?
  - a. Bachelor's degree in progress
  - b. Bachelors
  - b. Masters
  - c. Doctorate
  
4. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
  - a. 1-2
  - b. 3-5
  - c. 6-10
  - d. 11+
  
5. What is the content area you teach? (*Select all that apply*)
  - a. Math
  - b. English
  - c. Science
  - d. Social Studies/History



- a. Art
  - b. Business
  - c. Family and Consumer Science
  - d. Foreign Language
  - e. Technical
  - f. Physical Education
  - g. ESL
  - h. Media
  - i. Performing Art/Music
- 
6. Do you co-teach any class periods?
    - a. Yes, with a special education teacher
    - b. Yes, with an aid
      - a. Yes, one or more classes with a special education teacher and one or more classes with an aid
      - b. Yes, two general education teachers together
    - d. No

## **Part II**

### **Accommodation Experience**

1. On average, how many students with IEPs do you typically have per class period?
  - a. 1-2
  - b. 3-5
  - c. 6-8
  - d. 9-12
  - e. 12+
  
2. What is the primary way you determine students' IEP accommodations?
  - a. Refer to PowerSchool
  - b. Talk to the student
  - c. Talk to the parent
  - d. Talk to the case manager
  - e. At the IEP meeting
  - f. Copy of the student's IEP
  - g. Other

3. Outside of attending IEP meetings, how often do you communicate with special education teachers regarding accommodations for all of the students with IEPs in your classes?
- a) Daily
  - b) Weekly
  - c) 2-3 times per school year
  - d) Never
4. What IEP accommodations do you provide in your classroom? Mark all that apply.
- a. Preferential seating
  - b. Copy of peer or lecture notes
  - c. Text-to-speech
  - d. Speech-to-text
  - e. Extended time
  - f. Tests/quizzes read aloud
  - g. Test/quizzes in the testing center or resource classroom
  - h. Allow oral answers
  - i. Calculator
  - j. Reduce assignment length
  - k. Provide breaks during class
  - l. Behavior plan/ reinforcement system
  - m. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - n. None
5. Select the three IEP accommodations you provide most frequently in your classes.
- Preferential seating
  - Copy of peer or lecture notes
  - Text-to-speech
  - Speech-to-text
  - Extended time
  - Tests/quizzes read aloud
  - Test/quizzes in the testing center or resource classroom
  - Allow oral answers
  - Calculator
  - Reduce assignment length
  - Provide breaks during class

- Behavior plan/ reinforcement system
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - None
6. Which accommodations are most and least feasible for you to provide in your classes? Rank the following accommodations from most feasible (easiest) to least feasible (most challenging)
- Preferential seating
  - Copy of peer or lecture notes
  - Text-to-speech
  - Speech-to-text
  - Extended time
  - Tests/quizzes read aloud
  - Test/quizzes in the testing center or resource classroom
  - Allow oral answers
  - Calculator
  - Reduce assignment length
  - Provide breaks during class
  - Behavior plan/ reinforcement system
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
7. If there was a situation in which you felt you could not provide accommodations for students with IEPs, why might you not provide accommodations? *Select all that apply.*
- a. Not enough training
  - b. Not enough time
  - c. Student doesn't need it
  - d. Student doesn't ask for it
  - e. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. Not applicable – I always provide accommodations
8. What obstacles have you encountered when providing IEP accommodations? *Select all that apply.*
- a. None
  - b. Unaware of the accommodations
  - c. Student does not want to use the accommodations
  - d. Accommodations are not helpful
  - e. Unsure how to implement an accommodation

- f. Overwhelmed by the variety of accommodations I am asked to provide in a given class period
  - g. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
9. General education teachers are responsible for many teaching duties. In your order of getting all duties completed, where do you see implementing accommodations on your priority list?
- a. Very important
  - a. Important
  - b. Somewhat important
  - c. Not important
10. In your opinion, are accommodations necessary for students with IEPs? Please explain why or why not.
11. Are there practices currently in place at your school to help you implement IEP accommodations for students with disabilities?
- a. Yes- there are school-wide practices
  - b. Yes-there are department-wide practices
  - c. Yes- there are both school-wide and department-wide practices
  - d. Yes- I implement my own practices
  - e. Yes- I implement my own practices to supplement school-wide or department-wide practices
  - f. No
  - g. I don't know
12. *(Skip if respondent answers no or I don't know to above question)* In your typical teaching day, list the practices that are currently in place to help you to implement IEP accommodations for students with disabilities.
13. What would make implementing students' IEP accommodations more feasible in your classes?

14. How do you know when IEP accommodations allow a student to successfully access the general education curriculum? *Select all that apply.*
- a. Student is passing class
  - b. Student passes the assignment
  - c. Student continues to request the accommodation
  - a. Student has more success when an accommodation is used versus when it is not used
  - b. Evaluated performance with and without the accommodation
  - a. Other

### Part III

#### Training

15. To what degree do you feel prepared to provide IEP accommodations in a classroom?
- a. Very prepared
  - a. Prepared
  - b. Somewhat prepared
  - c. Not at all prepared
16. What training have you been involved in regarding providing IEP accommodations? *Select all that apply.*
- a. College/university classes
  - b. State professional development
  - a. District professional development
  - b. School professional development
  - c. Conferences
  - d. Research (Internet, journal articles)
  - f. Collaborating with colleagues
  - g. Other: \_
17. What number of college classes have you taken regarding special education or diverse learner needs?
- a. 1
  - b. 2
  - c. 3
  - d. 4+

18. When did you last receive training about IEP accommodations or working with diverse learners?

- a. I have not received any training on these topics
- b. This school year
- c. 1-2 years ago
- d. 3-5 years ago
- e. 6+ years ago

19. If you were to seek, or if your school/ district was to provide more training on IEP accommodations, what information would help you the most?

20. If given the opportunity, would you be interested in attending training on providing accommodations?

- a. Yes (*if yes is selected, route to question A below*)
- b. No (*if no is selected, route to question B below*)

A. If your school or district was to provide more training on IEP accommodations, what types of training would be most valuable?

- a. PLCs
- b. Professional development
- c. Coaching/mentoring
- d. Support for attending conferences/workshops
- e. Other: \_

B. What is the primary reason you would not be interested in receiving training on providing accommodations?

21. Thank you for taking time to share your feelings and perceptions about implementing IEP accommodations. Is there any additional information you would like to provide about this topic?

## Appendix B

### Email and Consent Sent Out to Department Heads

My name is Riley Johnson, and I am currently a graduate student at Utah State University. I am in the process of completing a creative project (IRB #12078) on general education teacher perceptions of Individualized Education Program (IEP) accommodations. This study is intended to inform collaborative practices between general education teachers and the IEP team regarding classroom accommodations. The results of this study may benefit future researchers on this topic, as well as those that work with adolescents with disabilities.

After receiving permission from your district and school principal, I am emailing you with the study information and survey link for you to copy into a new email and send to all general education teachers in your school. After sending out the study information, there is nothing further that you need to complete at this time. Any questions or responses that are sent back to you from the general education teachers must be forwarded back to the research team. There is to be no contact between you and the general education teachers regarding this study outside of the email with the content below, to protect the integrity of the study protocol.

Thank you for your assistance in helping me complete my study. **Please copy and paste the following in its entirety and send it on to the general education teachers at your school:**

Good Day,

**Please note that participation in this study is voluntary and will in no way affect your employment.**

My name is Riley Johnson. I am currently a graduate student completing a creative project through Utah State University (IRB #12078). Your special education department head has been asked to pass along the information for my study. My creative project study examines general education teachers' perceptions of Individualized Education Program (IEP) accommodations.

If you are a general education teacher who has at least one student with an IEP in at least one of the class periods you teach, you are invited to participate in the study by completing a brief online survey.

This survey is online through Qualtrics and is intended to inform collaborative practices between general education teachers and the IEP team regarding classroom accommodations. The results of this study may benefit future researchers on this topic, as well as those that work with adolescents with disabilities. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes.

Below you will find the link to the survey. When you click the link, you will be first directed to an informed consent form for the study that includes more information. No follow-up commitment beyond completing the survey is required.

The survey can be found at this link: [https://usu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_begi2xm13sQbUuW](https://usu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_begi2xm13sQbUuW)

☐

[Qualtrics Survey | Qualtrics Experience Management](#)

The most powerful, simple and trusted way to gather experience data. Start your journey to experience management and try a free account today.

[usu.co1.qualtrics.com](https://usu.co1.qualtrics.com)

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact the researchers directly, not your department head or the school special education teachers. We appreciate your help in this important research. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Riley Johnson  
Graduate Student  
[riley.fraser@aggiemail.usu.edu](mailto:riley.fraser@aggiemail.usu.edu)

Kaitlin Bundock, Ph.D.  
Creative Project Committee Chairperson  
[kaitlin.bundock@usu.edu](mailto:kaitlin.bundock@usu.edu)