

DOCUMENT RESUME

EC 152 568

ED 230 001

AUTHOR Vasa, Stanley F.; And Others
 TITLE Project Accommodate: Preparing Master Teachers to Provide Peer Inservice.
 PUB DATE Apr 83
 NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of The Council for Exceptional Children (61st, Detroit, MI, April 4-8, 1983).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; *Disabilities; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Mainstreaming; Program Descriptions; *Program Development; Secondary Education; State Programs
 IDENTIFIERS Nebraska; Project Accommodate

ABSTRACT

Project Accommodate, a program designed to improve inservice to regular Nebraska secondary teachers serving handicapped students, is described. The state's needs for inservice training to implement the goal of providing services in the least restrictive environment are discussed as background to Project Accommodate's development. Goals of the project are: to prepare persons with demonstrated expertise in mathematics, science, English/language arts, business education, and consumer and homemaking education as inservice providers; to provide inservice training to secondary regular educators through project prepared curriculum consultants/master teachers' modules; and to provide an ongoing addition to inservice programs via other project services and products. Elements of training for regular classroom teachers and curriculum specialists/master teachers are delineated. Project evaluation procedures are reviewed. (CL)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

PROJECT ACCOMMODATE

Preparing Master Teachers to Provide Peer Inservice

Presented by

Stanley F. Vasa, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Special Education
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
204B Barkley Center
Lincoln, NE 68583

Allen Steckelberg, M.A.
Associate Director
Project Accommodate
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
204 Barkley Center
Lincoln, NE 68583

Janet Connell Ehlers
Instructor
Department of Special Education
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
204 Barkley Center
Lincoln, NE 68583

at the

International Council for Exceptional Children Convention

Detroit, Michigan

April 7, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Allen Steckelberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED230001

EC152568

PROJECT ACCOMMODATE:

PREPARING MASTER TEACHERS TO PROVIDE PEER INSERVICE

The purpose of the project is to improve the quality and increase the amount of inservice provided to secondary regular education teachers in the State of Nebraska who serve or will serve handicapped students.

Further, the project purposes are to:

- ... train a number of inservice providers who are specialists in curriculum areas of English/language arts, business education, consumer and home economics, mathematics, and science;
- ... provide an alternative system of inservice delivery;
- ... provide inservice to local educators in: behavior and classroom management; instructional strategies in the classroom; mainstreaming/role of the classroom teacher and resource personnel; and adapting, selecting, and developing curriculum and materials;
- ... increase the delivery of inservice in rural areas; and
- ... tie into Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) human and material resource program and cooperate with State Education Training Series and other related projects.

Needs Assessment

Provision of programs in the least restrictive environment necessitates the proper preparation of regular educators. Emphasis on certification of special education personnel and compliance with other P.L. 94-142 mandates have severely limited the resources available to provide inservice training to approximately 23,000 certified teachers in Nebraska responsible for the success of handicapped students in the regular classroom.

Nebraska Department of Education (SEA) personnel have estimated that as many as 80% of the approximately 30,000 handicapped students served in

Nebraska are served in regular classrooms. The Nebraska "Right to an Education Policy Statement" identified the large number of school districts (over 900) and geographical distance as the major barriers in achievement of the goal of providing services in the least restrictive environment.

The Nebraska Department of Education (SEA) has developed a statement of personnel needs. Particular needs related to inservice of regular educators include:

- ... ". . . Educational Service Units (ESU) are not part of the SEA and, in fact, serve an independent role in the state. A lack of consistency across ESUs makes systematic inservice planning quite difficult for SEA personnel."
- ... "Rural districts have to rely on persons coming in from 'outside' or on traveling some distance in order to attend inservice presentations."
- ... "Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) have assisted in many areas of training when possible, but the lack of manpower and the small number of college and university programs (a total of 14 both state and privately endorsed) have placed a real burden on special education training programs."
- ... "It has been necessary because of preservice and inservice needs to plan a statewide approach which incorporates IHEs, Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and the SEA. Each group will contribute towards strengthening preservice and inservice training."
- ... "It is an SEA goal to provide preservice and inservice needs through a variety of delivery systems which incorporate human and material resources in the most productive sense possible."

The Nebraska Department of Education Training Needs Statement also identifies content area needs for inservice training. The SEA completed a survey of all special education and a random sample of 20% of all regular educators during the spring and summer of 1980, designed to determine the inservice needs of the State. Topic areas most often identified by teachers as needed (n = 730) were:

1. Behavior and classroom management techniques (78%)
2. Instructional strategies in the classroom (78%)
3. Mainstreaming role of classroom teacher and resource personnel (77%)
4. Adapting, selecting and developing curriculum and materials (72%)

The Nebraska Department of Education Training Needs Statement also identifies specific needs in coordinating inservice programs with LEAs and IHEs as follows:

1. "There is a need to develop inservice training activities for small groups of educators with unique needs. The SEA statewide needs assessment summarizes topics which need to be addressed."
2. "Statewide availability of inservice programming varies widely. Generally, the more urban areas (15 LEAs) have well developed inservice delivery systems. The smaller rural schools (1,123 LEAs) are inconsistent in training opportunities."

Project Design

Project Philosophy

The philosophy of this project is based upon assumptions about teachers, handicapped learners, and inservice provisions.

1. The "least restrictive environment" is an appropriate way to deliver services to secondary level handicapped learners. Further, the maintenance of the handicapped learner in the regular classroom to the maximum degree possible is the most desirable.
2. There exists a sufficient body of knowledge and instructional materials and strategies to allow for the successful accommodation of handicapped secondary students in the regular classroom.
3. Curriculum specialists and master teachers in subject-matter content areas can learn the necessary techniques to meet the needs of handicapped learners in the regular classroom and to present such strategies to their colleagues.
4. Regular secondary classroom teachers desire to improve their teaching skills and to better serve the handicapped learner.

5. Regular secondary classroom teachers perceive expertise in their respective subject areas as being more credible in accommodating handicapped learners in their specific subject content areas.
6. Handicapped learners benefit greatly from interaction and instruction in the regular secondary classroom.
7. Provision for model intervention strategies in the classroom facilitates local educational agencies in developing their own inservice programs.

Project Objectives

Three objectives have been identified for the project.

- Objective 1: To identify and train curriculum specialists/master teachers in mathematics, science, English/language arts, business education, and consumer and homemaking education as deliverers of inservice to secondary regular educators designed to improve instruction for handicapped students in regular secondary classrooms.
- Objective 2: To provide inservice training to secondary regular educators through project prepared curriculum consultants/master teachers delivery of inservice modules.
- Objective 3: To provide an ongoing addition to the inservice programs available in the State through development of inservice modules, cooperation with State Education Training Series, contributions to the State CSPD human and materials resources list and documentation of project materials and results.

Project Approach

The project encompasses two distinct training dimensions. First the program is designed to prepare persons who have demonstrated expertise in the areas of mathematics, science, English/language arts, business education, and consumer and homemaking education as inservice providers. The training was designed to build upon an already strong knowledge base in instructional strategies, behavior and management skills, and curriculum and materials by providing additional training and supervised experience. The curriculum specialists/masters teachers have attended three two-day

group training sessions, developed inservice training programs, and participated in the development of inservice training modules. Figure 1 provides a breakdown of the units of instruction, competencies, delivery systems, and instructional time frames for training the curriculum consultants/master teachers.

Figure 1

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM FOR CURRICULUM CONSULTANTS/MASTER TEACHERS

Unit of Instruction	Competency	Delivery System	Instructional Time Frame
1. Overview of Special Education	2	Printed Reading Materials Video tape presentations Formal Lectures	180 minutes
2. Knowledge of Resource Personnel & Array of Services	2	Printed Reading Materials Consultant Lectures Discussion	180 minutes
3. Adapting, Selecting, Developing Instructional Materials in Content Areas	4	Review of Available Materials Bibliography of Materials Guided Practicum Experiences Lectures Module Activity Development	720 minutes
4. Instructional Strategies with Mildly Handicapped Students in the Regular Classroom	3 & 4	Printed Reading Materials Simulation Experiences Video Tapes Discussions	360 minutes
5. Adapting Management Procedures to Accommodate the Handicapped	1	Printed Reading Materials Video Tape Scenarios Simulation Practicum Lectures - Consultant Lectures	360 minutes
6. Planning and Conducting Inservice for Regular Educators	6	Presentation of Inservice Simulation Activities Checklists	150 minutes
7. Development of Inservice Modules in Curriculum Content Areas	7	Sample Materials Printed Materials Practica time	260 minutes on site & individual time at home, school
8. Knowledge of Working with Secondary Teachers	5	Printed Material Simulation Activities Consultant Presentation	120 minutes

Inservice modules developed by project staff and participants serve as the core for the second training dimension. The modules are designed to serve as materials and support for the delivery of inservice by curriculum area specialists and project staff. Inservice sessions have been provided both at local schools and at regional and state meetings. Figure 2 describes the instructional program for regular secondary

classroom teachers. The figure contains a listing of the units of instruction, delivery systems, and instructional times.

Figure 2
Instructional Program for Regular Secondary Classroom Teachers

Unit of Instruction	Delivery System	Instructional Time
1. Overview of Special Education	Printed Reading Materials Video Tapes Lecture	60 minutes
2. Knowledge of Resource Personnel and Array of Services	Printed Reading Material Lecture Discussion	60 minutes
3. Adapting, Selecting, Developing Instructional Materials in Content Areas	Review of Available Materials Guided Practicum Lectures	180 minutes
4. Instructional Strategies with Mildly Handicapped in Regular Classroom; Presentation Style, Pacing, Grading, Activities	Printed Reading Materials Simulated Practice Video Tapes Discussion	120 minutes
5. Adapting Management Procedures to Accommodate the Handicapped	Printed Reading Materials Video tapes Simulated Practicum Lecture	120 minutes

Regular Classroom Teacher Role. The training for the regular classroom teacher includes the development of the following skills related to the successful integration of the mildly handicapped student into the regular secondary classroom:

1. Teachers will demonstrate knowledge of behavior and classroom management techniques.
2. Teachers will demonstrate knowledge of instructional strategies for accommodating handicapped students in regular classroom in their area of specialty.
3. Teachers will demonstrate knowledge of mainstreaming and the role of the classroom teacher and resource personnel.
4. Teachers will demonstrate the ability to adapt, select, and develop curriculum and materials for use by handicapped students in regular programs in their area of specialization.

Curriculum Specialist/Master Teacher. The training provided for the curriculum specialist/master teacher includes all of the components identified for the regular classroom teacher. In addition, the following have been included:

5. Curriculum specialists/master teachers will plan and conduct an inservice for regular educators.
6. Curriculum specialists/master teachers will demonstrate knowledge of techniques for working with secondary teachers, planning and providing inservice.
7. Curriculum specialists/master teachers will participate in the development of inservice modules in their respective areas of specialization.

An advisory panel consisting of Nebraska Department of Education curriculum consultants in mathematics, science, English/language arts, business, and consumer and home economics; SEA special education director of federal projects and director of inservice education; and secondary regular classroom teachers provided input into planning and implementation. Their roles in the project include:

1. Serving as members of the project advisory board;
2. Providing in kind support in training of the curriculum specialists/master teachers;
3. Serving as members of the instructional staff when the seven curriculum specialists/master teachers are provided training;
4. Critiqueing training modules developed in each area; and
5. Reviewing evaluation procedures for the project.

The involvement of the curriculum consultants from the State Education Agency permits the continuation of support for activities of the project after the conclusion of the three-year cycle. Leadership from the content area curriculum consultants is essential for continued support of the education of the mildly handicapped secondary student in the "least restrictive environment" in content area classes.

Dissemination of Information

The third objective of the project involves dissemination of information and materials developed by the project to other inservice providers in the

State. With this intent in mind, project materials have been provided to the State Education Training Series personnel and to directors of local CSPD projects upon their request.

Evaluation

Methodology

Project evaluation is conducted for three basic reasons: to assess the success of the project in meeting its objectives and purposes; to provide an accounting of the use of project funds and resources; and to provide information necessary to project staff and other interested parties as a guide for revision and improvement of project plans, management, utilization of resources and training activities.

In order to collect information to satisfy all these needs, several approaches to evaluating the project are to be undertaken. The project planning, management, and dissemination is evaluated primarily on a discrepancy based model using management plans and project activities and timelines as criteria for successful completion. Impact of the project is evaluated primarily on the number of persons trained, the level of training achieved, trainees' perception of the effectiveness of the training, and follow-up of performance changes in the participants. Collection methods include pre-post testing, evaluation questionnaires, follow-up questionnaires, and data collection forms. A copy of the Teacher Self-Inventory pre-post test measure is located in Figure 3.

Project success in training of participants is evaluated by answering the questions presented in Figures 4 and 5. The type of data collected is included in the left-hand column. The figures also provide the criteria for judging the results of the training procedures for assessing attainment of competence and the method of assessing the contribution of project participants.

Figure 3

Name _____

TEACHER SELF-INVENTORY

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE REACT TO EACH TOPIC REGARDING ITS IMPORTANCE TO YOU AS A SECONDARY TEACHER AND ALSO ACCORDING TO YOUR PERSONAL NEED FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA

KEY: 1 UNIMPORTANT
2 SLIGHT IMPORTANCE
3 NEUTRAL
4 MODERATE IMPORTANCE
5 VERY IMPORTANT

KEY: 1 NO NEED
2 LITTLE NEED
3 NEUTRAL
4 SOME NEED
5 MUCH NEED

IMPORTANCE AS A SECONDARY TEACHER

PERSONAL NEED FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

I. Mainstreaming and the role of the secondary classroom teacher and resource personnel

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Cognitive, physical, social and behavioral characteristics of mildly handicapped students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Concept of mainstreaming and the least restrictive environment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Significant issues involved in integrating mildly handicapped students in secondary classrooms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Factors involved in the successful integration of mildly handicapped students into secondary classrooms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. Role of secondary teachers in the identification and referral of mildly handicapped students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. Role of the secondary teacher in the development of the individual educational program for mainstreamed mildly handicapped students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. Role of the secondary teacher in the designing and implementing learning programs for mainstreamed mildly handicapped students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8. Roles of special education personnel in working with secondary classroom teachers and mildly handicapped students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

II. Classroom and behavior management

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1. Relationships between behavior problems and classroom performance | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Defining problem behaviors in the classroom | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Factors affecting student behaviors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Techniques to minimize behavior problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. Individual behavior management techniques | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. Group behavior management techniques | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

III. Instructional strategies for accommodating mildly handicapped students in secondary classrooms

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 1. Methods to informally assess students, the teacher and the classroom environment | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2. Use of peer and cross-peer tutors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3. Use of learning centers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4. Use of grouping techniques for learning activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5. Use of questioning techniques | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. Use of guided learning activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7. Improving student performance through instruction in locating information, organizational skills, test-taking skills, listening skills, study skills, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8. Adjustment in the delivery of information to students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9. Adjustments in the amount of feedback and practice | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10. Adjustment in evaluating student performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Figure 3 (continued)

TEACHER SELF-INVENTORY -- 2

IMPORTANCE AS A SECONDARY TEACHER

PERSONAL NEED FOR SKILL DEVELOPMENT

					<u>IV. Adapting, selecting and developing curriculum and materials for use by handicapped students in secondary classrooms</u>					
1	2	3	4	5	1. Evaluating instructional materials	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. Improving reading in content areas as a learning tool	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. Using guided assignments	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. Selecting instructional materials based on student abilities	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5. Modifying the presentation of materials	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6. Supplementing materials with additional resources	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7. Modifying the content of curriculum and materials	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8. Use of instructional media in instruction	1	2	3	4	5
					<u>V. Staff development/in-service</u>					
1	2	3	4	5	1. Needs assessment instruments for planning staff development activities	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. Writing goals and objectives for staff development activities	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. Resources, personnel, and materials needed for planning inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. Arrangement for successful implementation of inservice workshops	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5. Evaluation of staff development activities	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6. Strategies for working with adults	1	2	3	4	5

Figure 4

Evaluation Questions and Data Collection Methodology

Evaluation Questions	Data Collection Methodology
1. Have all planned preparation activities taken place? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> advisory committee meetings selection of curriculum specialists identification of trainers identification of course competencies preparation of course materials development of pre-post instruments development of participant evaluation questionnaire development of follow-up evaluation questionnaire 	1. Timeline discrepancy analysis: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> names of attendees and dates of advisory committee meetings names of selected curriculum specialists (N = 49) written documentation of attainment of competencies documentation of names and assigned topics of trainers written course materials completed pre post tests completed development of participant evaluation questionnaire completed development of follow-up evaluation questionnaire completed
2. Have curriculum specialists/master teachers gained skills in working with handicapped students in the regular classroom? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> behavior and classroom management instructional strategies in the regular classroom mainstreaming/role of regular classroom and resource teacher adapting, selecting, developing curriculum and materials 	2. Pre-post test analysis; Skill demonstration during simulated experiences; Participant perception of the value of training; Criterion referenced assessment of(a through d)
3. Have curriculum specialists/master teachers gained skills in planning and providing inservice programs? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> identifying inservice objectives locating instructional resources and materials designing inservice activities evaluating inservice effectiveness preparing and providing inservice facilities 	3. Criterion referenced assessment Pre-post test analysis of(a through e) Performance demonstrations during simulate experiences Participant perception of the value of training
4. Have curriculum specialists/master teachers perceived their training as adequate to deliver inservice? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> adequacy of training additional training needed other suggestions 	4. Tabulation of post training participant evaluation of(a through c)
5. Have curriculum specialists/master teachers provided inservice to secondary regular educators concerning integration of the handicapped student into classrooms in their subject area? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> number of inservices provided topics presented number of teachers trained evaluation of inservice 	5. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Record number of inservice sessions provided by curriculum specialist/master teachers Written statement of covered topics: agendas, brochures, inservice objectives; and dates of inservice Number and teaching area of regular educators in attendance at inservice session Summary of evaluation results from inservice session
6. Have secondary regular educators in English/language arts, mathematics, science, business education, and consumer and home economics gained skills in: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> behavior and classroom management instructional strategies in the classroom mainstreaming/role of classroom teacher and resource personnel adapting, selecting, and developing curriculum and materials 	6. Pre-post assessment of(a through d) Performance demonstration during simulated experiences Participant perception as revealed by summary of participant evaluation
7. Do secondary regular educators in each curriculum area perceive training provided as valuable? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> training is adequate additional training needed other suggestions 	7. Summary of results and recommendations of participant evaluation questionnaire
8. Are secondary regular educators in each curricular area using different instructional strategies and/or adapted materials after receiving project training?	8. Summary of data from follow-up questionnaires (three months after inservice session) on number of strategies/adaptations used
9. Do employers (principals, etc.) perceive training to be of value to regular educators who participate?	9. Summary of questionnaires compiled by employers of inservice participants

Figure 5

Assessment of Impact on Related Projects

Evaluation Questions	Data Collected
1. Has information about inservice modules, developed during the project, been disseminated to groups most likely to use them?	1. Dissemination to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Nebraska Dept. of Ed. curriculum consultants, special education personnel, and special vocational needs personnel Educational Service Units college and university Special Education faculty professional organization newsletters Director State Education Training Series local school districts
2. Have inservice modules been incorporated into other service delivery systems?	2. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of requests for use by Local CSPD inservice Number of modules incorporated into State Education Training Series
3. Have curriculum specialists/master teachers trained as inservice providers and inservice modules been incorporated into CSPD human and materials resource list?	3. Inspection of CSPD Human and materials resource list
4. Have project trained inservice providers received requests from LEA's and State Education Training Series to provide inservice?	4. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Number of requests from LEA's Number of requests from State Education Training Series
5. How many inservice programs have been provided as a result of the project?	5. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Count of number and location of inservice provided Count by teaching area of the number of regular educators receiving inservice training

Bibliography

Nebraska Department of Education Training Needs Statement. Nebraska Department of Education.

Nebraska Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Goals. Nebraska Department of Education.

Steckelberg, A. L., Vasa, S. F., & Asselin, S. B. Accommodating the mildly handicapped student in mathematics. University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Lincoln, NE, 1981.

Vasa, S. F., Steckelberg, A. L., & Asselin, S. B. Accommodating the mildly handicapped student in the regular secondary classroom: A resource guide. University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Lincoln, NE, 1981.