

## I. ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR MICHAEL F. GIANGRECO

Michael F. Giangreco (<http://www.uvm.edu/~cdci/archives/mgiangre/index.html>) is a Professor in the University of Vermont's Department of Education (Special Education Program) and at the Center on Disability & Community Inclusion. For more than a decade, Dr. Giangreco and his colleagues have been studying ways to improve paraprofessional supports for students with disabilities. His research has led to the identification of best practices in the use of paraprofessionals to promote the learning and development of students with disabilities within inclusive environments. Below is an annotated bibliography of Dr. Giangreco's work focused on paraprofessional support of students with disabilities (<http://www.uvm.edu/~cdci/archives/mgiangre/paraprofessional.html>) prepared by Kristi Godfrey-Hurrell.

Giangreco, M. F. (2013). Teacher assistant supports in inclusive schools: Research, practices and alternatives. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 37(2), 93-106. doi: 10.1017/jse.2013.1.

This article provided a summary of content from a keynote address delivered by Giangreco at the national conference of the Australian Association of Special Education in July 2012. Three major topics surrounding the utilization of teacher assistants in inclusive schools were addressed: (a) persistent and emerging research trends, (b) contemporary conceptual and data-based concerns, and (c) ideas about what schools can do to provide improved educational opportunities and supports for students with special education needs within inclusive environments.

Giangreco, M. F., Suter, J. C., & Hurley, S. M. (2013). Revisiting personnel utilization in inclusion-oriented schools. *Journal of Special Education*, 47, 121-132 doi: [10.1177/0022466911419015](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466911419015)

This quantitative research study examined influences of special educator (e.g., work roles, caseload) and school demographic variables (e.g., enrollment information) on special educators' ratings on providing effective special education services to students with IEPs. The purpose was twofold: (a) analyzed data from a previous study that examined special educator school density to further determine if findings were similar on a larger scale, and (b) used HLM analyses to explore relationships between special educator school density and other variables within the school on services provided to students. Authors presented a thorough review of the results and provided a discussion of limitations, findings, and implications for future research.

Giangreco, M. F., Doyle, M. B., & Suter, J. C. (2012). Constructively responding to requests for paraprofessionals: We keep asking the wrong questions. *Remedial and Special Education*, 33, 362-373. doi: [10.1177/0741932511413472](https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932511413472)

This paper addressed the overuse and misuse of paraprofessionals in schools through a description of key contextual issues associated with school-based paraprofessional decision making. Authors provided an alternative framework that schools could consider in developing processes and practices to fit the individual school in making decisions to support students' educational needs. The framework presented offered school/district and classroom/team-level concepts and corresponding actions that can be used to develop proactive processes and practices for assisting schools in determining use of paraprofessional staff most effectively.

Giangreco, M. F., Broer, S. M., & Suter, J. C. (2011). Guidelines for selecting alternatives to overreliance on paraprofessionals: Field-testing in inclusion-oriented schools. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*(1), 22-38. doi: [10.1177/0741932509355951](https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932509355951)

Paraprofessionals have become more commonplace in today's schools and so has their utilization to support students with disabilities in the general education classroom. However, research has indicated that paraprofessionals are often misused. Authors investigated alternatives to overreliance on paraprofessionals by describing the process and impact of the planning tool *Guidelines for Selecting Alternatives to Overreliance on Paraprofessionals* (GSA). A 5-year multistate mixed-methods design was employed with 26 schools in three staggered cohorts from 2002 to 2007. Findings are presented around five research questions that included: (a) why did schools decide to utilize the GSA planning process, (b) how did schools rate themselves on 20 GSA self-assessment items, (c) what were the schools' highest priorities and what actions were taken, (d) how did study participants rate the GSA planning process, and (e) what impact did the GSA planning process have in the participating schools on service delivery, faculty, and students.

Giangreco, M. F. (2010). One-to-one paraprofessionals for students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms: Is conventional wisdom wrong? *Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities, 48*(1), 1-13. DOI: [10.1352/1934-9556-48.1.1](https://doi.org/10.1352/1934-9556-48.1.1)

The use of one-on-one paraprofessionals to support students with intellectual and other developmental disabilities has been a common practice within the general education classroom. In this article, Giangreco (2010) provided five reasons that challenge the overreliance of one-to-one paraprofessionals in inclusive classrooms. Additionally, a series of recommended positions and actions are provided to encourage development of alternatives.

Giangreco, M. F., Suter, J. C., & Doyle, M. B. (2010). Paraprofessionals in inclusive schools: A review of recent research. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 20*, 41-57. DOI: [10.1080/10474410903535356](https://doi.org/10.1080/10474410903535356)

A review of research on special education paraprofessional issues and practices in U.S. schools between 2000 and 2007 is provided. Authors identified and summarized major findings from 32 studies. Nine topical categories were created: (a) hiring and retention of paraprofessionals, (b) training, (c) roles and responsibilities, (d) respect and acknowledgement, (e) interactions of paraprofessionals with students and staff, (f) supervision, (g) students' perspectives on paraprofessional supports, (h) school change, and (i) alternatives to the use of paraprofessionals. Implications for future research and actions are also given.

Suter, J. C., & Giangreco, M. F. (2009). Numbers that count: Exploring special education and paraprofessional service delivery in inclusion-oriented schools. *Journal of Special Education, 43*(2), 81-93. doi: [10.1177/0022466907313353](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466907313353)

A descriptive, quantitative design was used to explore key indicators of special education service delivery to increase knowledge and improve inclusive special education service delivery. Data were collected in 2006-2007 from a sample of 92 special educators and 36 administrators located in 19 inclusion-oriented schools within the state of Vermont. Several questionnaires were administered and analyzed. Discussion of study limitations and findings were presented.

Giangreco, M. F. (2009). *Critical issues brief: Concerns about the proliferation of one-to-one paraprofessionals*. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, Division on Autism and Developmental Disabilities.

This paper reviewed four key reasons why overreliance of one-to-one paraprofessionals is a critical issue in special education. Overreliance on one-to-one paraprofessionals was stated to be: (a) theoretically questionable, (b) a limiting support, (c) associated with a number of unplanned negative effects, and (d) aggravated by inadequate methods for decision-making. Seven possible solutions are presented.

Giangreco, M. F., Hurley, S. M., & Suter, J. C. (2009). Personnel utilization and general class placement of students with disabilities: Ranges and ratios. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 47*(1), 53-56.

This brief report presented data from federally reported sources to explore relationships among personnel utilization in full-time equivalents and general education class placement rates. The purpose of presenting the data was to illuminate availability of personnel supports for students with disabilities.

Causton-Theoharis, J., Giangreco, M.F., Doyle, M.B., & Vadasy, P.F. (2007). Paraprofessionals: The "sous chefs" of literacy instruction. *Teaching Exceptional Children 40*(1), 56-62.

This article highlighted five common circumstances from literature in which paraprofessional use was successfully utilized to improve reading skills of students with disabilities. Each commonality is reviewed and practical considerations are presented.

Giangreco, M.F., Broer, S.M. (2007). School-based screening to determine overreliance on paraprofessionals. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 22*(3), 149-158.

The overreliance on special education paraprofessionals is addressed in this study. Authors described the development of and directions for using the first tool, *Guidelines for Selecting Alternatives to Overreliance on Paraprofessionals* (Giangreco & Broer, 2003), for school screening of paraprofessional use. A field-test is also presented. Study included 27 schools from six states and a total of 244 screening and planning team members associated with the schools were included. Findings indicated that the screening tool is a practical and effective way for schools to evaluate their use of paraprofessionals. Initial findings, limitations, and implications for future research are presented.

Giangreco, M.F., & Doyle, M.B. (2007). Teacher assistants in inclusive schools. In L. Florian (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of special education* (pp. 429-439). London: Sage.

This chapter summarized selected literature concerning the utilization of teacher assistants to support the education of students with disabilities in all settings. The term *teacher assistant* was used to be inclusive to all those who assisted in the classroom and who may not be teaching. A brief overview of research trends and a summary of what is known about teacher assistants are provided. Authors also addressed three questions:

1. What are appropriate roles for teacher assistants who support the education of students with disabilities in inclusive service delivery systems?
2. What is the emerging role of the classroom teacher with students who have disabilities and their teacher assistants?
3. How does the assignment of teacher assistants affect the person/social aspects of schooling for students with disabilities?

Implications for research and practice are also provided.

Giangreco, M.F., Smith, C.S., Pinckney, E. (2006). Addressing the paraprofessional dilemma in an inclusive school: A program description. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 31 (3), 215-229.

A 3-year in-depth description of one large elementary/middle school that used an action planning tool to pursue alternatives to the overreliance on paraprofessionals is presented. Authors also presented information on the impact actions had on the school and next steps for implementation.

Broer, S. M., Doyle, M. B., & Giangreco, M. F. (2005) Perspectives of students with intellectual disabilities about their experiences with paraprofessional support. *Exceptional Children*, 71(4), 415-430.

Authors presented descriptive study findings from semi-structured interviews of 16 young adults with intellectual disabilities that explored their experiences and perspective in attending general education classes with paraprofessional support. Themes revealed included paraprofessionals as: (a) mother, (b) friend, (c) protector from bullying, and (d) primary teacher. Insights and discussion concerning each theme are presented. Further, information on how those relationships affected the student's self-perception and how relationships affected interactions with other students and teachers is offered.

Giangreco, M.F., Yuan, S., McKenzie, B., Cameron, P., & Fialka, J. (2005). "Be careful what you wish for...": Five reasons to be concerned about the assignment of individual paraprofessionals. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 37(5), 28-34.

This article provided information around issues pertaining to the use of paraprofessionals in the classroom. Three primary issues are discussed: (a) potential benefits of providing paraprofessional support, (b) concerns about individual paraprofessional assignments illustrated through three real-life vignettes, and (c) considerations for educational teams for linking paraprofessional research to practice. Additionally, authors presented alternatives crafted to reduce overreliance on individual paraprofessionals as a primary support for students with disabilities in the general education environment.

Giangreco, M.F., Halvorsen, A., Doyle, M.B., & Broer, S.M. (2004). Alternatives to overreliance on paraprofessionals in inclusive schools. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, 17(2), 82-90.

As a result of recent research efforts that have emphasized concerns about the overreliance of paraprofessionals in inclusive settings, this article presented a three-component administrative model for the effective utilization of paraprofessionals. The three components briefly described are: (a) supports- foundation for ensuring appropriate utilization of paraprofessionals, (b) decision making- the need for paraprofessional use, and (c) alternatives- provision of alternate actions that schools can encourage involvement of paraprofessionals, general and special educators, parents, and students with and without disabilities to reduce over and underuse of paraprofessionals. Extensive discussion is given to the third component, alternatives.

Giangreco, M.F., & Doyle, M.B. (2004). Directing paraprofessional work. In C. Kennedy & E. Horn (Eds.), *Including students with severe disabilities*, (pp. 185-204). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Over the past decade, paraprofessional presence has increased in general education classrooms for a variety of reasons. This chapter presented information about: (a) the similarities and differences between teachers and paraprofessionals, (b) different ways paraprofessionals can be effectively utilized within the general education classroom, (c) specific strategies paraprofessionals can be taught to improve quality of inclusive education, and (d) how teachers can effectively monitor and provide feedback to paraprofessionals. Authors further provided four primary indicators educators could use to determine if they are successfully directing the work of paraprofessionals.

Giangreco, M. F. (2003). Working with paraprofessionals. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 50-53.

This article discussed the importance of teacher engagement when paraprofessionals are in the general education classroom. The author provided considerations and alternative supports for educators who are looking to use paraprofessional support to facilitate inclusion of students with disabilities and increase teacher engagement among those students.

Giangreco, M. F. & Broer, S. M. (2005). Questionable utilization of paraprofessionals in inclusive schools: Are we addressing symptoms or causes? *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 20(1), 10-26.

This article presented descriptive, quantitative data from 737 school personnel and parents who supported the education of students with disabilities in general education classrooms. The study addressed three questions: (a) how special education teachers and paraprofessionals spent their time, (b) perspectives of paraprofessionals about certain paraprofessional practices, and (c) perspectives of professionals and parents about school wide practices associated with inclusive special education that may contribute to the reduction of inappropriate utilization of paraprofessionals. Findings highlighted specific concerns and provided suggestions that focus on change.

Giangreco, M.F., & Broer, S.M. (March/April 2003). The paraprofessional conundrum: Why we need alternative support strategies. *TASH Connections Newsletter*, 29 (3/4), 22-23.

In response to the under and overreliance of paraprofessionals in inclusive environments, authors presented nine service delivery options that have emerged as alternative uses of paraprofessionals. These options included resource reallocation, co-teaching, dual-certified teachers, reassigning roles, differentiated teacher roles, building capacity of general and special teachers, improving working conditions of general and special educators, peer supports, and self-determination.

Giangreco, M. F., Edelman, S. W., & Broer, S. M. (2003). Schoolwide planning to improve paraeducator supports. *Exceptional Children*, 70 (1), 63-79.

This study chronicled the use of a process of planning for paraeducator supports. Forty-six paraeducator planning teams in 46 schools in 13 states were included. Each school was given a 27-page planning book, *A Guide to School-wide Planning for Paraeducator Supports*, to assess their school's needs, identify priorities, develop, implement, and assess a plan. Findings indicated that the process assisted schools in self-assessing practices, identifying priorities, and developing and implementing action plans. Implications and future use are provided.

Giangreco, M.F., Backus, L., CichoskiKelly, E., Sherman, P., & Mavropoulos, Y. (2003).

Paraeducator training materials to facilitate inclusive education: Initial field-test data. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 22(1), 17-27.

This article addressed the lack of data attesting to the utility of paraeducator training materials by sharing initial field-test data based on the use of training materials designed to address entry-level training of paraeducators who provide special education services in inclusive settings. Findings indicated that paraeducators gained knowledge, perspectives, and skills that directly implicated their work. Further, both paraeducators and instructors included in this study rated materials as favorable. Implications and directions for future training programs are provided.

Giangreco, M. F. & Broer, S. M. (January 2003). Paraprofessionals -- No perfect solution. *CEC Today*, 9(5), 12-13.

Authors presented six variations of issues pertaining to paraprofessionals and argued for the strengthening of paraprofessional supports. Further discussion around service delivery options that offer alternatives to overreliance and inappropriate use of paraprofessionals is provided.

Giangreco, M. F., Edelman, S. W., & Broer, S. M. (2003). Schoolwide planning to improve paraeducator supports. *Exceptional Children*, 70 (1), 63-79.

This study aimed to address limitations and extend results of a pilot study through field-testing an updated version of a 10-step, school-wide planning process to improve paraeducator supports in a larger set of more diverse schools. Data reflected the utilization and outcomes of the process and included the perspectives of 331 individual team members. Findings indicated that the process did assist school teams in evaluating, planning, identifying priorities, developing action plans, and implementing plans around paraeducator practices. Implications and future use are provided.

Giangreco, M.F. & Doyle, M.B. (2002). Students with disabilities and paraprofessional supports: Benefits, balance, and band-aids. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 34 (7), 1-12.

Following a review of literature, authors addressed five contemporary questions to improve paraprofessional support for students with disabilities. The questions included:

1. To what extent should paraprofessionals be teaching students with disabilities?
2. What impact does the proximity of paraprofessionals have on students with disabilities?
3. How does the utilization of paraprofessional support effect teacher engagement and why should it matter?
4. How can authentic respect, appreciation, and acknowledgment of the important work of paraprofessionals be demonstrated?
5. What can be done to improve paraprofessional supports school-wide?

Implications for practice are provided for each question.

Giangreco, M.F., Broer, S.M., & Edelman, S.W. (2002). "That was then, this is now!" Paraprofessional supports for students with disabilities in general education classrooms. *Exceptionality*, 10(1), 47-64.

This study provided a description of the major issues and concerns identified by 215 school personnel in four schools about the expanded use of paraprofessionals in general education settings. Seven themes were presented and were based on interviews and observations in the schools. Practical implications and suggestions for future research are provided.

Giangreco, M.F. (2001). *Teacher leadership: Working with paraeducators (Instructor's and Participant's Manuals)*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center on Disability and Community Inclusion.

This is a course manual designed to provide a way to bring together teachers and special educators to share ideas, experiences, and strategies, and to problem-solve about how to effectively work with paraprofessionals. The primary focus of the course is to impart the initial, and most essential, knowledge and skills necessary for paraeducators. Four units are provided and include agendas, lesson plans, visuals, and overall course forms.

Giangreco, M.F., Edelman, S.W., & Broer, S.M. (2001). Respect, appreciation, and acknowledgement of paraprofessionals who support students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 67, 485-498.

This study addressed the gaps in research concerning paraprofessionals who support students with disabilities in general education classrooms. A description for how 103 school personnel served, thought about issues of respect, appreciation, and acknowledgement of students with a wide array of disabilities across the grades from four schools K-12 were presented. Six themes emerged and were discussed.

Giangreco, M.F., Broer, S.M., & Edelman, S.W. (2001). Teacher engagement with students with disabilities: Differences based on paraprofessional service delivery models. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 26, 75-86.

This study described differences in teacher engagement identified within two different approaches to providing support for paraprofessionals in the general education classrooms, program-based, and one-on-one. Data from 103 school personnel were presented from four schools grades K-12.

Giangreco, M.F., Edelman, S.W., Broer, S.M., & Doyle, M.B. (2001). Paraprofessional support of students with disabilities: Literature from the past decade. *Exceptional Children*, 68, 45-63.

This article summarized and analyzed a set of 43 pieces of professional literature concerning paraprofessional supports for students with disabilities published between 1991 and early 2000. Topical gaps in the literature, a review of major data-based findings, and implications for the field were presented.

Giangreco, M.F., Edelman, S., & Broer, S. (May, 2001). *A guide to schoolwide planning for paraeducator supports*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center on Disability and Community Inclusion.

This is a 27 page workbook to be used by school teams to plan, evaluate, and address paraeducator issues.

CichoskiKelly, E., Backus, L., Giangreco, M.F., & Tucker, P. (2000). *Paraeducator entry-level training for supporting students with disabilities paraeducators (Instructor's and Participant's Manuals)*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center on Disability and Community Inclusion.

These instructor and participant manuals provided a basic training program curriculum for paraeducators supporting students with disabilities in inclusive educational settings. The 18 hour course can be offered in a variety of formats and does not require outside trainers. Both an instructor and participant manual are included. Six units are included and address the following topics: (1) collaborative teamwork; (2) inclusive education; (3) families and cultural sensitivities; (4) characteristics of children and youth with various disabilities; (5) roles and responsibilities of paraeducators and other team members; and (6) paraeducators implementing teacher-planned instruction.

Giangreco, M. F., Broer S. M., & Edelman, S. W. (1999). The tip of the iceberg: Determining whether paraprofessional support is needed for students with disabilities in general education settings. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 24(4), 281-291.

This article addressed selected issues pertaining to the utilization of paraprofessionals and presented 10 guidelines to assist teams in planning for and implementing paraprofessional supports. Considerations and alternatives support solutions are provided.

Giangreco, M.F., CichoskiKelly, E., Backus, L., Edelman, S.W., Tucker, P., Broer, S., & CichoskiKelly, C., & Spinney, P. (March,1999). Developing a shared understanding: Paraeducator supports for students with disabilities in general education. *TASH Newsletter*, 25 (3), 21-23.

This article provided a discussion for developing a shared understanding of the underlying beliefs, values, and principles that can guide a team's work together as they plan, implement, and evaluate paraprofessional support in the schools.

Giangreco, M.F., Edelman, S., Luiselli, T.E., & MacFarland, S.Z. (1997). Helping or hovering? Effects of instructional assistant proximity on students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 64 (1), 7-18.

This study presented data on the effects of the proximity of instructional assistants on students with multiple disabilities who are placed in general education classrooms. Analyses of data produced eight major findings: (a) interference with ownership and responsibility by general educators, (b) separation from classmates, (c) dependence on adults, (d) impact on peer interactions, (e) limitations on receiving competent instruction, (f) loss of personal control, (g) loss of gender identity, and (h) interference with instruction of other students. Implications for practice are provided.