

SUNY CORTLAND
2015-2016 Faculty Research Program Application

THE FACULTY RESEARCH PROGRAM (FRP) is designed to promote research among all full-time, tenure-track, teaching faculty and professional staff. Research is encouraged on the premise that active inquiry in one's field fosters excellence. Firsthand involvement in current problems and methods of inquiry benefits all students, particularly those who go on to graduate school. The FRP provides seed money for projects that are new and likely to lead to future funded research. Awards may be used for personal compensation and/or research support, or, for those with 12-month appointments, for a replacement during the investigator's award period. Personal compensation is payable only during the summer to utilize the minimum fringe benefits rate (currently 17.0%). Those receiving personal compensation can teach no more than one session during the summer. Because international faculty may be ineligible for personal compensation based on visa status, they are strongly encouraged to contact the Research and Sponsored Programs Office (RSPO) to discuss specific circumstances before they apply. Under no circumstances will RSPO extend any award period beyond June 30, 2016.

Name of Applicant: Maria Timberlake Period of Performance: July 1, 2015- June 1 2016

Department: Foundations and Social Advocacy Telephone Extension: 5937

Title of Project: Academic Access for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities

Signature of Applicant: Maria Timberlake Date: 2/13/15

Signature of Department Chair: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Dean: _____ Date: _____

Applications are due in the Dean's Office by Friday, January 30, 2015.

Applications are due in RSPO by Friday, February 6, 2015.

Projects must be completed by June 30, 2016.

A complete 2015-2016 FRP application will contain the following in this order:

- Application Page 1 of 5 (this page) signed by the applicant, department chair and dean.
- Project Abstract of no more than 200 words in language understandable to an informed layperson.
- Narrative, including all seven sections specified in Section E. 2. c. of the FRP guidelines (2-3 pages).
- References cited page (listing complete citations only for those references cited in the narrative text).
- Budget Page (Application Page 2 of 5).
- Signed Application Agreement (Application Page 3 of 5).
- Curriculum Vitae (maximum of two pages).
- Signed FRP Application Checklist (Application Page 4 of 5).
- All other applicable attachments specified on the checklist.

The College Research Committee reserves the right to reject incomplete or late applications or applications that fail to respond to a required application element.

APPLICATION AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
2015-2016 FACULTY RESEARCH PROGRAM APPLICANT
AND
THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK COLLEGE AT CORTLAND
COLLEGE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

The applicant understands, agrees and certifies:

1. That the State University of New York College at Cortland College Research Committee in coordination with the Research and Sponsored Programs Office may revoke this award in whole or in part at any time if the recipient's relationship with the College ceases to exist, provided that such revocation shall not apply to any award funds obligated prior to the revocation date if such obligations were made solely for the purposes set forth in this application.
2. That the applicant has read and accepts the terms and conditions of this program as stated in this 2015-2016 Faculty Research Program (FRP) Application and in the 2015-2016 FRP guidelines, including all applicable requirements of the Institutional Review Board and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee.
3. That the applicant will assure that any funds granted as a result of this application shall be expended solely for the purposes set forth in this application, and any funds not expended upon completion of the project or on the termination date of the award (whichever is earlier) shall revert back to the Research and Sponsored Programs Office.
4. That the applicant will secure advance written approval of the Research and Sponsored Programs Office prior to implementing any major changes in the project budget or scope of work as approved by the College Research Committee.
5. That the applicant will prepare and submit a final report to the Research and Sponsored Programs Office using the 2015-2016 Faculty Research Program Final Report form (Application Page 5 of 5) within twelve months of the completion of the project or of the termination date of the award (whichever is earlier) specifying submitted and published publications, draft or final external proposals and other relevant materials resulting from the award (or absence thereof).
6. That all project activities and expenditures (other than preparing proposals for external funding to continue project research efforts and completing required reports) shall occur during the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 unless otherwise specifically authorized in writing by the Research and Sponsored Programs Office. Any such authorization shall not extend the end date of a 2015-2016 Faculty Research Program Award beyond June 30, 2016.

Maime Timberlake
APPLICANT SIGNATURE

2/13/15
DATE

SUNY CORTLAND

2015-2016 Faculty Research Program (FRP) Application Checklist

Please verify a complete application by checking each item below as applicable. My application includes . . .

- () 1. . . my completed signed Application signed by my department chair and dean.
- (X) 2. . . my abstract of no more than 200 words understandable to an informed layperson.
- (X) 3. . . my narrative including each sub-header specified in § E. 2. c. of the FRP guidelines.
- (X) 4. . . references I've cited (i.e., bibliographical references to works cited in my narrative).
- (X) 5. . . my budget page (including an attached sheet explaining supplies exceeding \$500).
- (X) 6. . . my signed Application Agreement with the College Research Committee.
- (X) 7. . . my two-page curriculum vitae.
- (X) 8. . . my signed Application Checklist (this page) and other applicable attachments specified below.
-
- (X) 9. As shown, I have contacted each of the following as appropriate or contact is not applicable:
- Yes (X) N/A () Amy Henderson-Harr of RSPO (ext. 2511) re approval for use of human research participants.
- Yes () N/A () Chair, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (ext. 2713) re approval for use of live vertebrates (excluding human research participants).
- Yes () N/A () Assistant Vice President of RSPO (ext. 2511) re approval for use of human body fluids.
- () 10. I have previously received a Faculty Research Program (FRP) award: () Yes (X) No
 ➤ If yes, I have appended any required report(s) submitted to RSPO about my most recent FRP award [Failure to include such report(s) will disqualify an application.] () Report(s) attached
- (X) 11. I have previously received a Summer Research Fellowship (SRF) award: () Yes (X) No
 ➤ If yes, I have appended any required report(s) submitted to RSPO about my most recent SRF award [Failure to include such report(s) will disqualify an application.] () Report(s) attached
- (X) 12. I have received or will receive financial support for this project: () Yes (X) No
 ➤ If yes, I have attached a separate sheet detailing and listing all sources and amounts of support for this project (previous and projected). () Separate sheet attached
- (X) 13. This project (i.e., data collection / primary investigation) will be carried out: () On campus
 (X) Off campus
- (X) 14. This application is a resubmission of a prior FRP application? () Yes (X) No
 ➤ If yes, I have addressed the previous proposal comments. () Separate sheet attached
- (X) 15. I understand that if I do not provide all requested information the College Research Committee may disqualify my proposal.

Maria Timberlake

Applicant Signature

2/13/15

Date

¹ Note: Any project using human research participants for interviews, surveys, observations, or experiments must comply with SUNY Cortland's Institutional Human Participants Policy (see <http://www.cortland.edu/irb/policies.html>).

Maria Timberlake
Faculty Research Program Proposal 2015

Title: Academic Access for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities.

Abstract:

Although the federal special education law *The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) guarantees access to the general education curriculum for all students, the law does not define access and there is no consensus on a definition of “access” in the special education literature. How the meaning of access is interpreted is extremely important because there is a history of segregation, low expectations, and limited academic instruction for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. New York state is currently implementing the Common Core State Standards and the application of these standards and corresponding curricular materials to the least visible and arguably most vulnerable children is critical to explore. This research will employ a case study design to investigate how decisions about academic content for students with the most complex disabilities are made. Multiple in depth interviews, classroom observations and analysis of curricular materials will be utilized to develop an in-depth portrait of standards-based instruction for students historically considered “too disabled” to benefit from academics (Spooner & Browder, 2006).

If this proposal results in an award, I hereby authorize the State University of New York College at Cortland to release this abstract for college publicity and/or educational purposes.

(1) Specific research question.

Although the federal special education law *The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) guarantees access to the general education curriculum for all students with disabilities, the law does not define what access means nor set criteria for an acceptable amount or type of access. Terms such as confusion, nebulous, complicated, and ambiguous appear widely in the special education literature when the meaning of access to the general education curriculum is described (Browder, Wakeman & Flowers, 2006; Browder, Wakeman, Flowers, Rickelman, Pugalee & Karvonen, 2007; Dymond, Renzaglia, Gilson, & Slagor, 2007). Scholars disagree about whether the intent of access is broad – making access a perfunctory term that means little or whether the intent was specific—implicitly requiring the placement of children with disabilities into general education classrooms with their nondisabled peers (Etscheidt, 2011; Ryndak, Moore, Orlando, & Delano, 2008-2009). How the meaning of “access” is interpreted is extremely important because there is a history of segregation, low expectations, and limited academic instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities (Spooner & Browder, 2006; Wehmeyer, Sands, Knowlton, & Kozleski, 2002).

I investigated teacher perceptions of access to academic content for my dissertation and proposed a theoretical model of access as an intuitive decision-making process¹. The next issue to investigate as I formulate a long-term plan of research on access is specific data on what curricular access looks like “on the ground” at the classroom level. The research questions guiding this inquiry are:

- (1) How do NY special educators in contrasting placements (public school and separate facility) make decisions about academic priorities for students with significant cognitive disabilities?
- (2) What does academic instruction look like in the classroom in terms of the curricular standards, instructional strategies, and assessments students with the most significant cognitive disabilities receive?
- (3) How are decisions about access and the variables that influence those decisions visible/not visible in these classrooms?

(2) Significance of the project.

Spooner, Dymond, Smith, & Kennedy (2006) suggested the lack of consensus on access could result in varying types and amounts of special education instruction as well as varying inclusive opportunities. Understanding how teachers navigate ambiguous directives and subsequently create academic experiences for students with significant cognitive disabilities is crucial for improving policy clarity and inclusive teacher preparation. New York also has a system of educational services (BOCES) that is unique and may impact how teachers make decisions. Students with significant cognitive disabilities (previously called severe disabilities) in the central NY area may attend a public school or a self-contained classroom on a BOCES campus. The impact of classroom placement on teacher perceptions and implementation of access is important to discern.

NY is currently implementing the Common Core State Standards and encouraging districts to use the Engage NY modules so issues of curriculum are prominent in policy and practice, but the specific application of these curricular materials to the least visible and arguably most vulnerable children is largely unknown. The goal of this study is to discover how students with significant

¹ Timberlake, M. T. (2014). Weighing costs and benefits: Teacher interpretation and implementation of access to the general education curriculum. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*. 39, (2) 83-99. doi: 10.1177/1540796914544547.

cognitive disabilities gain access to academic instruction in this era of high stakes testing, a system of Regents Exams and Common Core State Standards and ambiguous policy terminology like “high expectations” and “maximum extent possible”. (IDEA 2004) Special educators’ interpretation of their role and responsibility to create academic access is particularly important because it influences the knowledge and skills to which students are exposed, and whether they participate in academic as well as social experiences with nondisabled peers (Agran, Alper, & Wehmeyer, 2002; Dymond, et al., 2007; Moores-Abdool, 2010).

Focusing on a small number of teachers in order to more closely observe how they interact with curricular materials and implement instruction will deepen the findings from my prior study and inform creation of a future larger scale study of how curricular policies are interpreted by those who are expected to implement them (special educators). Research in other occupations has shown that human service professionals are influenced by deeply held values and norms of their profession, and rely on these norms to guide their decisions about the people they serve. (Evans, 2011; Maynard-Moody & Musheno, 2003; Vinzant & Crothers, 1998). The special educator participants in my prior research revealed strong commitments to specialized instruction, functional activities, and care and protection for students. More detailed information is needed about the information special educators receive about access and what the implementation of academic access consists of for real students in daily practice.

(3) Literature and background

Policymakers and disability advocates considered access to the same education curriculum used by nondisabled students to be a mechanism for increasing expectations and improving the effectiveness of special education (Malow-Iroff, Benhar & Martin, 2008; Yell, Katsiyannis & Hazelkorn, 2007). The phrase *access to the curriculum* was first introduced in the 1997 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) after Congressional debates about the academic progress of students with disabilities highlighted dissatisfaction with the outcomes being attained (Karger, 2005). Congress continued to express concerns about academic expectations and student progress during the 2004 IDEA reauthorization, and consequently, the word “education” was added to the general curriculum provision. IDEA states that

the education of children with disabilities can be made more effective by having high expectations for such children and ensuring their access to the general education curriculum in the regular classroom to the maximum extent possible ... (20 U.S.C. § 1400(c)(5)(A) (2004).

Access to the general education curriculum sounds quite straightforward and would seem to suggest that students with significant cognitive disabilities are taught their local district curriculum in regular education classrooms. However, interpretation of *access*, *high expectations*, and *general education curriculum* have not proven to be clear and unequivocal. Because access was not defined anywhere in the statute or regulations, the provision leaves room for flexible interpretation, essentially leaving the details of the general curriculum to the discretion of local districts, and teachers (Karger, 2005). Consequently, researchers, educators, and advocates have disagreed on the literal meaning and scope of access to the general education curriculum. The special education literature offers conflicting interpretations of access for students with significant cognitive disabilities; Ayres, Douglas, Lowrey & Sievers, 2011 Browder, 2012; Courtade, Spooner, Browder, & Jimenez, 2012; Dymond, et al., 2007; Etscheidt, 2011; Hunt, McDonnell, & Crockett, 2012;

Ryndak, et al., 2008-09; Soukup, Wehmeyer, Bashinski, & Bovaird, 2007). Scholars debate whether academic access is an appropriate goal for all students (Ayres, et al., 2011). Some suggest that academics and Common Core State standards are frivolous when there are independent living skills to master, while others consider it a form of prejudice to deny academic instruction to students with severe disabilities (Ayres, et al., 2011; Courtade, et al., 2011). Researchers also disagree on whether placement in a general education classroom is a necessary precursor to access or whether the general curriculum can be delivered in a separate special education setting (Etscheidt, 2011; Spooner et al., 2006; Ryndak, et al., 2008-09, Courtade et al., 2013). Far less is written about how special education teachers interpret the meaning of access and make decisions to employ the available strategies and options.

Three prior studies explored the meaning of access to school personnel. Agran, Alper & Wehmeyer (2002) found that almost half of special education teachers in one state reported they did not use the general curriculum for their students with severe disabilities. Dymond et al., (2007) found that almost all of the special educators in their study defined access for students with significant cognitive disabilities as “adapted” content and few reported believing these students should be taught the same curriculum that is taught to nondisabled students. Just over half the special educators indicated that the curriculum should be based on the individual needs and interests of the student, and many used words like “meaningful” and “relevant” to describe the ideal curricula. My dissertation research extended these prior studies by investigating teacher perceptions of academic access.

In *Weighing Costs & Benefits* (2014) I proposed a theory of access as a largely intuitive process of educators making “cost-benefit” decisions. Special educator participants taught some academic content and skills to students with significant cognitive disabilities but engaged in a process of evaluating what students might gain and lose through participation in academic activities. The highest “cost” was defined as “wasting time,” or using limited instructional time for skills deemed unimportant, while benefits were activities perceived to have long-term value such as preparing meals. These teacher perceptions of policy are critical because policy is enacted and access to the general education curriculum is realized through teachers’ daily work.

Missing from the literature are examples and explanations about how curricular decisions look “on the ground” day-to day in the classroom and how terms like “high expectations” are actualized. This is important because prior researchers have found that specific guidelines and directions were often missing when professionals began to implement a new or revised policy (Hill, 2003; Vinzant & Crothers, 1998). Professionals responsible for implementing ambiguous policy provisions have relied on their colleagues, prior experiences, personal values, and assumptions about expectations in order to comply and organize their work, resulting in both expected and unanticipated policy outcomes (Lipsky, 2010; Maynard-Moody & Musheno, 2003; Riccucci, 2005; Sandfort, 2000). Discovering what special educators believe, value, and do about the general education curriculum is essential to understanding how IDEA’s “access to the general education curriculum” provision is implemented.

(4) Research design and methods

I will employ a multiple case study design to gather exploratory and comparative data on teacher use of curriculum through in-depth interviews, classroom observations and analysis of curricular materials. Case study methodology has been defined as “empirical inquiry for investigating phenomena in depth and in real life context” (Yin, 2009 p.18). While my prior research generated a theory of access through interviews (n=33) the purpose of this study design is to create a detailed portrait of teacher decisions in daily practice by gathering data on the resources, materials, personnel,

student characteristics and other factors that produce academic access and may be involved in the weighing and balancing of curricular “costs and benefits”. Doing so will allow analysis within as well as comparison between teachers of the factors leading to access, what access becomes in practice, and other influences on teachers’ professional decision-making that can only be discerned through direct observation and interaction on site.

A. Participants

- i. Recruit three special educators of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are willing to allow me access to their classrooms and interested in sharing their time and classroom with me.
- ii. The teachers must be certified in special education, currently teaching students with significant cognitive disabilities (defined as at least two students on their caseload who qualify for the NY Alt)². At least one teacher will come from public k-6 or k-8 buildings where opportunities exist for inclusion and at least one will come from a special education classroom in a separate facilities (i.e. BOCES campus).
- iii. In order to recruit teachers who work in local district elementary schools and teachers who work on a BOCES campus, I’ll introduce myself to district administrators via telephone and ideally, in-person at regional BOCES (Board of Cooperative Educational Services) in May/June 2015 (after receiving IRB approval for this study).
- iv. Contact teachers with an introductory informational email in June of 2015 (after receiving IRB approval for this study). This will let them know about the research and that I will send an email seeking study participants after July 1. Because teachers may be off during the summer, this preliminary contact will communicate the purpose of the study and a “heads –up” that a request for volunteers will be forthcoming.
- v. Recruit participants from four BOCES surrounding SUNY Cortland: Onondaga-Cortland-Madison (serves 23 local school districts), Tompkins -Seneca-Tioga (serves 9 districts), Broome-Tioga (serves 15 districts) and Wayne-Finger Lakes (serves 25 school districts).

B. Materials

- i. Create an invitation explaining the study for recruitment.
- ii. Develop a semi-structured interview guide that explores teachers’ interpretation of their responsibility to create academic access.
- iii. Create a classroom observation form for recording examples of academic instruction, schedules, student characteristics, teacher planning and preparation, visibility of Common Core Standards, classroom personnel, and interactions.

² The only students eligible for the NY Alternate Assessment are those considered to have significant cognitive disabilities.

C. Data Collection

- i. Begin recruiting upon receipt of IRB approval and begin data collection by mid July continuing through Dec 2015.
- ii. Conduct initial 45-60 minute interviews via telephone or skype at times convenient to participants.
- iii. Conduct at least two full day classroom observations at each site and request IEP goals, schedules and planning guides from the three case study participants.
- iv. Subsequent interviews will be conducted after classroom observations and document reviews; questions will focus on the application of curricular access in practice.

D. Analysis

- i. Audio record interviews and hire grad students for transcribing and other data management assistance.
- ii. Create matrix to compare data by placement and grade levels.
- iii. The steps for qualitative data analysis for case study research outlined by Yin (2009) will provide the general framework, while elements of grounded theory (Charmaz 2006) and systematic pattern coding and data displays (Miles & Huberman, 1994) will be utilized. I plan to code interview transcripts, observation notes and printed curricular materials, and eventually organize similarities and differences between individual participants. Both inductive analysis, where theory is generated through categorizing my codes into increasingly complex constructs, and deductive analysis to make meaning of the emerging themes based on my experience and the special education literature, will be utilized.

Dates	Research Activity
Spring 2015 *prior to official start	Prepare and submit IRB application for expedited review upon notification of award
July 2015	Recruiting via email, telephone contact with administrators, and personal visits to area BOCES campuses
Aug 2015	Recruiting continued Begin data collection- telephone or skype interviews Begin preliminary analysis
Sept – Dec 2015	Data collection continued classroom visits and interviews Transcribing interviews & ongoing analysis
Jan 2015 - April 2016	Writing for peer-reviewed publication
April-May 2016	Submit paper to academic journal Compile findings and combine with prior research Begin preparation for Spencer Foundation or other grant for summer 2016 submission

5) Broader impacts

Academic possibilities unimagined when the phrase “access to the general education curriculum” was included in IDEA continue to be revealed as students with significant cognitive disabilities are exposed to new levels of academic instruction. Terms such as “demeaning and stigmatizing” (Courtade et al., 2011) “shift” (Ayres et al., 2011) and “compromise” (Browder, 2012) all refer to the turmoil underway as the field evolves and traditional ways of educating students with significant cognitive disabilities are challenged by new expectations and policies. Special educator perceptions should inform the national conversation because they are showing on a micro level the issues the field is debating at the national level. This research will contribute a portrait of how teachers caught in this “shift” understand and enact access.

Findings will also inform my teaching of undergraduate and graduate level pedagogy courses by deepening my understanding of the special education system in NY and what teachers face on a daily basis.

Finally, public policy research has shown that differences in policy interpretation can lead to different activities and interactions in the workplace, therefore understanding the perceptions of the teachers who are responsible for implementing access is essential to understanding the implementation of curricular access in practice (Brodkin, 2003; Heck, 2004).

As researchers and policymakers debate how to use the Common Core state standards, the adequacy of assessment scores, and other policy reforms, the implementation of curriculum for children and youth who have been historically denied access to academics and held to lower expectation of their competence must be examined and better understood.

6) Dissemination and potential for future funding

I will submit this research for a presentation at CEC The Council for Exceptional Children 2016 annual conference. I will prepare a paper for a peer-reviewed academic journal, either *International Journal of Inclusive Education* or *Theory into Practice* or *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*.

Potential opportunities for an externally funded larger study include:

- Spencer Foundation Small Research Grants in the Area of Inquiry (up to \$50,000)

Area of Inquiry is **The Purpose and Values of Education:**

One important aspect of such inquiry is the question of the relationship between public and political understandings of educational purposes and values, on the one hand, and educational policies and practices on the other. ... empirical work that probes effectively and creatively into these deeply challenging and permanently important issues can contribute mightily toward social decision-making that moves education along constructive paths.

- Federal Institute of Education Sciences special education research grant with collaborators/colleagues with similar interests at the University of Illinois and Marist here in NY.
- State-specific developmental disability organizations and non profits.

References

- Agran, M., Alper, S. & Wehmeyer, M. (2002). Access to the general curriculum for students with significant disabilities: what it means to teachers. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 37, 122-133.
- Ayres, K.M., Douglas, K.H., Lowrey, K.A. & Sievers, C. (2011). I can identify saturn but I can't brush my teeth: What happens when the curricular focus for students with severe disabilities shifts. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities* 46,11-21
- Brodkin, E. (2003). Street-level research: Policy at the front lines. In T. L. Corbett, M. (Ed.), *Policy into action implementation research and welfare reform* (pp. 145-163). Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Browder, D. M., Wakeman, S. Y., & Flowers, C. (2006). Assessment of progress in the general curriculum for students with disabilities. *Theory Into Practice*, 45, 249-259.
- Browder, D., Wakeman, S.Y., Flowers, C., Rickelman, R., Pugalee, D. & Karvonen, M. (2007). Creating access to the general curriculum with links to grade-level content for students with significant cognitive disabilities: an explication of the concept. *The Journal of Special Education*, 41, 2-16.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: a practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Courtade, G., Spooner, F., Browder, D. & Jimenez, B. (2012). Seven reasons to promote standards-based instruction for students with severe disabilities: A reply to Ayres, Lowrey, Douglas & Sievers (2011). *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities* 47, 3-13.
- Dymond, S. K., Renzaglia, A., Gilson, C. L., & Slagor, M. T. (2007). Defining access to the general curriculum for high school students with significant cognitive disabilities. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 32(1), 1-15.
- Etscheidt, S. (2012). Complacency with access and the aggregate?: affirming an individual determination of educational benefit under the individuals with disabilities education act. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 22, 195-207. doi: 10.1177/1044207311410423.
- Evans, T. (2011). Professionals, managers and discretion: Critiquing street-level bureaucracy. *British Journal of Social Work*. 41, 368-386. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcq074.
- Hill, H. (2003). Understanding implementation: street-level bureaucrats' resources for reform. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, 13(3), 265-282.
- Hunt, P., McDonnell, J. & Crockett, M.A. (2012). Reconciling an ecological curricular framework focusing on quality of life outcomes with the development and instruction of standards-based academic goals. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 37 139-152.
- Individuals with Disabilities Act. (2004). Public Law 108-446. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Karger, J. (2005). Access to the general education curriculum for students with disabilities: A discussion of the interrelationship between IDEA and NCLB. A policy paper for educators and families. U.S. Office of Special Education Programs.

- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street level bureaucracy, dilemmas of the individual in public services* (Vol. 30th anniversary expanded edition). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Malow-Iroff, M., Benhar, M., & Martin, S. (2008). Educational reform and the child with disabilities. In H.L. Johnson, & A. Salz, A. (Eds.), *What is authentic educational reform? Pushing against the compassionate conservative agenda* (pp. 71-88). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
- Maynard-Moody, S. & Musheno, M. (2003). *Cops, teachers, counselors: Stories from the front lines of public service*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Miles, M. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis An expanded sourcebook* (Second ed.). Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moores-Abdool, W. (2010). Included Students with autism and access to general curriculum: What is being provided? *Issues in Teacher Education* 19(2) 153-169.
- Riccucci, N. M. (2005). *How management matters street level bureaucrats and welfare reform*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ryndak, D. & Alper, S. (2003). *Curriculum and instruction for students with significant disabilities in inclusive settings* (2nded.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Ryndak, D., Moore, M., Orlando, A. & Delano, M. (2008-2009). Access to the general curriculum: the mandate and role of context for students with extensive support needs. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 33-4, 199-213.
- Sandfort, J. R. (2000). Moving beyond discretion and outcomes: Examining public management from the front lines of the welfare system. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, 10(4), 729-756.
- Soukup, J. H., Wehmeyer, M. L., Bashinski, S. M., & Bovaird, J. A. (2007). Classroom variables and access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 74, 101-120.
- Spooner, F., & Browder, D. M. (2006). Why teach the general curriculum? In D.M. Browder & F. & Spooner (Eds.), *Teaching language arts, math, & science to students with significant cognitive disabilities* (pp. 1-14). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Spooner, F., Dymond, S. K., Smith, A., & Kennedy, C. H. (2006). What we know and need to know about accessing the general curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 31, 277-283.
- Vinzant, J. C. & Crothers., L. (1998). *Street level leadership, discretion and legitimacy in front line public service*. Washington DC Georgetown University Press.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., Sands, D., Knowlton, H.E. & Kozleski, E.B. (2002). *Providing access to the general curriculum: Teaching students with mental retardation*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Yell, M., Katsiyannis, M. & Hazelkorn, M (2007). Reflections on the 25th anniversary of the US supreme court's decision in Board of Education v. Rowley. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 39(9), 1-12.
- Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case study research design and methods* 4th ed. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Inc.

SUNY CORTLAND
2015-2016 Faculty Research Program (FRP)
Budget Page

Proposed budget. Itemize all projected expenditures in detail. On a separate sheet, justify all items of supplies exceeding \$500. All monies must be expended between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016 unless otherwise approved in writing by the Research and Sponsored Programs Office. Please note that approval of funds for travel reimbursement will be strictly confined to travel that is clearly and directly related to and necessary for the research enterprise itself (as opposed, for example, to the dissemination of findings).

A) Faculty Personal Compensation (not to exceed \$3,000); include fringe benefits in Section C:

Summer compensation \$1500

B) Student Salaries (Undergraduates: at least \$8.95 per hour September 1, 2013; Graduates: at least \$12.15 per hour beginning September 1, 2013; include fringe benefits in Section C) :

40 hrs graduate student salary@ \$13./hr \$520

transcribing audio recordings, organizing notes and material collected on site, assisting with literature search during writing stage.

C) Fringe Benefits (Faculty: 17.0%; International Faculty: 53.36%; Undergraduates: 5.0%; Graduates: 15.0%):

\$255. Faculty \$78. Graduate student

D) Other:

1) Other Personal Services (one-time payments for consultants, transcriptions, etc.; please contact RSPO for applicable fringe rates as appropriate):

2) Travel (itemize travel, meals, lodging, etc.):

\$600.00 (estimate minimum 6 site visits + minimum 2 recruiting visits)

3) Supplies and materials:

4) Other:

\$150 for three \$50. gift certificates for participating teachers

GRAND TOTAL REQUESTED \$3103.00

EDUCATION

- PhD in Social Policy May 2013
Brandeis University, Heller School for Social Policy and Management
Waltham, Massachusetts
- Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study in Special Education May 2008
University of Maine Orono, Maine
- M.Ed in Special Education August 1986
Concentration: Students with Severe and Multiple Disabilities
University of Maine Orono, Maine
- B.S. in Elementary Education June 1985
Northeastern University Boston, Massachusetts

TEACHING and RESEARCH

- State University of New York College at Cortland** Jan 2013 - present
Foundations and Social Advocacy Department
Cortland, NY
Assistant Professor

Teaching graduate and undergraduate courses in educational research and inclusive education pedagogy, serve on the Teacher Education Candidate Review Committee and College Technology Accessibility Committee focusing on how to assist faculty in universally designing more course content across disciplines.

- Heller School for Social Policy and Management** Jan 2010 – Dec 2012
Brandeis University Waltham, Massachusetts
Research Assistant

Conducted a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis for an evaluation of a Massachusetts state project providing participant-directed services to low income children with autism and their families.

- Center for Community Inclusion & Disability Studies** July 1994 – July 2008
Maine's University Center for Excellence in
Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (UCEDD)
Research Associate in Inclusive Education

Designed professional development, provided technical assistance and facilitated administrative planning in general and special education, universal design and school reform. Conducted workshops for early childhood providers, K-12 educators and administrators, and post-secondary audiences in inclusive practices.

Knowlton Elementary School
Ellsworth, Maine
Teacher

September 1986 – June 1989

Taught a self-contained classroom for students with disabilities. Created a preschool transition process, parent support system, and wrote & received two Department of Education innovative education grants.

PUBLICATIONS

Timberlake, M.T., Leutz, W. N., Warfield, M. E. & Chiri, G. (2014). "In the driver's seat": Parent perceptions of choice in a participant-directed Medicaid waiver program for young children with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*.44, 903-914 Doi:10.1007/s10803-013-1942-4.

Warfield, M. E., Chiri, G., Leutz, W.N. & Timberlake, M. (2014). Family well-being in a participant-directed autism waiver program: the role of relational coordination. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 58, (12), 1091-1104. doi: 10.1111/jir.12102

Parish, S.L., Magana, S., Rose, R., Timberlake, M. & Swaine, J.G. (2012) Inadequate Health care of Latino Children with Autism and other Developmental Disabilities. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities* 117(4) 304-315.

SELECTED PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

Atlanta, GA: Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) Conference Paper presentation "Who Gets What? Equity & Justice in Distributing Support to Individuals with Developmental Disabilities". August 2010.

Honolulu HI: Pacific Rim Conference on Disabilities. *Building on Strengths: A Key to Student Success*. February 2005

Toronto Canada: World Conference on Deafblindness *General Education Strategies that Empower Students with Deafblindness*. August 2003

AWARDS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Recipient of the AAIDD 2013 Researcher Hero Among Us award 2013
Recipient of the Lurie Fellowship in Disability Policy, Brandeis University 2008-2011

SERVICE

- Associate Editor for Creative Works, Review of Disability Studies: An international Journal. Oversee solicitation and review of submissions such as art, poetry and fiction.
- Invited Reviewer: Child & Youth Policy Journal, Maternal & Child Health Bureau Journal and Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities
- Professional Development Schools (PDS) Partnership Advisory Council, SUNY Cortland