Spring 2018

Inclusion in morning meetings

Robin Lauber
James Madison University

Inclusion in Morning Meetings

_____

An Honors College Project Presented to

the Faculty of the Undergraduate

College of Education

James Madison University

_____

by Robin Theresa Lauber

May 2018

Accepted by the faculty of the Department of Educational Foundations and Exceptionalities, James Madison University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Honors College.

FACULTY COMMITTEE:

HONORS COLLEGE APPROVAL:

_____
Project Advisor: Holly McCartney, Ph.D.,
Professor, Elementary and Early Childhood
Education

_____
Bradley R. Newcomer, Ph.D.,
Dean, Honors College

_____
Reader: Laura Desportes, Ph.D.,
Professor, Exceptional Education

_____
Reader: Tiara Brown, Ph.D.,
Assistant Professor, Exceptional Education

PUBLIC PRESENTATION

This work is accepted for presentation, in part or in full, at the National Conference on Undergraduate Research –

University of Central Oklahoma on April 7, 2018.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Tables

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my research advisor, Dr. Holly McCartney, for her endless support, expertise, and dedication to me and my research throughout the past year and a half. Dr. Holly McCartney has continually helped me create work at the highest level and has nominated me for recognition on the state and national level. I would like to thank Dr. Laura Desportes for intriguing my interest in data collection as well as serving as a reader for this work. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Tiara Brown for sparking my initial interest in inclusion and for her role as a reader on this project. Lastly, I would like to thank the College of Education and the other professors I have had throughout the years who have supported my studies and my research.

Abstract

This thesis explores the extent to which teachers implement best practice of inclusion during their daily Morning Meetings. Morning Meetings are a standard practice at the beginning of the school day where student and teachers greet one another, share personal stories and information, participate in a group activity, and read a morning message written by the teachers. Preschool through third grade teachers in local school districts were given a self-reflection survey. The survey was a standardized checklist that was informed by research on inclusive practices and The Morning Meeting Book (Kriete & Davis, 2014). It was modeled after the Division for Early Childhood (DEC) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) joint early childhood inclusion policy, which states the defining features of inclusion as access, participation, and supports (2009). The survey lists specific practices that teachers may or may not be implementing that promote inclusion. My hypothesis before the research began was that teachers would struggle to implement the practices that take more time and preparation outside of their normal routine. The analysis of the data showed that my hypothesis was correct to some extent, teachers were more successful when implementing accommodations that they could plan into the whole group, and less successful with one-on-one accommodations that required them to work individually with a student outside of the Morning Meeting.

Background of Morning Meetings and Inclusion

Morning Meetings are a specific part of the day in classrooms, and are made up of four sequential components (Kriete & Davis, 2014). These components are a greeting, sharing time, group activity, and news and announcements. During the greeting, all students and teachers are greeted by name and welcomed into the classroom for the day. During sharing, the students will either all share their answer to a question, or a small number of students will share a longer response, leaving time for questions and comments from their classmates. The group activity is short but allows the entire class to participate, and the news and announcement component is used to review the day's schedule and transition to the day.

In 1975, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA) was authorized, and stated that children with disabilities should be educated in their least restrictive environment (94th Congress). At the time, this was not clearly defined, but because of the influence of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, when the EHA was reauthorized in 2004 as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the least restrictive environment was defined and emphasized as the general education classroom. This means that students should be served for as much time as possible in the general education classroom with their same age peers who are typically developing, and should be given the supports and accommodations necessary so the student can succeed there. This literature review studies both Morning Meetings and inclusion, as well as the inclusion of students with disabilities in a daily Morning Meeting.

Morning Meetings

Kriete, the creator of Morning Meetings, names the benefits of daily Morning Meetings, which are the increase in the students' care for one another, improved social skills, greater personal responsibility, better teacher-student relationships, and improvements in academic skills

taught in Morning Meetings (2014). In a supplemental article, she argued that Morning Meetings transition classrooms from groups to communities (Kriete, 2013). It starts with children learning each other's' names and important information about them, and continues to be built as more is shared and risks are taken. This community, she believes, creates an environment where students can effectively learn and meet the human need to feel significant.

The History of Morning Meetings

As early as 1969, Glasser stated that having classroom discussion is important because it allows students to have an input in their environment and see school as a place that responds to their needs. He emphasized that these meetings take place in a complete and full circle, and the student were able to choose what topics they wanted to discuss and take leadership roles as the meeting moderator. In 1970, two classrooms in Columbia, SC used his theories and held meetings in their fifth and third grade classes (Kelly, 1974). Topics of discussion varied based on what the students asked to talk about, but often included friendship, fear, name-calling, and future worries. The idea that students can have a say in their classroom environment and can and should be active participants in it was new at the time, but the data showed that it allowed students to expand on their problem solving skills, feel their opinions and feelings were important, and that they are not alone in their struggles (Kelly, 1974).

There is little information on the implementation and success of Morning Meetings between Glasser's initial practice and Kriete's book. During this time, there is little evidence of further research and writings regarding the impacts or effects of having classroom meetings, and no indication of the popularity the practice.

Morning Meetings and Classroom Environment

Bechtel (2004), who works for Responsive Classroom and the Northeast Foundation for Children, believes that the classroom community that can form out of Morning Meetings can be sensed in different school environments and conflicts throughout the day, and serves her students by teaching them life skills such as empathy, respectful communication, and self-control. Another teacher who found Morning Meeting to be effective in enhancing classroom environment was a fifth grade teacher who chose activities to promote collaboration, incorporate greetings from other languages, and work with partners with whom they don't usually spend a lot of time (Cohen, 2017).

In another school, Ketts was the only third grade teacher at her school who did Morning Meeting every day, and found that the year after she implemented it, her students scored higher than the students in the other classes on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (2012). Bondy & Ketts (2012) conducted an interview study with some of Ketts' students to try and determine the cause of the higher scores and the impact of Morning Meeting. Students noted that Morning Meetings allowed them to have fun with their peers and their teacher, which, combined with the Greeting, allowed them to feel included, known, and know how to help others. These are all crucial skills for being a mature adult, and oftentimes as educators we assume children will "grow into" these skills without understanding that they must be taught and practiced in controlled environments. The students and Ketts both independently stated that Morning Meeting was a good start to their academic day and allowed them to wake up and get focused and energized before going to their Language Arts teachers. As a teacher who knows the students' home lives, Ketts was able to see that students often came into school upset or frazzled, and Morning Meeting was the perfect transition to the school day. She also saw the sense of belonging and responsibility increase in all

her students as the students' attitudes towards helping one another and directing their own learning increased.

Gardner emphasizes the impact she has observed Morning Meeting to have on academics, specifically in her fifth grade science classroom (2012). She says that conducting Morning Meeting every day positively affected her students' ability to participate in scientific collaboration and inquiry. This way of learning science is more representative of the way scientists think and discover, but students must be taught how to do it. By explicitly teaching social skills in Morning Meeting and allowing students to practice them not just in the meeting but in academics, students are given the tools to be able to confidently learn as part of a community.

Morning Meetings and Academics

McTigue and Rimm-Kaufman (2010) also discussed the relationship between Morning Meeting and academics, stating that Morning Meetings can be used as time to review, reinforce, or introduce new content. All four parts of the meeting can be focused on literacy rich activities that promote concept of word, vocabulary development, phonological awareness, fluency, or a large variety of other topics. Meetings can be thematic and focus on one skill or theme throughout, or touch on multiple topics in which the teacher believes students need more repetitions.

The cited research above describes the procedure of Morning Meeting as well as the academic, social, and emotional benefits that result for the students who participate in them. That said, there is clearly a paucity of literature regarding the benefits of Morning Meeting on students' academic achievement.

Inclusion

The joint statement released by the Division for Early Childhood (DEC) of the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) states that the three principles to inclusion in the general education classroom are access, participation, and supports (2009). Students with disabilities must have access to an appropriate classroom and to the curriculum being taught, must have the proper accommodations so they are able to participate in the classroom community, and must have supports from practitioners so they are able to thrive here. It is very common that even if students with disabilities do not spend the whole day in the general education classroom, at the minimum they participate in their class' Morning Meeting. Short articles have been written by Responsive Classroom that discuss how access, participation, and supports can be provided for during Morning Meetings, but there is little empirical or practitioner data on how this is implemented or how successful these accommodations, modifications, and interventions are being done.

Principles of Inclusion before Access, Participation, and Supports

Before the DEC and NAEYC created their joint position including principles of access, participation, and supports, Soodak (2003) wrote about three practices that were used in an inclusive school to increase belonging and effective teaching. One of these practices was membership, which is similar to the inclusion principle of access. Membership is implemented by educating all children in a heterogeneous classroom in the school they are districted to and giving students access to all rooms, events, and settings within that school. Students do not have to earn their way into an environment, but have the right to be a member of that setting just because they are a student at that school.

The other two principles Soodak refers to, friendship and collaboration, do not align with participation and supports, but are worth mentioning because they are also important parts of

including students of various ability levels. Friendships are not just important but are necessary for all students, and are often a struggle especially for those with various disabilities (Searcy & Meadows, 1994). The final principle of collaboration refers to collaboration among teachers, as well as collaboration between teachers and families, both for the purpose of effectively supporting students. Soodak also discusses supporting students with disabilities by using positive behavior supports, proactively changing the environment to support appropriate behavior, and using a functional behavioral assessment when necessary.

Inclusion and Belonging

Like Morning Meeting, inclusion promotes a sense of belonging for all students in a classroom (Shogren, Gross, Forber-Pratt, Francis, Satter, Blue-Banning, & Hill, 2015). Wilson (2012) states that belonging is a basic human need and an unearned right, and like Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs suggest, teachers should first attend to students' biological, physical, and safety needs, and then next their belonging needs. Additionally, academic achievement and school climate have a high correlation (Reynolds, Lee, Turner, Bromhead, & Subasic, 2017). Because belonging can't be taught in one well thought out lesson plan, children need to be taught belonging in their social context every day at school. Inclusion supports this because it endeavors to send a message to all students that they don't have to perform well or have achieved in a certain way in order to gain access to their school or their classroom. It also models for students to include each other, stand up for one another, and appreciate diversity, which enhances their idea of belonging, affecting their belonging needs and the other students around them.

As Rouse and Florian (2004) point out, there is a difference between having a high number of students with disabilities in your school and having an inclusive school. Inclusive schools should have policies, practices, and a school culture that are reflective of all students

11

who attend, in order to create a sense of belonging, acceptance, and inclusion for them as individuals.

Inclusion and Academics

In the past, many researchers concluded that inclusive schools achieve at a lower academic level than schools that do not include those with disabilities (Lunt & Norwich, 2002). However, it was found that this finding was inaccurate because it measured progress based on the standards that the students were meeting, not their achievement (Florian, Rouse, Black-Hawkins, & Jull, 2004). Florian et al. argued that a more accurate way to measure academic success was to look at all students' beginning achievement and ending achievement, and use their individual progress to draw conclusions. Measuring success based on standards does not leave room for students to start at a lower level and then grow closer to the standard that they should be reaching, but marks any achievement below the standard as a failure.

Rouse and Florian measured the performance of individual students across five years, and looked at data from schools that have a broad range of students with diverse educational needs (2006). The range was 7.4% to 42.4%, and qualitative measures were also used to see if schools with a higher percentage of students with disabilities were considered inclusive or not. By comparing the results of schools, Rouse and Florian concluded that educating students with diverse educational needs in inclusive schools did not lower the achievement of students without disabilities.

Inclusion and Universal Design for Learning

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a means to implementing inclusion by changing the learning environment so it is accessible to all students via the use of technology (Rose & Meyer, 2002). UDL allows all students, regardless of their level of academic achievement,

physical abilities, or any other characteristic that may set them apart from others, to become

learners and fully engage with curriculum and classmates (Basham, Israel, Graden, Poth,

Winston, 2010). It focuses on flexibility in instruction and curriculum, as well as having high

expectations for all students and providing students with supports so they can meet them.

Boroson (2017) discusses the relationship between inclusion and UDL. When

implementing UDL, options must be provided to meet students where they are and give them the

tools they need to succeed as learners. By differentiating instruction in this way, individuals are

able to flourish in the context of a classroom, and barriers to learning and success can be

overcome.

Inclusion and Morning Meetings

Before Morning Meetings were more formally standardized as they are today and before

inclusion was the legal standard, educators saw the benefits they had for students with

disabilities (Zeeman & Martucci, 1976). In response to Glasser's initial idea of the class

meetings, educators implemented them in special education classrooms. Zeeman and Martucci

reported that students in one classroom increased their class participation, and decreased their

distracted behaviors, which led to improved academics. These same students also were able to

initiate positive social interactions with their typically developing peers on a one-on-one level,

and at the schoolwide level, as they formed close friendships and saw the typical lunchroom

segregation dissipate.

Bruce, Fasy, Gulick, Jones, and Pike (2006) also discuss the impact Morning Meeting has

on students with disabilities. Because of their differences, students with disabilities may feel like

outsiders when interacting with peers, but participation in Morning Meeting empowers these

students with a sense of belonging, and students are able feel like they are a key component of

the classroom identity. Because many people with disabilities struggle with social and communication skills, I.E.P. goals can easily be incorporated into the Morning Meeting lesson plan as eye contact, formal and informal greetings, listening, and other similar skills are practiced each morning. The final component of the meetings, the news and announcement section, also benefits students with disabilities, as teachers have the opportunity to review the daily schedule and highlight any changes, which students with disabilities often struggle with and require warning for.

Conclusion

My thesis makes a unique contribution to the topics of both Morning Meeting and inclusion, and adds to the paucity of literature which connects Morning Meeting and inclusion. With a focus on Morning Meeting, it measures what practices of inclusion teachers are implementing well, which they are struggling to implement, and what those trends suggest. From my conclusions, resources can be created to help teachers include students with varying ability levels in their Morning Meetings, leading to students who feel more welcome in the class, as well as growth in social skills and academics.

Method

Research Purpose

Because there is little data to show the extent to which teachers are including students with disabilities in their daily Morning Meetings, I set out to determine to what extent teachers were modifying and changing the structure of their lesson in order to accommodate all students. Before beginning my research, I hypothesized that teachers were successful at including students in ways that did not interrupt their daily routine, for example, making sure all students were in the circle, and allowing fidget toys to be used, but that significantly fewer teachers would be

successful at incorporating more time consuming accommodations, such as incorporating students' IEP goals into the lesson and practicing potential responses with specific students prior to the start of the meeting.

In order to gather data regarding teacher's fidelity in implementing inclusive practices in their Morning Meetings, a survey was created based on literature from a variety of resources and practicing teachers which included examples and non-examples that they had of ways to include students with a wide range of abilities. General practices of inclusion were edited and written to be specific to Morning Meetings, and specific practices from Morning Meetings were also part of the survey. My hypothesis before the research began was that teachers would struggle to implement the practices that take more time and preparation outside of their normal routine, such as practicing parts of the meeting with students beforehand and teaching students how to include their peers.

Site Selection

Once the survey was created, it went through IRB protocol in order to gain appropriate approval. Shortly afterwards, Dr. Holly McCartney asked superintendents and principals from five local school districts to send the survey to their preschool through third grade teachers, or for permission for her to do so.

Participant Selection

There were 16 responses the survey, and all data was collected from October 12, 2017 to January 11, 2018. Additionally, one school replied to my advisor and told her that they could not participate because they do not do Morning Meetings.

Six of the responses did not meet the criteria for inclusion in this study, as they left two or more of the three total sections unanswered, or did not put an appropriate answer for what the

question was asking. Of the respondents whose surveys were included, four were preschool teachers (one noted they were a Special Education preschool teacher), three were kindergarten teachers, one was a first grade teacher, and one was a third grade teacher. All of the respondents indicated that they have been teaching that specific grade for at least two years, with the most experienced teaching have twenty-five years in the same grade. The mean number of years that teacher had been teaching their current grade was 8.5 years. When the teachers were asked how many years they have been teaching any grade preschool through third grade, the minimum was again two and the maximum twenty-five, but the mean increased to 9.8 years.

Measures

      Survey Creation Procedures. Survey research is defined as "the collection of information from a sample of individuals through their responses to questions" (Check & Schutt, 2012). This research allows for a variety of methods to recruit participants, collect data, and utilize various methods of instrumentation. Survey research can use quantitative research strategies (e.g., using questionnaires with numerically rated items), qualitative research strategies (e.g., using open-ended questions), or both strategies (i.e., mixed methods). As it is often used to describe and explore human behavior, surveys are therefore frequently used in social and psychological research (Singleton & Straits, 2009). They are often used in exploratory research to help inform next steps. A survey was chosen to explore my research question because it allowed me to contact a wide range of teachers from many different school districts and ask them for quantitative and qualitative information. It also helped me gain an understanding classrooms that I did not have the capacity to visit myself, and allowed me to use this information to make connections and draw conclusions.

I created the survey (see Appendix A) using a variety of resources (see Appendix B). Many of the resources were from Responsive Classroom, an evidence based model that supports the use of Morning Meeting in classrooms. Other resources were from case studies or articles that had general guidelines for inclusion, and I took the practices described throughout the resources and used edited them to fit into the context of Morning Meeting. Additionally, a few non examples of inclusion were added to the survey to add another way to evaluate to what extent inclusion was being practiced.

The first section of the survey was modeled after the three principles of inclusion, as stated by DEC and NAEYC in their 2009 joint statement. These principles are access, participation, and supports. The survey also gives examples of specific supports and asks teachers to indicate if those supports are consistently used during their Morning Meetings.

The second section of the survey asked open-ended questions about the time and location of the meetings, as well as the time in relation to when the students arrive at school. The final section asked questions about the teacher and classroom makeup, such as how long the teacher has been teaching early childhood, how long they have been teaching their current grade, how many students are in their class, and a description of the range of abilities in their classroom.

Once the survey was created, it was transferred to Qualtrics, as I believed an online survey would increase the likelihood that teachers sent it back as opposed to a paper survey.

Literature Search Procedures. I created the literature review using fifteen articles, three government documents, and three books, which were found using Education Research Complete, which is a database within EBSCOhost, and was provided for by James Madison University. The key words that were used in the search to find these articles were (a) "inclusive education", (b) "student attitudes", (c) special education, (d) "mainstreaming in special education", I

"belonging", (f) "social acceptance", (g) "classroom management", (h) "classroom environment", (i) "students with disabilities", and (j) "socials skills in children". Some of the literature was found because it was cited in articles that were found using this search method.

Data Collection. I organized the data first by creating a chart to show all of the data in one place. Each respondent was given a number, one through ten, and the respondent's answers are recorded horizontally while the question is listed vertically. This allows readers to see what each individual said, while also comparing the ten responses for each question.

I included mini versions of this chart in the analysis portion of my paper so it is easier to read the results of each question. First, I began by looking at the categories of Access, Participation, Supports, and Specific Supports. I recorded what the practice was, how many total teachers indicated that it is a part of their Morning Meeting, and what percent of the total respondents this was. Practices that are not best practice but were included to help prevent response bias are indicated with an asterisk.

The remainder of the data was organizing by using the respondent's number one through ten. First, I compared the questions that asked what time students arrive and what time the Morning Meeting starts. I also added a column that calculated how much time passes between these two times. This allowed me to calculate the average time between student arrival and the beginning of Morning Meeting for these ten respondents.

To organize the answers to the questions regarding the location of the Morning Meeting and the range of abilities found in the classroom, the teachers' exact quotes were used next to their respondent number. The last four questions were combined into one table, again using the respondents' given numbers.

Findings

Participants were asked to check a box for all of the following practices that they

consistently implemented in their Morning Meetings. Tables 1, 2, and 3 state how many of the

teachers indicated that the practice was regularly done, and what percent of the total respondents

this was.

Table 1: Teacher Responses Regarding Access

Practice	Number of Respondents who Implemented it	Percent of Respondents who Implemented it
All students who are present at school are present at the Morning Meeting.	10	100%
Morning Meeting is done at the same time and place each day.	10	100%
Appropriate seating is provided to allow all students to be in the circle.	9	90%

Table 2: Teacher Responses Regarding Participation

Practice	Number of Respondents who Implemented it	Percent of Respondents who Implemented it
Calming objects or fidget toys are used so students are focused and calm enough to participate.	7	70%
Students know how to include their peers with disabilities in a meaningful way. Each student knows his or her role in this.	9	90%
Students are excluded from the circle if they aren't following rules or exhibiting appropriate behavior.*	6	60%
IEP goals are incorporated into the Meeting.	8	80%
For students who need social supports during the Meeting, a social story or video has been done with them to prepare them for the Meeting. This will prepare them for what to expect from the teacher,	5	50%

what to expect from the other students, and what is expected of them.		
Students who need supports know what questions will be asked of them at the Meeting and have practiced their potential response.	2	20%
Chants and coordinated movements have been practiced with students beforehand.	9	90%
Students are allowed to go to a quiet corner or to another predetermined space if they need to exit the Meeting for self-regulation purposes.	10	100%
Some students are asked to just listen and observe.*	4	40%

*This is an example of an inappropriate practice.

Table 3: Teacher Responses Regarding Supports

Practice	Number of Respondents who Implemented it	Percent of Respondents who Implemented it
Appropriate accommodations are used so students can communicate effectively.	8	80%
The volume of Morning Meeting is varied. (Examples: use whisper voices, American Sign Language, silent clapping, etc. These variations should be taught to and used by all students.)	9	90%
There is a visual schedule of Morning Meeting steps, including a symbol to signal when a certain part of the Meeting has been completed.	4	40%
The visual schedule is reviewed before the Meeting occurs, and is referenced throughout it.	4	40%
A cue is given five minutes before the end of the Meeting so students know when they can expect a transition.	3	30%
The Greeting that is used incorporates verbal and visual elements.	8	80%

Students who need supports are given response options when questions are asked.	8	80%
Changes are made throughout the Meeting if necessary based on students' needs.	10	100%
If someone walked in during the Morning Meeting they would see evidence of collaboration between teachers to make the access, participations, and supports a reality.	7	70%

Table 4 records the total number of Access, Participation, and Supports best practices that the teachers implemented, as well as the number of inappropriate practices. There are 19 total best practices and two inappropriate practices. The mean, median, and mode for the number of best practices teachers implemented are all 14. The minimum is nine and the maximum is 17. Three teachers implemented 0 of the inappropriate practices, four implemented one of the inappropriate practices, and three teachers implemented both of the inappropriate practices.

Table 4: Total Number of Best and Inappropriate Practices Implemented

Respondent Number	Total Best Practices Implemented	Total Inappropriate Practices Implemented
1	14	1
2	14	2
3	9	1
4	16	0
5	13	1
6	17	0
7	17	2
8	14	1
9	11	2
10	15	0

Table 5: Teacher Responses Regarding Specific Supports

Practice	Number of Respondents who Implemented it	Percent of Respondents who Implemented it
Increased wait time	10	100%
Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS)	0	0%
Buddy student	6	60%
Practice student responses with them beforehand	4	40%
Students use other mediums to share (Ex: show a drawing, present a video, use pre-recorded responses, etc.)	5	50%

Table 5 (above) indicates how many of the total respondents implement each practice. The data can also be analyzed on an individual basis in order to discuss patterns seen in individual teachers. Though this study will be focusing on patterns seen across all ten participants, individual data can lead to conclusions as well. In order to clearly present this information, each respondent was given a number 1-10, and the same number is used for each respondent throughout this paper.

The next two questions on the survey asked teachers what time their Morning Meeting began and what time their students arrived at school. The purpose of this was to get data on the length of time in between the students' arrival and the start of the meeting, and see if there is any correlation between this information and the ability of teachers to include all students. The average length of time between the students' arrival and the start of the Morning Meeting was 34.4 minutes, and individual data can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6: Student Arrival Compared to Morning Meeting Start Time

Respondent Number	Time Students Arrive in the Classroom	Time Morning Meeting Begins	Length of Time Between Student Arrival and Morning Meeting Time
1	9:35	10:10	35 minutes
2	8:30	8:45	15 minutes
3	8:25	8:45	20 minutes
4	9:35	10:00	25 minutes
5	8:00	NA	
6	8:00	10:00	120 minutes
7	8:00	8:20	20 minutes
8	8:10	8:30	20 minutes
9	7:45	8:15	30 minutes
10	7:45	8:10	25 minutes

Nine of the respondents answered the question "In what area of the classroom does your Morning Meeting occur?", and though the detail given varied, eight indicated that the meeting took place on a large rug or carpet. One stated that the students were in their seats, though it was not stated if the students sat at individual desks or tables, and one teacher submitted a picture of the area where the Morning Meeting occurred (see Appendix D). Respondent five's response was deemed invalid as it did not provide a proper description of the setting of the Morning Meeting. The teachers' exact responses are included in Table 7 (original spelling left as is).

Table 7: Teacher Description of Morning Meeting Location

Respondent Number	Description
1	The carpet in front of the Promethean Board at the front of the room
2	At the rug at the front of the room.

3	On the alphabet rug by the SMART board
4	Our rug closest to our Promethian board and the chair where I sit for read alouds
5	NA
6	Large group area (carpet, in front of the smart board and white board)! [respondent also included a picture, which can be found in Appendix D]
7	Carpet
8	Large area carpet
9	in seats,using Prometheum Bd for Calendar
10	large carpet area near my specials calendar, weather bear, pics of kids to show they are present or not, jobs chart

The next questions asked respondents to describe the range of abilities found in their

classrooms. Of the ten respondents, nine indicated that there was at least one student who either

had a diagnosed disability, had an IEP, is an English Language Learner, has behavior challenges,

or is below grade level. The teacher's exact response is included in Table 8.

Table 8: Teacher Description of the Class' Range of Abilities

Respondent Number	Description
1	Most students are typically developing, one student has a DD and simply requires additional wait time for responses (we are considering dismissing him from services), several students are ELLs, one student is in the eval process for speech
2	Students with severe behavior challenges- mature, excited kindergarteners
3	I have students who do not speak English as well as students who are very shy and not very vocal.
4	We have 16 typically developing children and 1 with a developmental disability
5	ADHD

6	We have 3-5 year olds.
7	1 IEP for behavior
8	Above grade level students to a student who has an IEP (DD currently, operating on an average age of 2 years old)
9	below, on, and above grade level
10	developmental delays, speech delays, hearing impariments

The last four questions asked teachers what grade they teach, how many years they have taught this grade, how many years they have taught any grade PK through 3, and how many students are in their class.

As you can see in Table 9, three of the respondents teach Pre-K, one teaches Special Education Pre-K, three teach PK, one teaches grade 1, and one teaches grade three. The average number of years of experience teachers have in the grade they are currently in is 8.5. The average number of years of experience teachers have in any grade PK through 3 is 9.8. The average number of students in a class is 17.5 and the range is from 12 to twenty-four.

Table 9: Grade Level, PK-3 Teaching Experience, and Number of Students

Respondent Number	Grade Level	Number of Years Teaching Current Grade	Number of Years Teaching PK-3	Number of Students in the Class
1	PK	4	4	18
2	K	2	2	21
3	K	3	6	21
4	PK	5	5	17
5	3	14	15	16
6	SPED PK	4	4	12
7	3	3	3	24

8	K	15	16	20
9	1	10	18	20
10	PK	25	25	16

Discussion

This was a pilot study, and the number of respondents was low. Therefore, conclusions cannot be generalized to represent the teachers in the areas where the surveys were sent out to, nor can they be generalized to a larger scale. Though the statistical significance may not have been strong, it gives a baseline for future research with a more robust number of participants.

Practices related to "Access"

From the Access section of the survey, it can be noted that these ten teachers were highly successful with giving all of their students sufficient access to the Morning Meeting. All of the teachers said that all of their students who were present at school were present at the Morning Meeting. Especially in inclusive classrooms, students are often pulled out of their classrooms so they can receive various services, or practitioners come into the classroom to provide those services. It can be tempting to schedule these services to occur during Morning Meeting, as it is not as explicitly academic as times of the day such as reading groups or whole group lessons. However, these ten teachers have prioritized their class community and the learning that occurs during Morning Meeting and are able to find other times of the day to give students necessary services.

One hundred percent of these ten teachers also indicated that their Morning Meeting is done at the same time and place each day. This is a best practice as it provides consistency, which benefits all students, and is often a necessity for students with Autism, who do not react well to schedule changes (Kriete, 2013).

Ninety percent of the ten teachers stated that all of their students were appropriately included in their Morning Meeting circle. This question was included in the survey under the assumption that all teachers had their Morning Meeting in a circle, and the purpose of it was to see if teachers made sure that the student seating allowed this. This is especially applicable for those with physical disabilities, as it takes more creativity to include all students and make sure that no one's seating is different if there are physical limitations.

However, because of the wording of the question, it is unclear whether the one teacher who did not implement this practice does not have their Meeting in the circle, or if they do but one or most students are not included in it. Best practice for Morning Meeting states that the students are sitting in a circle so that they can all see one another. This is beneficial because it allows the class to be unified in one place, students can practice eye contact, and because students are connected in an unending shape (Kriete 2013). One limitation of this question is that it did not separate these two aspects, so it is impossible to know why one respondent does not implement this practice. Interestingly, respondent nine, who said their students sit in their chairs to conduct the Meeting, indicated that this statement was true for their classroom, meaning that the students must move their chairs into a circle in order to conduct Morning Meetings. Respondent nine did not indicate that there were any students with physical disabilities in their class, though this is a good accommodation to implement if there had been.

Practices about "Participation"

When looking at the questions about student participation in Morning Meetings, the only practice that all ten teachers said they implemented was "Students are allowed to go to a quiet corner or to another predetermined space if they need to exit the Meeting for self-regulation purposes." I find this to be interesting, because as a substitute and practicum student that has

seen many different classrooms in multiple school districts represented, having this space for students seems to be uncommon. One possible explanation to this is the non-example of a best practice that was included, which stated that students were asked to leave the circle if they were not displaying appropriate behavior. Six teachers indicated that this was true in their classroom, and it is possible that these teachers confused the self-regulation space with a space for students to go as punishment when they are misbehaving.

Three of the practices that were asked about require teachers to make changes to whole group instruction to accommodate students with disabilities. These practices state that students know how to include their peers with disabilities, movements and chants have been practiced with students beforehand, and students' IEP goals are incorporated into the Meeting. Ninety percent of teachers surveyed said that students knew how to include their peers with disabilities into Morning Meeting, and 90% said that movements and chants had been practiced with students beforehand. Looking at the individual chart shows that 80% of the teachers are doing both, and 100% are doing at least one, which is encouraging because it shows that teachers value all students in the classroom and want to promote classroom community as a result of doing Morning Meetings. This also shows that they are willing to truly include all students by practicing parts of the Meeting with individuals or the whole group as necessary.

Additionally, 80% of teachers indicated that students' IEP goals were included in the Meeting. This indicates that these Morning Meetings are rich enough in social and academic content for this to be feasible, and the Meetings are being implemented in the way they were designed. According to McTigue and Rimm-Kaufman (2012), Morning Meeting should not be void of academics, but each of the four essential components can be rich in content. If a Morning Meeting is truly inclusive, the content must be accessible and appropriate for all students, so

28

working on students' IEP goals is a crucial part of this, and the teachers surveyed seem to be doing well with it.

When comparing these three practices side by side, seven teachers are implementing all three, two are implementing two practices, and one teacher is implementing only one. This shows that 70% of the teachers are willing to adapt their lesson plans to accommodate students with disabilities in a significant way, and 100% are willing to adapt their lesson plans in at least one way.

Three practices that support individual students were measured in this section of the survey. One was about the use of calming objects or fidget toys, which 70% of participants said they allowed their students to use. The two practices that were less successful for the teachers surveyed were the two about individual social supports that require more preparation and work for teachers than implementing calming objects. Fifty percent of the teachers indicated that they used social stories or video modeling to explain behavior expectations to students who required additional explanation, and 20% of teachers indicated that students were prepared ahead of time with the questions they would be asked. Of the two teachers who implement that latter practice, only one also implements the former. This means that of the ten participants, six are implementing significant individual supports to students who require it.

Overall, 10% of the teachers surveyed are willing to implement significant individual accommodations for students with disabilities, and 60% are willing to implement some individual accommodations. These two questions are difficult to make conclusions on, because due to the anonymity of the survey, I am unable to know to what extent these accommodations are truly necessary. If, for example, there was no one in the class who required individual supports, in this data that would be displayed as unwillingness to accommodate for students.

Another potential reason that video modeling and social stories specifically were only used by 50% of teachers could be because of the mixed results of studies that have tried to show the effectiveness of them. Social stories, though compared with social narratives, which are evidence-based practices, have been shown by some researchers to be ineffective when compared to other methods of teaching and maintaining appropriate social skills (Wong et al., 2015; Malmberg, Charlop, & Gershfeld, 2015).

One of the inappropriate practice that was included in this section, stated that some students were asked to just listen and observe. Four of the teachers surveyed said that they implemented this practice. The purpose of adding this was to see if there were some students who were not being fully included in the Meeting based on communication issues, content that the students could not engage with, or a variety of other reasons. Teachers who said this was true of their classroom showed that even though they are doing other things to try and include all of their students into the Meeting, there is not 100% inclusion in their room for some reason.

Practices about "Supports"

The third set of questions related to supports provided to the students. From this set of questions, the practices that very few teachers did effectively were related to the schedule of Morning Meeting and the schedule for the rest of the day. Thirty percent of teachers said they gave a cue when the Morning Meeting was able to end so that students can expect a transition. This has been noted as important for all students, as they need to know when a change will be occurring, and important specifically for those with Autism Spectrum Disorder, as students with ASD often know their daily schedule well and require warning before changes occur. Both Hodgdon (2011) and Schopler et al. (1995) state that reviewing picture schedules with students with ASD helps these students, as they struggle to internalize how long activities take and gain

an overall sense of time. Four of the teachers stated they gave a visual schedule of the parts of Morning Meeting including a signal to indicate when one part of the Meeting was done, and those same four teachers also said they reviewed the schedule as the Meeting progressed. Two of those teachers also give a cue when Morning Meeting is about to end. Only one teacher gives cues when the Meeting is about to end but doesn't go through a schedule before or during the meeting. This data makes sense, as visual schedules are more likely to be reviewed at the beginning of something, and less likely to be referenced again in the middle and at the end. It is unusual that a teacher would give a cue five minutes before the Meeting is about to end but wouldn't reference the schedule at the beginning or in the middle of the Meeting, so it makes sense that only one teacher of the ten surveyed did this.

Four of the practices reflected changes that teachers would make to the whole group for the purpose of benefiting those with disabilities. These practices are "The volume of Morning Meeting is varied", "The Greeting that is used includes verbal and visual elements", "Students who need supports are given response options when asked", and "Students use other mediums to share." These practices are all decided upon when the teacher is creating the Morning Meeting lesson plan, but the main purpose of each is to serve those with sensory needs, those who require visual supports, and students who need scaffolding when answering open ended questions.

Ninety percent of teachers were able to effectively implement "The volume of Morning Meeting is varied", 80% of teachers stated that they implemented "The Greeting that is used includes verbal and visual elements" and 80% reported implementing "Students who need supports are given response options when asked." Every teacher surveyed implemented at least one of these practices; one teacher implemented one, three teachers implemented two, and six teachers implemented all three. This shows that 100% of the teachers surveyed were willing to

31

make at least one change to the whole group to serve students with disabilities. Sixty percent of the teachers surveyed implemented all three, showing that they are willing to make multiple changes for the benefit of their students. This is encouraging because it shows that even if it is a small change, most teachers I surveyed are willing to make those changes to include and support students. Though there is no research that shows to what extent teachers are willing to go to include students with disabilities, this finding aligns with research that states that teachers desire to include students with disabilities in their classroom, they just don't know how to (Lopes, Monteiro, Sil, Rutherford, & Quinn, 2004). Based on this research, it makes sense that these are the changes that they would make to their classrooms, as they require no extra training or degrees, and are generally intuitive.

Two of the broader, less defined practices in this section were "Changes are made throughout the Meeting if necessary based on students' needs" and "Appropriate accommodations are used so students can communicate effectively". All ten teachers said that they implemented the former practice, and eight the latter. Looking back, one of the survey was practices like these, as they are hard to measure, and it is likely that teachers will say they do these even without considering if they do or not because of the wording. Some teachers could also have different definitions for what this looks like practically than others do, and it is possible, though not likely, that all teachers have different definitions than I do. If I were to do this survey again or I were to do more research on the topic, I would have added more specific qualifiers for many of the broader statements on the survey so more solid conclusions could be drawn.

Assuming that these teachers' definitions are similar to mine, which is likely a big assumption, this means that 100% of teachers surveyed are attentive to the needs of all of their

students, and are willing to change their lesson plans in a variety of ways in order to meet those educational, physical, social, and emotional needs. This also means that 80% of those surveyed are ensuring that students can communicate with the group in a way that is most appropriate for them. Though this seems like an encouraging statistic, it is alarming that two teachers are not ensuring that this is true for all of their students. Even if there is one student who struggles to communicate with others, this inability should be a priority for a teacher of young children to address, as communication is a constant need for humans to be able to share what they are thinking and feeling. Communication with others, and specifically a positive relationship with a teacher is a major way that students learn, and it is also crucial for students to be able to have social conversations with others to grow in personal relationships and become a part of the community.

As discussed in the literature review, Reynolds et al. (2017), emphasis the correlation school community and academic achievement have, and Steins and Behravan (2017) have found high correlations between the relationship teachers and students have and both classroom management and social learning. When looking at these two studies, the ability to communicate effectively with students is assumed, as students need to be able to communicate to have a deep relationship with their teacher and with their school community. Thus, the inability to communicate should not be occurring in Morning Meeting or in any other aspect of the school day for even one student, which shows the alarming implications that come with this piece of the data.

One teacher who indicated that this was not true of their Morning Meetings was Respondent 10, who has preschool students with developmental delays, speech delays, and hearing impairments. Because this survey was originally sent at the beginning of the year, it is

possible that at least one student did not have a written IEP yet, and therefore did not yet receive the proper accommodations to be able to communicate.

Having students who are able to communicate effectively, whatever that looks like for them, will greatly enhance the environment and outcomes of Morning Meeting. As a next step in research, I would be interested to find the correlation between the implementation of these practices and the overall academic, social, and emotional benefits that Morning Meeting has on students. I think that all students being able to communicate with one another would greatly enhance the social and emotional benefits to all students, and if I were coaching teachers on how to include all students in Morning Meeting, this would be a top priority for me.

Another practice that was addressed was, "If someone walked in during the Morning Meeting they would see evidence of collaboration between teachers to make the access, participations, and supports a reality." Seventy percent of teachers surveyed said that this was true of their classroom. It's surprising that this wasn't higher because of the increased emphasis schools have been putting on teacher collaboration due to recent research that has shown the impact that this has on student learning. Goddard, Goddard, and Tschannen-Moran (2007) began preliminary research on the correlation between collaboration and student outcomes, and found that schools who were seeking to improve via increased collaboration had higher student achievement.

Practices about "Specific Supports"

The fourth category of questions asked teachers what specific supports they provided for students in their classroom. All 10 teachers stated that one support they implemented was increased wait time. This was surprising because this is usually very difficult for teachers just based on human nature, and I have even had multiple college professors who have been trying to

model this with their pre-service teachers and have struggled with it. Research by Bracey (1987) showed that even teachers who had been trained and coached to wait three to five seconds between a teacher statement and student response or between two teacher statements only waited for an average of 3.3 seconds, while those in the control group waited for an average of 0.9 seconds. Even if a response bias was present for this question, it is still encouraging that all ten teachers selected it, as it means that they understand the importance of increased wait time and are actively seeking to implement this in their Morning Meeting. Though wait time is important in all settings, it is especially important in Morning Meeting, as children are often sharing personal details or stories, and waiting to hear them or allowing students to fully think can have an impact on their view of themselves and how other students view them.

　　None of the teachers surveyed said that they used Picture Exchange Communication Systems (PECS) in their classroom to support students. PECS is a standard and commonly used accommodation for students that have trouble communicating, and is especially effective for young children. However, 60% of teachers surveyed said they used a buddy student as a specific support. A buddy student is used by pairing a student who is struggling with one who is not, so that student can help the struggling student to be successful. It requires the teacher to train the buddy student on what to do and what not to do so that the buddy student doesn't do work for the struggling student and doesn't lead to dependence. The high frequency use of the buddy student shows that the classrooms surveyed likely do have students with disabilities, as other supports besides PECS are being used to help students.

　　Fifty percent of the teachers said they allowed students to use other mediums to share. This surprised me because often a prime example of differentiation is allowing students to use different mediums as summative assessments to show what they've learned, and teachers are

often encouraged to incorporate this into other lessons throughout the day (Doubet & Hockett, 2018).

Only 40% of teachers surveyed stated that they practiced student responses with them beforehand. This piece of data fits in well with my hypothesis, which states that teachers would be less likely to implement practices that take more of their time and cannot be implemented within the whole group lesson.

Other Questions Addressed

After the four sections that asked teachers which practices they implemented, teachers were asked to share details about their class' Morning Meeting and their personal experience. Of the ten teachers surveyed, nine answered both parts of the question, "What time do your students arrive in the classroom?" and "What time does your Morning Meeting begin?" Of these nine, eight began their Morning Meeting within thirty-five minutes of their children entering the classroom. This practice supports students, as having a Morning Meeting when students first come into the room sets the tone for the day and helps prepare students for any changes in classroom schedule (Kriete, 2013). Interestingly, the one teacher who waited two hours to start their Morning Meeting was the teacher who implemented the most positive practices and neither of the two negative practices. If the research allowed, it would be interesting to interview this teacher and ask them why they made this classroom decision and if they believe it affects their ability to include students with disabilities well. Additionally, since it is known that most of the Meetings occur within the first thirty-five minutes of arrival, I am curious how teachers who hold their meetings soon after arrival help students who are consistently late to feel included in the class community apart for Morning Meeting and if they ever change the time of day that they have it to ensure that each student is present.

To understand the relevance of the questions, what is the range of abilities found in your class, what grade do you teach, what is the size of your class, how many years have you been teaching this grade, and how many years have you taught any grade preschool through third, I looked at the total number of best practices and inappropriate practices implemented to see if there are any potential trends (see Appendix E).

There is no correlation between number of best practices implemented and any of these factors. As the number of best practices increased, no trends emerged. For example, one third year teacher implemented only nine best practices, while another third year teacher implemented seventeen. The grade level and number of students in the class also had no effect on the number of best practices teachers reported using.

The same data can be assessed by looking at the inappropriate practices (see Appendix F). When looking at the overall responses and the number of best and inappropriate practices each respondent implemented, 70% of teachers implemented one or less of the inappropriate practices. All three teachers who implemented zero of the inappropriate practices were pre-school teachers. The other preschool teacher who participated implemented only one of the inappropriate practices. On the top end of the age spectrum, the only third grade teacher who responded implemented both of the inappropriate practices. It's hard to say if this is a trend or just a coincidence based on the low number of respondents, but it would be worth exploring with a larger data pool.

The number of students in the class showed no correlation with the number of inappropriate practices implemented. The average number of students in the ten classes is 17.5, which is reflective of Virginia's average class size, which is 18.2 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). Eight of the ten classes surveyed have 16 to 21 students in them. The two

outliers are a class of 24 and a class of 12. Both of these outlier classes had teachers who

implemented 17 of the best practices, and the teacher of the class of twelve also implemented

none of the inappropriate practices. A conclusion cannot be drawn as to why this teacher has

implemented these practices at such a high quality. This teacher is a Special Education teacher,

so their professional background is likely a large reason why, but it would be interesting to do

more research and see to what extent the small class size helps with this.

The last piece of data that conclusions can be drawn from is the number of years that the

teacher has been teaching any grade preschool through third grade. The three teachers who

implemented both of the inappropriate practices have been teaching for two, three, and eighteen

years. The four teachers who implemented one of the inappropriate practices have been teaching

for four, six, fifteen, and sixteen years, and the three teachers who implemented none of the

inappropriate practices have been teaching for four, five, and twenty-five years. In each category

there were two teachers who had been teaching for six or less years, and at least one teacher who

has been teaching for fifteen or more years. Therefore, for this group of respondents, there is no

correlation between number of years teaching and number of inappropriate practices

implemented.

From this data, it can be seen generally that the teachers who were surveyed were more

successful at implementing whole group changes to their Morning Meetings than implementing

individual accommodations that they must put in place before the Morning Meeting, though

there are some exceptions to this. This aligns to an extent with my hypothesis, which stated that

teachers would not implement practices that added to their planning. In the case of these

teachers, the extra planning time did not seem to be the issue, as teachers were willing to do

things such as incorporate students' IEP goals and teach their students how to include their peers

with disabilities. The trend that the data showed was that teachers did not provide many individual accommodations that would have taken time with that individual student outside of the Morning Meeting. Examples of this include going over responses with students before the meeting and going over social stories with students regarding behavior expectations. This could be for many reasons, including lack of time to spend with individual students, lack of professional development or knowledge about how to implement these practices, or lack of necessity based on their students.

 If I were to continue my research on this topic, I would like to do formal observations to see what teachers' inclusive Morning Meetings are like, and use a specific rubric to eliminate response bias. Additionally, I would like to see what teachers' professional development, educational background, and school philosophy are in order to understand why certain practices are and are not being consistently implemented.

References

94th Congress. (2004). *Public law 94-192.* Washington D.C.

Basham, J., Israel, M., Graden, J., Poth, R., & Winston, M. (2010). A comprehensive approach to RTI: Embedding universal design for learning and technology. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 33,* 243-255.

Bechtel, L. (2004). Building community, day by day. *Teaching Tolerance.*

Bondy, E., & Ketts, S. (2012). "Like being at the breakfast table": The power of classroom morning meeting. *Childhood Education, 77,* 144-149.

Boroson, B. (2017). Inclusive education: lessons from history. *Educational Leadership, 74,* 18-23.

Bracey, G.W. (1987). Bit if it's brief enough, silence my indeed be golden. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68,* 399.

Bruce, S., Fasy, C., Gulick, J., Jones, J., & Pike, E. (2006). Making morning circle meaningful. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus, 2.*

Check, J., & Schutt, R.K. (2012). Research methods in education. *Creative Education, 4.*

Cohen, P.D. (2017). Jump-start morning meetings! Four fun ideas to start the school day off right. *Scholastic Teacher, 127,* 58-59.

Cortiella, C. (2006). NCLB and IDEA: What parents of students with disabilities should know and do. *National Center on Educational Outcomes.*

Division of Early Childhood. National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2009). *Early childhood inclusion: A joint position statement of the Division of Early Childhood (DEC) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, FPG Child Development Institute.

Doubet, K.J., & Hockett, J.A. (2018). *Differentiation in the elementary grades: Strategies to engage and equip all learners.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Florian, L., Rouse, M., Black-Hawkins, K., & Jull, S. (2004). What can national data tell us about inclusion and pupil achievement? *British Journal of Special Education, 31,* 115-121.

Gardner, C. (2012). Morning meeting and science – a winning combination. *Science & Children, 50,* 60-64.

Glasser, W. (1969). *Schools without failure.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Goddard, Y.L., Goddard, R.D., & Tschannan-Moran, M. (2007). A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and student achievement in public elementary schools. *Teachers College Record, 109,* 877-896.

Kelly, E.W., Jr., (1974). Classroom discussions for personal growth and democratic problem-solving. *Elementary School Journal, 75,* 11-15.

Kriete, R., (2013). Start the day with community. *Educational Leadership, 61,* 9-49, 68-70.

Kriete, R., & Davis, C. (2014). *The morning meeting book* (3rd ed.). Turner Falls, OK: Northeast Foundation for Children, Inc.

Hodgdon, L.A. (2011) *Visual strategies for improving communication.* Troy, MI: Quick Roberts Publishing.

Lopes, J.A., Monteiro, I., Sil, V., Rutherford, R.B., & Quinn, M.M. (2004). Teachers' perception about teaching problem students in regular classrooms. *Education & Treatment of Children, 27,* 394-419.

Lunt, I., & Norwich, B. (2002) *Can inclusive schools be effective schools?* London, U.K.: Institute of Education.

Malmberg, D.B., Charlop, M.H., & Gershfled, S.J. (2015). A two experiment treatment

    comparison study: Teaching social s*kills to children with autism spectrum disorder.*

    Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities, 27, 375-392.

McTigue, E.M., & Rimm-Kaufman, S.E. (2010). The responsive classroom approach and its

    implications for improving reading and writing. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 27,* 5-24.

National Center for Education Statistics.(2008). *School and Staffing Survey.* Retrieved from

    http://www.nces.ed.gov

Reynolds, K.J., Lee, E., Turner, I., Bromhead, D., Subasic, E. (2017). How does school climate

    impact academic achievement? An examination of social identity processes. *School*

    Psychology International, 38, 78-97.

Rose, D.H., & Meyer, A. (2002). *Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for*

    learning. Alexandria: ASCD.

Rouse, M., & Florian, L. (2006). Inclusion and achievement: student achievement in secondary

    schools with higher and lower proportions of pupils designated as having special

    educational needs. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 10,* 481-493.

Schopler, E., Mesibov, G.B., & Hearsey, K. (1995). Structured teaching in the TEACCH system.

    In E. Schopler & G.B. Mesibov (Eds.), *Learning and cognition in Autism* (pp. 243-268).

    New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Searcy, S., & Meadows, N. B. (1994). The impact of social structures on friendship

    developments for children with behavior disorders. *Education & Treatment of Children,*

    17, 255-266.

Shogren, K.A., Gross, J.M.S., Forber-Pratt, A J., Francis, G.L., Satter, A.L., Blue-Banning, M.,

    & Hill, C. (2015). The perspectives of students with and without disabilities on inclusive

    schools. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 40,* 243-260.

Singleton, R.A., & Straits, B.C. (2005). *Approaches to social research.* New York, NY: Oxford

    University Press.

Steins, G., & Behravan, B. (2017). Teacher-student-relationships in teacher education: Exploring

    three projects of knowledge transfer into action. *Psychology, 8,* 746-770.

Soodak, L.C. (2003). Classroom management in inclusive settings. *Theory Into Practice, 42,*

    327-333.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Policy*

    statement on inclusion of children with disabilities in early childhood programs.

Wilson, R.A. (2012). Belonging. *Exchange,* 51-55.

Wong, C., Odom, S.L., Hume, K., Cox, A.W., Fettig, A., Kucharczyk, S., Brock, M.E., Plavnick,

    J.B., Fleury, V.P., & Schultz, T.R. (2015) Evidence based-practices for children, youth,

    and young adults with autism spectrum disorder: A comprehensive review. *Journal of*

    Autism and Developmental Disorders, 45, 1951-1966.

Zeeman, R., & Martucci, I. (1976). The application of classroom meetings to special education.

    Exceptional Children, 42, 461-462.

Appendix A: Inclusive Morning Meeting Self-Assessment Rating and Questionnaire

Access
_____ All students who are present at school are present at the Morning Meeting.
_____ Morning meeting is done at the same time and place each day.
_____ Appropriate seating is provided to allow all students to be in the circle.

Participation
_____ Calming objects or fidget toys are used so students are focused and calm enough to participate.
_____ Students know how to include their peers with disabilities in a meaningful way. Each student knows his or her role in this.
_____ Students are excluded from the circle if they aren't following rules or exhibiting appropriate behavior.
_____ IEP goals are incorporated into the Meeting.
_____ For students who need social supports during the meeting, a social story or video has been done with them to prepare them for the meeting. This will prepare them for what to expect from the teacher, what to expect from the other students, and what is expected of them.
_____ Students who need supports know what questions will be asked of them at the Meeting and have practiced their potential responses.
_____ Chants and coordinated movements have been practiced with students beforehand.
_____ Students are allowed to go to a quiet corner to another predetermined space if they need to exit the meeting for self-regulation purposes.
_____ Some students are asked to just listen and observe.

Supports
_____ Appropriate accommodations are used so all students can communicate effectively.
_____ The volume of Morning Meeting is varied. (Examples: use whisper voices, American Sign Language, silent clapping, etc. These variations should be taught to and used by all students.)
_____ There is a visual schedule of Morning Meeting steps, including a symbol to signal when a certain part of the Meeting has been completed.
_____ The visual schedule is reviewed before the Meeting occurs, and is referenced throughout it.
_____ A cue is given five minutes before the end of the Meeting so students know when they can expect a transition.
_____ The Greeting that is used incorporates verbal and visual elements.
_____ Students who need supports are given response options when questions are asked.
_____ Changes are made throughout the Meeting if necessary based on students' needs.
_____ If someone walked in during the Morning Meeting they would see evidence of collaboration between teachers to make the access, participation, and supports a reality.

Specific Supports Used
_____ Increased wait time
_____ PECS
_____ Buddy student
_____ Practice student responses with them beforehand

_____ Students use other mediums to share (Ex: show a drawing, present a video, use pre-recorded responses, etc.)

What time does your Morning Meeting occur at?

What time do your students arrive in the classroom?

In what area of the classroom does your Morning Meeting occur? Please be descriptive regarding what that area looks like and where it is positioned in the room.

(Optional question) Please upload a picture of the space your Morning Meeting takes place in.

Describe the range of abilities found in your classroom.

What grade do you teach?

How many years have you taught this grade?

How many years have you taught any grade PK-3?

How many students are in your class?

Appendix B: Resources Used to Create Survey

Lee, Y., & Recchia, S. (2016). Early childhood inclusion. *Young Children, 71,* 79-84.

Responsive Classroom. (2015). Adapting morning meetings: speech and anxiety needs.
Responsive Classroom. Retrieved from responsiveclassroom.org

Responsive Classroom. (2011). Morning meeting is for everyone. *Responsive Classroom.*
Retrieved from responsiveclassroom.org

Responsive Classroom. (2014). Planning morning meetings for students with Autism Spectrum
Disorder (ASD). *Responsive Classroom.* Retrieved from responsiveclassroom.org

Responsive Classroom. (2009). Small changes, great gains. *Responsive Classroom.* Retrieved
from responsiveclassroom.org

Appendix C: Picture of the Location of Respondent 6's Morning Meeting

Appendix D: Respondents Ranked Based on Best Practices Implemented

To best organize this information, this chart puts the respondents in order, beginning with the participants with the fewest number of best practices, and ending with those with the highest number of best practices. If multiple participants had the same number of best practices, those with less inappropriate practices were ranked above those with more inappropriate practices.

Respondent Number	Number of Best Practices Implemented	Number of Non-Best Practices Implemented	Range of Abilities Found in the Classroom	Grade Level	Number of Years Teaching Current Grade	Number of Years Teaching PK-3	Number of Students in the Class
3	9	1	I have students who do not speak English as well as students who are very shy and not very vocal.	K	3	6	21
9	11	2	below, on, and above grade level	1	10	18	20
5	13	1	ADHD	3	14	15	16
1	14	1	Most students are typically developing, one student has a DD and simply requires additional wait time for responses (we are considering dismissing him from services), several students are ELLs, one student is in the eval process for speech	PK	4	4	18
8	14	1	Above grade level students to a student who has an IEP (DD currently, operating on an average age of 2 years old)	K	15	16	20
2	14	2	Students with severe behavior challenges- mature, excited kindergarteners	K	2	2	21
10	15	0	developmental delays, speech delays, hearing impariments [sic]	PK	25	25	16
4	16	0	We have 16 typically developing children and 1 with a developmental disability	PK	5	5	17
7	17	2	1 IEP for behavior	3	3	3	24
6	17	0	We have 3-5 year olds.	SPED PK	4	4	12

Appendix E: Respondents Ranked Based on Inappropriate Practices Implemented

To best organize this information, this chart puts the respondents in order, beginning with the participants with the fewest number of inappropriate practices, and ending with those with the highest number of inappropriate practices. If multiple participants had the same number of inappropriate practices, those with more best practices were ranked above those with less best practices.

Respondent Number	Number of Best Practices Implemented	Number of Non-Best Practices Implemented	Range of Abilities Found in the Classroom	Grade Level	Number of Years Teaching Current Grade	Number of Years Teaching PK-3	Number of Students in the Class
6	17	0	We have 3-5 year olds.	SPED PK	4	4	12
4	16	0	We have 16 typically developing children and 1 with a developmental disability	PK	5	5	17
10	15	0	developmental delays, speech delays, hearing impariments [sic]	PK	25	25	16
1	14	1	Most students are typically developing, one student has a DD and simply requires additional wait time for responses (we are considering dismissing him from services), several students are ELLs, one student is in the eval process for speech	PK	4	4	18
8	14	1	Above grade level students to a student who has an IEP (DD currently, operating on an average age of 2 years old)	K	15	16	20
5	13	1	ADHD	3	14	15	16
3	9	1	I have students who do not speak English as well as students who are very shy and not very vocal.	K	3	6	21
7	17	2	1 IEP for behavior	3	3	3	24
2	14	2	Students with severe behavior challenges- mature, excited kindergarteners	K	2	2	21
9	11	2	below, on, and above grade level	1	10	18	20