

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 081

EC 300 077

AUTHOR York, Jennifer, Ed.; Vandercook, Terri, Ed.
 TITLE Integrated Education. Feature Issue.
 INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Affiliated Program on
 Developmental Disabilities.
 SPONS AGENCY Administration on Developmental Disabilities (DHHS),
 Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE 88
 NOTE 21p.
 PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)
 JOURNAL CIT IMPACT; v1 n2 Win 1988

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Planning; Educational Cooperation;
 Educational History; *Educational Practices;
 Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education;
 Friendship; Futures (of Society); Individualized
 Education Programs; Legal Responsibility;
 Mainstreaming; Organizational Change; *Severe
 Disabilities; *Social Integration; Student
 Educational Objectives; Teacher Role; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This "feature issue" provides various perspectives on a number of integrated education topics, including successful integration practices and strategies, the changing roles of teachers, the appropriate role of research, the history and future of integrated education, and the realization of dreams of life in the mainstream for children with severe disabilities. Titles and authors of articles include: "Past, Present, and Future of School Integration" (Maynard C. Reynolds); "Full Inclusion Is Possible" (Marsha Forest); "Realizing the Vision for Michael" (Dorothy Skarnulis); "The Role of Research in Integration" (William Stainback and Susan Stainback); "Integration--The Legal Imperative" (Larry Ringer and Sonja Kerr); "'Caught in the Curriculum': A Synopsis" (Roger Strand); "Integrated Education and Organizational Change" (Richard Schattman); "Regular Class Integration at Middle School: Feedback from Classmates and Teachers" (Jennifer York and others); "Enhancing Educational Success through Collaboration" (Jacqueline S. Thousand and Richard A. Villa); "Tear Membership: Who's on First?" (Linda Kjerland and others); "What's in an IEP? Writing Objectives for an Integrated Education" (Jennifer York and Terri Vandercook); "Integrated Education: MAPS To Get You There" (Terri Vandercook and Jennifer York); and "Cath, Jess, Jules, and Ames...A Story of Friendship" (Terri Vandercook and others). A list of six resources on integrated education is also included. (JDD)

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

MINNESOTA MUAP IMPACT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Feature Issue on Integrated Education

Volume 1 (2) Winter 1988

Message From The Editors

Throughout the United States and Canada increasing numbers of children with severe disabilities are becoming full members of their home school communities: attending regular classes, making friends with neighborhood kids, learning and belonging with same age peers. Regular and special educators are collaborating more than ever before in the design and implementation of quality integrated programs; in the process, they have experienced the rewards of teamwork and have expanded their professional relationships and resources. The commitment of so many individuals—family members, peers, administrators, teachers, consultants—to meeting the challenge of integration is impressive. In Minnesota alone more than 60 school districts are taking the initiative in this new and challenging design of education, and that's exciting. The power of this commitment, enthusiasm, and creative problem solving cannot be overestimated.

The Minnesota University Affiliated Program (MUAP) on Developmental Disabilities is committed to assisting in the development of educational practices, and in conducting field-based research on how best to create integrated school communities where our children learn and belong together. The purpose of the MUAP is to bridge the gap between the university community and the service community, working within both to develop, promote and implement effective integration practices for school, work, home, and community life.

The purpose of this feature issue of *IMPACT* on the topic of integrated



The school community at Battle Creek Elementary, St. Paul, includes Catherine (center), and her best friends Jessica, Julie and Amy. Her three friends are also part of Catherine's educational planning team.

education is to provide various perspectives on a number of integrated education topics, including successful integration practices and strategies, the changing roles of teachers, the appropriate role of research, the history and future of integrated education, and the realization of dreams of life in the mainstream for children with severe disabilities.

We extend our sincere appreciation to all the contributors who so enthusiastically agreed to share their experiences, visions, and perspectives. The development of this newsletter has been a *homecoming* of sorts for all of us in its collection of articles that reflects the hard work of so many, and in its role as a forum of support and optimism for realizing the vision of integrated school communities where members with even the most severe disabilities are valued for their unique contributions.

Finally, this issue of *IMPACT* is dedicated in loving memory to two individuals who by their lives made a difference in the world. Sue Kruse was a teacher in Iowa who cared deeply about her students and her school community. She understood that all students in a school must be valued and assisted to make a contribution in order for the school community to be complete. Aaron Hiendlmayr was a 6-year-old child in St. Paul who created a community of adults and children who are richer for knowing him. His relationships deepened the commitment of others to the building of integrated school communities where each belongs.

—Jennifer York and Terri Vandercreek

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert
Crivinski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CONTENTS

Issue Overview	1
Historical Perspective	2
Philosophical Foundations	3
A Vision	4
Role of Research	5
The Law	6
Continuum Critique/Awards	7
Systems Change	8
Minnesota Focus	10
Resources	12
Integration Survey	13
Teams	14
Strategies, IEP and MAPS	16
A Success Story	18
Upcoming Events	20

Past, Present, And Future Of School Integration

Maynard C. Reynolds

The history of special education can be summarized quite well in two words: progressive inclusion. Children with disabilities moved first from total neglect into residential schools. Such schools were far-removed from most families, but they were created with some initial optimism and represented a degree of commitment by the public-at-large. Next came day schools and classes, and, more recently, fast-growing resource rooms and the "mainstream." The story is one of gradual movement toward more inclusive or integrated arrangements. Changes have not been linear. There have been delays and some regressions; but this is not a case of wide pendulum swings. It is a story of quite steady, or progressive, inclusion.

The word progressive has several meanings here. Progress signifies improvement, success, and betterment. It is an improvement, I believe, when families, schools, and other institutions of the community are totally inclusive of, and supportive to, all their members. When individuals have opportunities to set purposes and make choices about their own lives, to learn and become competent in pursuit of their own aims, and to receive their share of the rewards and joys of life, their freedom is enhanced and that, for me, is a very fundamental achievement. This view suggests also that increments in freedom can come at many levels. The individual who learns to make choices about his or her own food and who becomes competent in self-feeding may have gained as much or more than another person who learns higher algebra. Opportunities in all of these aspects of life are broader and richer when people are integrated in schools and communities, they are more limited when one is confined to segregated and highly-structured environments.

Progressive also implies change through a sequence of stages or gradual movement along a dimension of development. The inclusion and integration of students with disabilities in the schools has shown this kind of gradual change. In this context, the continuum or cascade model of special education may be thought of as an historical statement, showing gradual changes from restrictive to less restrictive arrangements of special education. We may be ready in the United States and some other Western nations to "lop off" the most restrictive elements of the continuum, the residential school being the likely candidate for demise, but in many other parts of the world the full cascade is likely to remain viable for at least the near future.

The word inclusion as used here implies acceptance rather than rejection by the schools. Children with disabilities are now guaranteed a right to education (under P.L. 94-142), but they are still often rejected from the "mainstream" programs and shunted off to special places for their education. Thus, rejection processes still operate within many schools, amidst arguments on issues about what is "appropriate" and what is meant by the "least restrictive environment" principle. We have not yet achieved the full and appropriate measure of inclusiveness within the schools.

The current debates about integration of children with disabilities will be resolved, I believe, by means of

progressive inclusion. We should expect to see more students with disabilities, even those with the most complex needs, served in regular education settings. But the trend which I predict and favor is by no means inevitable. Much depends on the commitments and work of parents, educators, and policy makers.

The chief cause of my optimism about progressive inclusion in the future is that a number of very able people have linked themselves together to advocate for integration. A colleague has suggested to me the concept of "freight train technique", which is illustrated when a group of well-informed, progressive people step outside of the large professional structures of a field to advocate particular changes. The assumption is that large organizations tend to become bureaucratic, slow-moving and dependent upon broad consensus among members; this is a recipe for conservatism and not for progressive action. The theory is that even a relatively small number of such people, if they link themselves together (as in the case of a heavy freight train), go wherever important decisions and policies are being made in the field and enter their data and ideas vigorously into the dialogue, can have enormous influence. Recent progress in the United States in moving through the advanced stages of progressive inclusion, focusing on the persons with very complex disabilities, has had "freight train" leadership; this leadership has come, for example, in the work of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps (TASH). Fortunately, there has been progressive governmental work also, as in the Medicaid Waivers movement and the strong and timely moves by the federal department of education in support of programs to prepare teachers of children with severe and profound disabilities. It is especially encouraging to see significant numbers of highly able young professionals join in the integration movement and to see their recognition of the moral as well as technical aspects of special education.

In these few reflections I have referred mostly to integration in the schools. It will be important not to think of schools of the future as comprised of sets of little box-like classrooms each with a single teacher. There is much ferment these days about the restructuring of schools, often involving the formation of teams of professional educators working in partnerships, sharing the broad "store" of knowledge and skills which such teams may possess. Educators who wish to advocate for more integration of students with disabilities should join in the restructuring processes and push the movement beyond present boundaries to encompass life-long learning opportunities and fully integrated communities. The succeeding articles in this issue of IMPACT will tell how the continuing story of progressive inclusion is unfolding. I read these articles with a marvelous and widely shared sense of victory!

Full Inclusion Is Possible

by Marsha Forest

I am privileged to act as an education advisor to two unique school systems in southern Ontario, Canada: The Hamilton Wentworth Separate School Board and the Waterloo Region Separate School Board. The stated goal and philosophy of both these systems is that *each belongs*, meaning that all children go to their neighborhood schools and attend age appropriate regular classes. (The criteria for full inclusion is "breathing" i.e., life itself.) Supports and services go to the child when needed. Although this is not yet a reality for every child in these systems, it is a policy being carried out in most instances. Other systems and places in Canada are also moving in this direction, but I would say that these two school boards give us an especially clear image of what is possible and how simple it is to include everyone once we decide to do just that.

For too long, integration, or mainstreaming, has been thought to mean placement of a child with a handicap in a school or classroom. Integration truly has a much deeper meaning that's expressed in the terms "inclusion" and "belonging". Unless this deep meaning is addressed, the movement to integrate children with disabilities will be a *placement* issue rather than a *philosophical* debate.

What we are really doing is asking a new set of questions: *What kind of school communities do we want? Who do we want our children to grow up with? What values will we model for our children? What do we want the future to look like?* These are the questions that must be asked, rather than, "How do we do it?" I believe that if we truly understand the why of integration, the how will follow quite easily. If we really want someone to be part of our lives, we will do what it takes to welcome that person and accommodate his or her needs.

Imagine for a moment that you have a child who today is happy, healthy, attending his or her local school, and progressing normally. Reflect for a moment on where you would want the child to go to school should he or she be in a car accident and become unable to walk without assistance and unable to learn as

quickly. Whenever I ask this question of educators who are also parents, I always receive the same answer: the parent would want the child to stay with the family, as well as be with friends at the regular school in the regular classroom with all the necessary supports.

It's obvious that we've created a system of segregation and isolation that at best doesn't make sense, and at worst is cruel and mean. We must change this not simply for the sake of the person with the disability, but for all of us. And we must act quickly before a new generation repeats our mistakes.

Leadership is One Key

Courageous and dynamic leadership that has a clear vision of where the system is heading is a common element between the Hamilton and Waterloo systems, as well as in other places where quality education exists. Jim Hansen is the guiding force in the Hamilton system, which was integrating children when no one was even talking about the issue. Jim is a gutsy, tough talking, no nonsense Superintendent of Operations who believes without a doubt that all children can learn together and that segregating students is poor educational practice. His system has welcomed all children since 1969.

George Flynn arrived in Waterloo Region as the Director of Education in 1985 and has moved it toward full inclusion since his arrival. In a recent brief to the Select Committee on Education of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario (Sept. 12, 1988) he wrote:

"The function of the education process is to liberate the mind, strengthen its critical powers, inform it with knowledge, engage its human sympathies and illuminate its moral and practical choices. It has never been the intended purpose of education to resist or reject people; on the contrary, it is the goal of education to deliver us from the captivity of unexamined life. The human values of liberty, dignity, privacy and responsibility, which education supports, apply equally to all

people...People matter most." These two individuals have provided the leadership needed to inspire their school systems to fully include and welcome all children.

Fight or Change

We can fight and debate and go to court. We can have due process hearings (in the U.S.) and Tribunals (in Canada). We can hire lawyers who can argue anything. Or, we can stop and look at what we are doing to one another and to our society.

Our schools are simply a reflection of who we are as a culture. According to all the major studies in both our countries we are not doing too well. Illiteracy is rampant, drop-outs fill our streets, our prisons are bulging at the seams. According to some, the school system is only adequately serving 20% of our population. The rest are not getting a fair deal.

I used to wonder why many special education people got so incredibly uptight when the subject of integration was raised. Now I understand. Adults often feel threatened when they know they will need to change and that's what this issue is all about—it has little or nothing to do with some little kid with cerebral palsy or downs syndrome. It has everything to do with change, with our values, and with our very philosophy of education and life itself. Change can be threatening or challenging.

The Living Proof

The Hamilton and Waterloo Systems have given me a living laboratory in which to watch education for the year 2000 in practice. I have seen that full integration can be, and indeed is, a reality. We have the "living proof" right in our own backyard.

There are not neat formulas or magic recipes that either school board would give you. They are not perfect. They are, however, incredibly child-centered systems with leadership that believes in team building, cooperation, collaboration and learning. They are also systems that dare talk about love and social justice.

Inclusion, continued on page 4

Inclusion, continued from page 3

To me the key in all of the above is that a new generation is being born—a generation who tolerates difference and change far better than I do, who are less afraid, and who are more loving to people with differences.

The integration of children with disabilities is not an issue of "mainstreaming"; it is an issue of *inclusion*. It is very simple. If we want it to happen it will. It takes time and hard work; the re-education of the adults in any system is a big job. The

children are easier for they are less afraid of the unknown. Full inclusion can work. If we involve the children and ask them to help us, it will work beyond our wildest dreams. If we listen to the children and follow their lead, we will see a new system emerge in which all learn and each belongs.

The inclusion of those we have labelled and excluded will liberate our hearts and souls. We will all not only read and write better, but we will be part of creating a more loving and caring world.

Note: There are excellent videos available that show both of these systems in action. There are also written materials available. For further information write The Centre for Integrated Education, Frontier College, 35 Jackes Ave. Toronto, Ontario, M4T 1E2. Or write directly to Mr. George Flynn, Director, Waterloo Region Separate School Board, 90 Mulberry Street, Hamilton, Ontario L8N 3R9.

Dr. Marsha Forest is Director of Education at Frontier College in Toronto, Ontario.

Realizing the Vision for Michael

by Dorothy Skarnulis



Dream? Envision the future? You must be kidding! You don't know my child. My son has severe disabilities. Professionals say he is so handicapped that he needs very "special" help that can only be found in a "special" school. So, what can I possibly dream or envision for him?

Michael, at age four, left home and went to live in a "special" school that was supposed to teach him skills for living. During the entire six years that he lived there, the arrangement didn't feel right to me. He never learned the skills that he went there to learn. Instead, he learned obnoxious noises, chewing on clothing, dependency, and waiting; these are not valued skills in our society.

From the beginning, I was dissatisfied with Michael's situation. The nagging doubts grew louder

and louder. If he was ever going to live at home and be part of his community, then he needed to learn how to do what is acceptable. But what I saw happening in the special school was that he was learning to be more unacceptable, more different. He was imitating the other students and not the staff who were trying to teach him an hour or two a day. If this was what people thought was good for him then something was terribly wrong.

While struggling with this dilemma, I heard Dr. John O'Brien talk about normalization. He was saying what I had instinctively felt: children and adults with disabilities must have opportunities to live and participate in their own communities with all the necessary supports. People learn best in natural settings, such as homes, schools, workplaces, parks, recreation centers, churches, and restaurants. I couldn't expect Michael to learn to live at home by living in an institution; to learn to shop in a store by going to the canteen at the special school; to learn to eat in a socially acceptable way in a cafeteria with one staff person feeding six other people at the same time.

I began to talk to professionals whom I trusted about Michael living at home, going to school, shopping and playing in the community. I wanted them to tell me how to do it. No one could help me. I felt alone, isolated and scared and began to doubt my belief. But then I really watched my son when he was with my niece and nephew, when he was at home on weekends, when we were out shopping; he was a different person. He knew there were higher expectations for his behavior and acted appropriately most of the time. So, if that happened during visits a couple of times a month, what would

happen if he lived with us all the time?

My dream for Michael began with the ideal: he would come home, have his own room decorated for his likes and interests, go to school like everyone else his age, do the same things that other kids do, and develop friendships. That sounded reachable, but as I shared this vision with people that knew Michael I encountered reactions of disbelief, cynicism, skepticism, hostility and rejection. Just as I began questioning whether I was realistic or not, I heard of several parents in other states who were successfully accomplishing what I imagined, my battery was recharged and changes began to happen.

Michael came home to live on July 4, 1980, Independence Day. He is now 19 years old and goes to school at Forest Lake High School. He attends regular classes, including art, floral design, and swimming; plays bass drum and timpani in the orchestra; works at a local mail order company; attends football games and concerts; and goes on hayrides, canoe trips and snowmobile rides with friends and family. I'm pleased to say that most people that know Michael share my vision because he has shown them anything is possible. When Michael and I attend his planning meetings, the other team members are now invested in actualizing the vision.

Michael is older, and his desires and needs are forever changing. But because of our past experience we both know we'll never again give up our dreams.

Dorothy Skarnulis is Executive Director of the ARC, St. Paul, St. Paul, Minnesota.

The Role Of Research In Integration

by William and Susan Stainback

A growing number of educators and parents are beginning to advocate that *all* students be integrated into the mainstream of regular education, including those who have traditionally been labeled severely and profoundly handicapped. They essentially believe that it is now time to stop developing criteria for who does or does not belong in the mainstream. Instead, the spotlight should be turned toward increasing the capabilities of the regular education mainstream to meet the unique needs of all students.

Reasons for Integration

There are a number of reasons this movement has gained momentum. One frequently cited reason is the benefits to the students. In integrated settings students can, given proper guidance, learn to understand, respect, be sensitive to, and grow comfortable with the individual differences and similarities among their peers. Students also can learn to interact, communicate, develop friendships, work together, and assist one another based on their individual strengths and needs. In addition, it also has been found that if given individualized, adaptive and cooperative learning programs, all students can be provided an opportunity to achieve up to their potential in integrated settings.

Another, and perhaps more powerful, reason for educating all students in regular education is the ill effects of segregation and separation in our schools. The civil rights movement has made people more sensitive to these effects. As Chief Justice Earl Warren stated in the landmark 1954 *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision, separateness in education can "generate a feeling of inferiority as to [children's] status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. This sense of inferiority...affects the motivation of a child to learn...[and] has a tendency to retard...educational and mental development."

Role of Research

In this section, we will first discuss what research is *not* well suited for and then what it is suited for in the advancement of the movement to educate all students in regular classes.

Research, using either qualitative or quantitative methodologies, is *not* well suited to determining whether or not integration is a good idea. As noted by Doug Biklen,

Some people would have us wait for science, in this case educational researchers, to prove that integration yields faster, more effective learning than does segregation. But...to look to science for an answer to the question, "Is integration a good idea?" is like asking, "Is it good and right for people to care for their aging parents?" In other words, the practice of integration...is not fundamentally a question that science can answer. From science we can learn some of the effects of such a policy (e.g. types of education possible...) or how to make it work better, but science cannot tell us that integration is right. We can answer it only by determining what we believe, what we consider important.

As conveyed by the above quote, the decision to integrate our schools is based on societal values. Our societal values should not be subject to quantitative (or

qualitative) investigations or reviews of scientific research to determine their efficiency or popularity, but rather they should be evaluated according to what is right, just, and desirable. The right to life, privacy, equality, religious choice, marriage, or having a family are value choices based on the type of life we wish to live, not on research indicating their popularity or ease of implementation. For instance, if the *Brown vs. Board of Education* ruling was based on research findings regarding attitudes among citizens in the 1950's or the enormous obstacles that would have to be overcome to achieve it, racial desegregation in our schools and subsequently in our society may never have begun to occur. But instead, it was recognized that segregation on the basis of race was in conflict with our societal values of equality and fair treatment for all people. Desegregation was accepted and strategies for achieving the goal were implemented throughout the nation. Likewise, it is the same societal values of equality and fair treatment for all individuals that constitute the basis for the integration of persons classified as disabled into the mainstream of education and the community.

Thus, educational integration involves such questions as: Do we want to live in an integrated society in which all people are considered of equal worth, or, do we want to segregate some people? Should we require some people to earn their access to the mainstream by demonstrating various competencies created by professionals, or should we assume that access to society's basic institutions is a birthright of all? Most advocates of integration believe that if we want a democratic, egalitarian society the answers to these questions are obvious. Throughout history we have focused on such questions repeatedly, specifically in regard to nationality, religion, race, sex, and now physical and intellectual differences, and in every instance we have reaffirmed a commitment to integration and equality for all.

While the decision to integrate our schools is based on values, research does have a critical part to play in achieving excellence in the education of all students in integrated regular education classes. Quality instruction in our schools cannot be expected to occur without well conceived and conducted research. Such research can provide the basis for development and refinement of programs, procedures, and techniques that can allow for quality education to occur within groups of students with diverse needs in integrated regular education classes. This type of research is reflected in the studies of cooperative learning strategies, adaptive learning models, effective teaching, behavior management, support facilitation, peer tutoring, material and procedure adaptation for individual difference, curricular-based assessment, and the vast body of information available on curricular learning areas such as communication and alternative communication skills, classroom computer technology, and parent and professional collaboration.

Thus, research can help us attain the goal of providing a quality education to all students in regular education classes. Despite popular opinion to the contrary, there currently are a large number of research studies that are pointing the way.

Research, continued on page 6

Research, continued from page 5

For example, there are a number of well designed studies by highly regarded researchers published in respected research journals in education wherein students with diverse characteristics, including those classified as having severe disabilities, have been successful in a number of different regular education settings. It appears that success is achieved when peer tutoring; support facilitation; and adaptive, cooperative, and individualized programs are included in regular education classes, and failure is experienced when this is not done. Thus, research is showing us that if, based on societal values, we want integrated schools and classrooms, it is possible to achieve them. To do so, we must be willing to expand our efforts to make classrooms more inclusive; that is, to include within regular education classes cooperative learning, support facilitation, peer tutoring, individualization, and adaptive learning programs. This is why some authors in the past few years have suggested that "special" educators join or merge into regular education. They see merger as a way to bring the expertise and resources in special and regular education together to help make regular education more flexible and adaptive to individual differences.

As changes continue to take place to make our schools more inclusive, research procedures also are necessary to

evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of programs implemented in the schools; the effectiveness of schools, classrooms, and teachers; and the progress of students, both collectively and individually. Such evaluation research is needed to assure accountability in addressing the goal of providing every student an education appropriate to their unique needs within a regular, mainstreamed, education structure.

Conclusion

If we accept the viewpoint that segregation is unfair and morally wrong, our job as educators is *not* to conduct research on whether educating all students in regular education is a good idea, but rather to study ways to best accomplish it. Research does have a critical role to play in achieving success in educating all students in regular education. Although research is not appropriate for determining desired educational values and goals, it must be recognized that such goals cannot be achieved without quality research.

Note: Reprints of this article, including citations, are available from the authors.

Drs. William and Susan Stainback are Matthew J. Guglielmo Endowed Chair Professors at California State University. Their address is 2339 Lillyvale Ave., #158, Los Angeles, CA 90032.

Integration—The Legal Imperative

by Larry Ringer and Sonja Kerr

A rapidly increasing number of students, parents, educators, and advocates are recognizing the need to eliminate unnecessary educational segregation of children with disabilities from their peers who do not have disabilities. Congress has long recognized this need, and for many years federal law has prohibited unnecessary disability-based isolation.

In 1975, Congress enacted the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, commonly known as "Public Law 94-142." In one section of the law [20 U.S.C. Section 1412(5)(B)], Congress required that

to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children ... [be] educated with children who are not handicapped and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment [may occur] only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily . . .

That requirement is mirrored in Minnesota law [Minnesota Statutes Section 120.17 (Subdivision 3a)(4)]. Federal regulations further specify that the educational placement for a child with disabilities be as close to home as possible, and that each child has the right to be educated in his or her "neighborhood school" unless a different arrangement is necessary to implement the child's individualized education plan (34 C.F.R. Section 300.552).

Thus, the law requires that each child with disabilities be

educated in regular classes and other integrated environments at the child's neighborhood school, unless the child's planning team (including the parents) cannot develop a plan to provide the supports and adaptations that would enable the child's education to proceed "satisfactorily" in those integrated environments. The school district has the burden of proving that any removal is necessary, and removal can only occur to the extent necessary to meet the child's unique needs [Minnesota Rules Part 3525.3900 (Subparts D and E)].

Legally, integration is a civil rights issue, not a philosophical or educational trend. Federal courts have made clear that if a child can "feasibly" be integrated, segregation is illegal, regardless of the school district's philosophical perspective on integration.

While the basic laws requiring integration have not changed in the past ten years, knowledge and understanding of the planning, support, and adaptation processes necessary for successful integration have advanced dramatically. There is now substantial evidence that most, if not all, children with disabilities, including children with very severe disabilities, can be educated appropriately without isolation from peers who do not have disabilities. When the requirements of federal and state law are teamed with increasing evidence regarding the results of well-planned integration, it becomes clear that segregation can no longer be justified educationally or legally.

The legal issues surrounding integration are more

Imperative, continued on page 9

"Caught In The Continuum": A Synopsis

by Roger Strand

"The principle of the least restrictive environment (LRE), sometimes referred to as LRA, or the least restrictive alternative, is conceptually and philosophically flawed," proclaims Steven Taylor from the Research and Training Center on Community Integration at the Center on Human Policy, Syracuse University. His observation appeared in an article entitled, "Caught in the Continuum: A Critical Analysis of the Principle of the Least Restrictive Environment," *The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, (Spring 1988), pp. 41-53. According to Taylor, the principle of LRE was progressive when it was introduced, but we must now look to new concepts that will guide us in implementing total integration for people with developmental disabilities.

Building on previous critiques of the continuum concept, Taylor presents seven serious conceptual and philosophical flaws or pitfalls in the LRE principle that apply across the life span and in settings, including education, work, recreation and community services. These are:

- The LRE principle legitimates restrictive environments.
- The LRE principle confuses segregation and integration on the one hand with intensity of services on the other.
- The LRE principle is based on a "Readiness Model".
- The LRE principle supports the primacy of professional decision making.
- The LRE principle sanctions infringements on people's rights.
- The LRE principle implies that people must move as they develop and change.
- The LRE principle directs attention to physical settings rather than to the services and supports people need to be integrated into the community.

Contrasted with the LRE principle, a commitment to integration, in Taylor's view, requires a shift in focus:

- From the development of facilities and programs into which people must fit to the provision of services and supports necessary for people with severe disabilities to participate fully in school and community life;
- From neighborhoods to typical homes, from regular school buildings to regular classes, and from vocational models to typical jobs and activities;
- From professional judgment as a basis for determining community involvement to personal choice;
- From a presumption in favor of integration to a mandate to provide opportunities for integration;
- From a conditional ("to the extent necessary, appropriate, feasible") to an unconditional commitment to integration;
- From requiring individuals to change in order to participate in the community to requiring service systems to change;
- From restrictions applied categorically as a condition for receiving services to opportunities available to nondisabled people;
- From disability labels as a factor in determining community participation to a recognition of common human needs;
- From independence to community belonging; and
- From placing people in the community to helping them become part of the community.

Taylor cautions his readers by adding, "The concepts that guide us today can mislead us tomorrow... If and when integration is achieved, we must be prepared to find new ideas and principles to guide us through the challenges and dilemmas we undoubtedly will face."

Requests for reprints of the complete article should be sent to Steven J. Taylor, Ph.D., Center on Human Policy, Syracuse University, 724 Comstock Avenue, Syracuse, NY 13244.

Roger Strand is a member of the Minnesota Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities.

Minnesotans Receive TASH Awards at National Conference

The Minnesota University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities was honored December 8th at the National TASH Conference for its first video production, "A New Way of Thinking". The 1988 TASH Media Award recognizes presentations that make a major contribution to public awareness of issues important to persons with severe handicaps. "A New Way of Thinking", released in 1987, examines the issues faced by five people with developmental disabilities who range in age from 3 to 27.

Lorrie Ufkin of Sherburn, Minnesota, is one of the recipients of the 1988 TASH Distinguished Parent Award given Dec. 8th at the national conference in Washington, D.C. The award is given to parents of children with severe handicaps in recognition for their efforts on behalf of their child, efforts which also have positively impacted the lives of other children on the local, regional, state or national levels.



Lorrie is seen here with husband Duane, son Jacob, and daughter Emily.

Integrated Education and Organizational Change

by Richard Schattman

Since the mid-seventies, special education has been rapidly evolving to meet the intent of public law. While federal law, regulations and guidelines have provided us with a broad framework for the establishment of an educational system which provides special education services, specific methods to attain the intent of that public law have varied considerably. In this article I will discuss some of the original methods and structures and those which are emerging today. I will also briefly explore a few organizational factors which are both facilitating and inhibiting the evolution of special education service models.

Many of us who have been involved in special education during the past fifteen years "grew up" with the self-contained model. This model was premised on the belief that children with very complex learning needs could be best served in a setting where the emerging technologies of special education could be focused and concentrated. Part of the justification for the special class model was to provide labs for the development of special education instructional techniques. To this end, the special class model served us well. Out of it came refinement of the IEP process and the opportunity to develop instructional methods, specialized materials, and behavioral techniques appropriate to the school setting.

The plan to congregate students in special education programs was also a political one. With the advent of PL 94-142 in 1975, a definable and observable constituency was needed. This identified population would be difficult to see if disbursed throughout the educational system in integrated regular class settings.

In the past five to seven years, school districts have begun exploring alternatives to the segregated and special class models. A notable innovation in this area is referred to as the integrated model. Here again, there are a wide variety of interpretations of the integrated model; however, a few common characteristics seem to exist among all of the examples of successful programs that I have observed or found through review of the literature. These common characteristics include:

1. A district wide philosophy which does not discriminate between regular and special education and one which has high expectations for all children.
2. A trusting relationship among teachers, administration, and school boards.
3. The existence of planning teams and the administrative support needed to encourage the planning team process (time, staff development, etc.)
4. Qualified staff to support the programming needed by children with intensive educational needs.

Today, there is no question that children with significant educational, developmental, and social needs can have quality educational programs in age appropriate regular classes. Further, these children can benefit and learn better in regular class placements when these placements are in their community school. In the Franklin Northwest Supervisory Union, a regional school district in Vermont, the implementation of an integrated model is demonstrating

increases in the rate of specific skill acquisition for students with moderate to severe/profound needs; it's also demonstrating other more significant changes important to the development of appropriate social skills and improved self-concept.

When children with significant needs are placed in regular classes for 90% to 100% of the day (with appropriate levels of support), they develop meaningful relationships with peers. Through these relationships, children with special needs increase their opportunities for learning. The peers without handicaps benefit in the rewards inherent to supporting a friend. The values and lessons which naturally result from these interactions are of importance to all as they enrich the class, the school, and the community.

The question may be asked why parents from throughout the United States who want integrated options for their children are meeting so much resistance from the schools. I would suggest that the factors which most contribute to perceived resistance are more a reflection of organizational issues and less a reflection of beliefs about how to best educate students with special educational needs. Organizations have a tendency to maintain the current order, the status quo. There are many arguments which support the maintenance of the prevailing structure, including (a) lack of resources, b) space problems, c) contrary beliefs, d) educators know best, e) concerns for jobs, and f) relations between administration and teachers. When this list is considered by a parent, however, it reads more like a litany of excuses than justification for exclusion.

In a particular school located in Swanton, Vermont, a child with significant mobility needs began classes this fall. The school board attended to all of the needed modifications which would enable access, including the building of a ramp and bathroom. The board along with the principal acted independently, without mentioning cost factors to the special education director. The significance of their actions must be appreciated. The underlying attitude supporting this activity was a belief that the incoming student was foremost a student at the Swanton school, and secondly, a child with special needs. The board perceived her as a child for whom they were responsible. This attitude conveys the values of the community which include a commitment to the needs of all of its members. The attitudes reflected in this brief vignette were not always present in this community. The attitudinal change was the culmination of discussion among professionals, parents, and other community members. The dialogue focused on the relationship between our beliefs for our school and its practices. In this case we were challenged to review the practice of segregation relative to the belief that "all children can learn that which is important for them to learn given time and appropriate support". The discussion led us to see conflict between our belief and practice. The result was the initial planning for a model which would enable all children to benefit from home school, regular class

Organization Change, continued from page 8

placements.

In order for the Franklin NW Supervisory Union to achieve an integrated model, systematic change had to take place. The planning process for these changes occurred over time and followed a deliberate approach for monitoring the involvement of key constituency groups. A factor facilitating organization change was the sharing of power between teachers and administrators; if teachers were to accept placements of children with severe and intense needs in their classes, they had to perceive their role as significant in the design of the programs and the identification of the level of resource support they would need. The planning team model was utilized to organize administrators, teachers and parents so that planning and problem solving for individual student programs could occur in a manner which was responsible and respectful of the varied points of view represented on a planning team.

Another significant alteration in the daily operations of this school system was the involvement of parents in both the design of the service model and in the development of plans for their child. The annual IEP meeting was not seen as sufficient in fulfilling this purpose. Again, the planning team was a means to establish ongoing parent involvement. Once parents had ongoing contact with the team the quality and value of their input was so greatly enhanced as to make them indispensable members of the team.

Parent involvement and the sharing of responsibility for the allocation of resources would appear to be two significant changes which are often resisted by school systems. These two factors need system wide support for integrated options to be consistently available throughout a learner's educational career. Examples of integration within unsupportive systems have encountered great difficulty

with transition from grade to grade, a high degree of teacher alienation, and increased isolation for the integrated student.

Integration, from this author's perspective, is clearly the model of choice. Students within the Franklin NW Supervisory Union are achieving better in integrated settings. While achievement is a critical variable to consider when looking at the value of integrated programs, there are many other compelling reasons to integrate all learners in their age appropriate regular classroom. Unfortunately, decisions to provide integrated or segregated opportunities for children with significant special education needs do not only focus on the child, but are often more a reflection of the organization's needs. I would contend that no part of the placement decision should rely on the system's needs. The best decisions for children are made when the child's needs are first and foremost. For many school systems the next steps may include the development of a plan to break the organizational barriers currently keeping all children from the opportunities only available in the mainstream of our schools. Confrontative approaches may offer limited advantage to individuals, but they hold little hope for encouraging the necessary organizational changes needed to enable the opening of our schools to all children. The initial stages of planning for integration call for collaboration among teachers, parents and administrators. When we involve all of the key constituents, give them power to impact on policy, and give them support to implement their recommendations, growth and change are inevitable.

Note: Reprints of this article, including citations, are available from the author.

Richard Schattman is Director of Special Education for the Franklin Northwest Supervisory Union. His address is Office of the Superintendent, P.O. Box 130, Swanton, VT 05488.

Imperative, continued from page 6

complex for children who are not yet of kindergarten age. Minnesota law now requires that school districts assure that eligible children with disabilities receive appropriate early intervention services beginning at birth; these services are to be provided through interagency efforts planned by a team which includes the family, school, and county social service and health agencies. Because many school districts do not provide educational programs for typical children before kindergarten, removal from regular education classes operated by the school district is often not the issue.

As with children above the age of five, school districts must assure that younger children with disabilities receive an appropriate program of education that meets their unique needs, including the need to learn age-appropriate behavior from peers without disabilities. The team must consider a variety of program options, including services in the home, district operated classrooms, or private day care/nursery schools, and provide services in an environment which will enable the child to learn what the team determines is important. If a child cannot make appropriate progress in the development of communication, socialization, or other essential skills unless educational services are provided in an integrated environment, the child has a legally-enforceable right to such integration. Therefore, the school district might be required to assure that the child receives services in the context of an

integrated early childhood setting even if the district does not itself operate such a program.

The law has become one of the powerful tools that assure that all children have the opportunity to be respected, productive, included members of our school communities. Among many families and educators, the legal mandate for integration has helped to create a strong commitment to work together creatively, cooperatively, and energetically, in providing opportunities and supports for integration. Further, the values and requirements set forth in the law have enabled families to persuade some school personnel to respond positively to their request that their child be integrated. Unfortunately, some families will be unsuccessful in their efforts to work with their district for effective integration. In such cases, due process hearings and court litigation may be the tools which families need to open otherwise closed doors.

The law reflects the high priority that our society and government place on avoiding unnecessary segregation. It can help us realize the vision of integrated schools and communities through ensuring that the doors are open to all children with disabilities.

Larry Ringer and Sonja Kerr are attorneys with Legal Advocacy for Persons with Developmental Disabilities, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

MUAP Helps Integrate School Communities

Model Demonstration Integration

Project: The Minnesota University Affiliated Program (MUAP) on Developmental Disabilities, in collaboration with Intermediate School District 916, is entering its third and final year of grant funding from the United States Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) for a model demonstration project on Least Restrictive Environments. The major emphasis of the project has been to integrate middle school students with severe disabilities into their schools and communities. The two implementation sites have been at the Roseville Area Middle School in Little Canada and the John Glenn Middle School in Maplewood. Between 15 and 25 students with moderate to severe disabilities are at each site. The primary areas of programmatic changes for the students have been: (1) assignment to regular education homerooms, (2) membership in selected regular classes, (3) community-based instruction, and (4) involvement in after school activities.

A series of materials on the processes, outcomes and research activities associated with the project are in preparation and will be available late summer, 1989. For further information contact Ellen Caughey, Site Coordinator in Roseville (612) 481-8580; Cheri Heise-Neff, Site Coordinator in Maplewood (612) 779-5803; or Jennifer York, Ph.D., Project Director, (612) 624-4848 at the University of Minnesota.

Minnesota Integrated Education Technical Assistance Project:

Planning for this cooperative project between MUAP and the Minnesota Department of Education is underway and major project activities are scheduled to begin in January. This project will be a vehicle for disseminating information, and for providing training and technical assistance to increase the participation of learners with severe disabilities in their school communities. Major project activities include: (a) providing ongoing technical assistance each year to two identified Minnesota school districts, (b) delivering monthly inservices on building integrated

school communities, (c) monthly Educator Support Group meetings for all educators involved in serving students with severe disabilities in regular classes and other typical school and community environments (in conjunction with the MNASH Integration Team), (d) co-sponsoring a national conference titled, "Integrated Education: Realizing the Vision" (with MNASH), and (e) development and dissemination of materials on integrated education of students with severe disabilities.

One product to be developed in conjunction with the MNASH Integration Team is a collection of stories about the successful integration of students with severe disabilities into regular classes and other typical school or community environments. If you have success stories about individual students or specific strategies, please share them by sending them to Terri Vandercook at MUAP.

For additional information on this project's activities contact Terri Vandercook, Project Director, (612) 624-4848 at the University of Minnesota.

Developing and Providing Quality Educational Programs for K-3 Learners with Severe Disabilities in Regular Classes:

The Martin County Special Education Cooperative and the MUAP have received an Effectiveness Grant from the Minnesota Department of Education, Unique Learner Needs Section. The purpose of the grant project is to demonstrate and evaluate the effectiveness of a cooperative model for educating learners with severe disabilities in home school, age appropriate classes. Three children and their educational teams will serve as the focus of project efforts: a kindergarten boy in East Chain, a first grade girl in Sherburn, and a third grade girl in Fairmont. Three case studies detailing individual program development strategies, evaluation strategies and outcomes will be prepared for dissemination by late summer, 1989. For further information, contact Bob Teeling, Project Coordinator (612) 631-9478 or Terri Vandercook, University Liaison, (612) 624-4848 at the University of Minnesota.

Advocacy Agencies Update

ARC-St. Paul: Recently hired a full-time integration specialist to work with community recreation and leisure programs.

ARC - Suburban:

- Through its Individual Advocacy Program, it is offering assistance in the design of integrated educational services to ten families.
- Assisting parents in south Washington county to develop a Special Education Advisory Committee of regular and special educators, administrators, parents of children with disabilities and parents of children without labels.
- Developing integrated leisure options in school and community settings through a new full-time position: Community Services Developer.

MNASH:

- **Integration Committee:** A committee of parents and professionals providing information and support for integrated services. Outcomes have included a forum and inservices on integration, support to individual families, communication with other advocacy agencies, comments on public policy and state rules, and formation of a monthly parent support group.
- **Integration Team:** A committee of professionals providing support for educators involved in integration pursuits.
- **Parent Support Group:** Developed in the spring of 1988 in collaboration with ARC-MN, PACER, ARC-St. Paul, and ARC-Suburban, this group of parents is committed to achieving integrated education for their children with severe disabilities.

ARC-Minnesota: Has hired half-time Integration Consultant to provide integration assistance to parents and school districts.

PACER:

- Making available to parents, at minimal or no cost, selected integration materials including resources in lending library
- Supporting parents who desire integration in their child's IEP

State Department of Education Initiatives

The Minnesota Department of Education, Unique Learner Needs Section, has named the integration of children with handicapping conditions into regular education as one of our major focus areas during the next school year. A number of steps have been taken and future plans are being developed.

One major step has been the creation of a LRE Advisory Group, which met for two days this summer to identify obstacles and outline strategies for the integration of children with handicaps in regular education, whenever appropriate. This thirty-member committee is comprised of regular and special educators, parents, advocates, administrators, a legislative aide, university trainers, and MDE staff. An important outcome of the group's meeting was the blending of the varied philosophies into the following policy statement:

The education system shall meet the needs of all students. Students with handicapping conditions should receive appropriate education with nonhandicapped peers in regular school environments (classroom, community, home). Justification is needed when a student is removed from his/her regular environment. Removal from the regular environment must be for reasons related to educational needs and goals, specifying distinctive advantages to the student. Special education and regular educators should collaborate efforts in the delivery of this policy.

This statement, which is a summary of individual and group work, has been shared with and endorsed by the directors of special education at their fall meeting in Brainerd and is currently being shared for review and endorsement by the Special Education Advisory Committee and the State Board of Teachers

*Submitted by Mary McDevitt,
Education Specialist, LRE, MN
Department of Education*

Minnesota Schools On The Move:

Throughout Minnesota a growing number of cooperatives, districts and schools are integrating students with disabilities into regular classes. Listed below are the districts and cooperatives that are integrating elementary, middle and/or high school students on a full- or part-time basis. If we've missed your school, please accept our apology and let us know about your integration efforts.

Anoka-Hennepin (District #11);
Babbitt (District #692);
Belle Plaine (District #716 with MN River Valley Special Ed. Coop.);
Bagley (District #162 with Bemidji Regional Interdistrict Council);
Bloomington (District #271);
Burnsville (District #191);
Chisago (District #141);
Cloquet (District #94 with Cloquet Area Special Ed. Coop.);
Delano (District #938 with Meeker Wright Special Ed. Co-op);
Duluth (District #709);
Edina (District #273);
Eli (District #696 with Bemidji Region Interdistrict Council);
Elk River (District #728);
Forest Lake (District #831);
Grand Rapids (District #318 with Tri-County Coop.);
Hastings (District #200);
Intermediate District #287;
Intermediate District #916;
Intermediate District #917;
International Falls (District #361);
Jordan (District #717 with MN River Valley Special Ed. Coop.);
Mahnomon (District #432 with Bemidji Regional Interdistrict Council);
Mapleton (District #72 with S. Central Special Ed. Co-op);
Mid-Range Special Ed Co-op;
Minneapolis (District #1);
Monticello (District #882);
Mounds View (District #622 with Intermediate District #916);
Net Lake (District #707);
New Prague (District #721 with MN River Valley Special Ed. Coop.);
Northland Special Ed Coop.;
Owatonna (District #761);
Prior Lake (District #719 with MN River Valley Special Ed Coop.);
Red Lake (District #38 with Bemidji Regional Interdistrict Council);
Richfield (District #280);
Rosemount (District #196);
Roseville (District #623 with Intermediate District #916);
Saint Cloud (District #742);
Saint Michael (District #885);
Saint Paul (District #625);
Shakopee (District #720 with MN River Valley Special Ed Coop.);
South Koochiching (District #363, with Bemidji Region Interdistrict Council);
Stillwater (District #834);
TOW Special Ed Co-op;
Tri County Co-op;
Walker (District #119 with PAWN Special Ed. Co-op);
White Bear Lake (District #624)

Resources on Integrated Education

Purposeful Integration . . . Inherently Equal. (1987). D. Biklen, et al. Syracuse University, Center on Human Policy, publisher. Available through Technical Assistance for Parent Programs Project (TAPP), 312 Stuart St., 2nd Floor, Boston, MA 02116. *No cost.*

This manual discusses the importance of integration, defines the concept, describes model programs, and presents practical planning and preparation suggestions for parents and professionals to facilitate effective integration.

Education/Integration: A Collection of Readings on the Integration of Children with Mental Handicaps Into Regular School Systems. (1984). M. Forest, (Ed.). G. Allan Roehrer Institute, publisher. Available through G. Allan Roehrer Institute, Kinsmen Bldg., York University Campus, 4700 Keele St., Downsview, Ontario M3V1P3. *Cost: \$12.00*

A collection of easy to read articles that provide visions and descriptions of, as well as rationales and strategies for, achieving an integrated education.

More Education/Integration. M. Forest, (Ed.). (1987). G. Allan Roehrer Institute, publisher. Available through G. Allan Roehrer Institute, Kinsmen Bldg., York University Campus, 4700 Keele St., Downsview, Ontario M3V1P3. *Cost: \$15.00.*

Readings on integration education topics, including: current mainstreaming practices; administrative and social support systems; specific integration models, and personal viewpoints of parents and teachers. One article of particular interest presents a challenge to the traditional cascade model of special education.

The Homecoming Model: Educating Students Who Present Intensive Educational Challenges Within Regular Education Environments. (1986). J.S. Thousand et al. University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities, publisher. Available through The Homecoming Project, Center for Developmental Disabilities, 499C Waterman Bldg., University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405. *Cost: \$4.00*

A guide for establishing shared responsibility among regular and special educators, administrators, and parents using a cooperative teaming process in the education of students who present intensive educational challenges. The guide emphasizes interdisciplinary team planning for transitioning students with disabilities into local regular education programs.

Regular Lives [videotape]. T. Goodwin and G. Wurzburg (producers). (1988). State of the Art Productions. Available through WETA, Educational Activities, Box 2626, Washington, D.C. 20013. *Cost: \$34.95 per copy (includes shipping and handling).*

An excellent documentary focusing on individuals with developmental disabilities who are successfully integrated in typical school, work, and living environments. A variety of perspectives are included: parents of children with labels, parents of children who are not labeled, individuals with disabilities, typical peers, special educators, regular educators, employers, and a principal. It has been used successfully with inservice school personnel, students, families, and community members.

Integrating Students With Severe Disabilities Into Regular Education Classes and School Community Life: A Resource List. (Nov. 1988). T. Vandercook, et al. Minnesota University Affiliated Program, publisher. Available through MUAP, University of Minnesota, 6 Pattee Hall, 150 Pillsbury Drive S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455. *Cost: \$3.00*

Resource list especially for educators and parents, containing information about successful models and strategies in integrated education, as well as materials providing a sound rationale and empirical support for integration. Includes journal articles, books, articles, reports, papers, newsletters, audiotapes, and videotapes.

Regular Class Integration At Middle School: Feedback From Classmates And Teachers

by Jennifer York, Terri Vandercook, Cheri Heise-Neff, and Ellen Caughey

During the 1987-88 school year, learners with severe disabilities at the Roseville Area Middle School in Little Canada, and at John Glenn Middle School in Maplewood, became members of regular education homerooms and classes. The integration project was part of a federally funded 3-year grant to the University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities, with a subcontract to Intermediate District 916. Learners were integrated in regular homerooms and in a variety of regular classes, including science, reading, social studies, health, art, physical education, and industrial technology. At the end of the school year, classmates without disabilities, regular education teachers, and special education teachers were asked to provide feedback by answering open-ended questions on a brief survey. This article summarizes their responses.

Classmates Learn From Integration

When asked if having peers with severe disabilities in regular education classes was a good idea, over 90% of the 180 classmates responded "yes", reporting that both they and their classmates with disabilities learned important lessons from being together. Many of the students surveyed thought that their peers with disabilities learned more and had a clearer understanding of appropriate behavior when around "normal" young people. One area of change that the majority surveyed noted was positive social change in their peers with disabilities. The classmates noted that by year-end the students with disabilities seemed to be more social, talkative, attentive, interested, happy, appropriate, cooperative, fun, responsible, grown-up, friendly, spontaneous, confident, independent and creative. Classmates also reported their peers were less noisy and shy and had decreased their frequency of talking out of turn, asking others to do things, and hugging. These changes are interpersonal attributes which have been repeatedly identified as important to the successful inclusion and maintenance of individuals with severe disabilities in typical school, work and community settings.

Classmates also indicated that they themselves learned a lot from sharing school activities with students who have disabilities. Most reported learning that their peers with disabilities are more like, than different from, themselves. As one student put it: "They are just like us but in a different way". Many also responded that they developed a greater understanding and acceptance of their new classmates.

Finally, when asked if there were other classes, after school, and community activities that their peers with disabilities could be involved in, the overwhelming majority (close to 90%) stated "yes" and provided specific recommendations as to the type of classes and activities

Educators Say "Yes" To Regular Class Integration

Overall, the feedback about regular class integration from both the regular and special educators was very positive. Perhaps most remarkable was that all indicated regular class integration should continue and that they would all like to

be involved again. Several regular educators explained that they felt a professional responsibility for working with all students, no matter what or how severe the disabilities. They also felt that by including a student with severe disabilities as a member in one of their classes they would learn more about such students, and were intrigued by this new challenge. Special educators were particularly interested in regular class integration because they felt regular class membership would provide students with disabilities with the opportunity to learn new skills, and specifically to learn from peers without disabilities. One teacher presented this perspective well by asking, "If we build a wall around them [students with severe disabilities] so they are in special environments, how do special education teachers and students learn about typical situations and expectations?"

Both regular and special educators concurred that the most difficult aspect of regular class integration was deciding how to involve the students with disabilities in the regular class routine. By the end of the year, however, both groups felt they had a better understanding of how to carry this out. In addition, some felt that by working with students who have severe disabilities, strategies for working with "typical" kids who slip through the cracks had been expanded.

Nearly all of the educators found the highlight of the experience to be the acceptance of the students with severe disabilities by their classmates, and the involvement the two sets of students had with each other. There were several specific references to friendships that had developed. Several of the regular educators also stated that the enjoyment displayed by the students with disabilities about coming to, and being involved in, class was the best part.

The educators identified a number of benefits of the experience for students without disabilities, including greater acceptance and understanding of peers with disabilities; recognition of similarities between themselves and their classmates; improved self-esteem; and, for some, improved grades.

Special educators had no difficulty listing positive outcomes for the students with severe disabilities. Improved social communication and interaction skills, as well as improvement in curricular areas, were noted. Several of the special educators commented that the students were "highly motivated to go to class" or that the regular class was "the highlight of their day". Regular educators, on the other hand, had greater difficulty identifying changes in the learners with severe disabilities; this seemed largely due to unclear expectations for student involvement. Regular educators were pleased to hear from the special educators about the improvements they had seen in the students, and recommended that special educators communicate more clearly the expectations for students with disabilities since the changes observed would be to a lesser degree than classmates without disabilities. One regular educator

Enhancing Educational Success Through Collaboration

Jacqueline S. Thousand and Richard A. Villa

If schools are to educate all learners in heterogeneous environments where students of varying abilities are present and participating in all classes and activities, then the organizational structure of schools must foster heterogeneity. Presently, a number of characteristics of the traditional American school stand in the way of successful integrated learning. Among them is the lack of support for collaborative efforts, including team teaching, by educators.

As Tetreault has noted, "A teacher is more willing to share responsibility for a student who presents challenges when that student comes with a team to support him." A key to successfully meeting the educational needs of all students is the development of a collaborative relationship among the school staff so that each teacher's unique skills and interests may be of value to other teachers or to a broader range of students than those for whom he or she is directly responsible.

In a number of Vermont schools a problem-solving and decision-making process referred to as collaborative teaming is employed to promote this sharing of expertise. Collaborative teaming allows team members to work together to achieve a common, agreed-upon goal. It involves the application of the principles of cooperative group learning, as forwarded by David and Roger Johnson of the University of Minnesota, to adult planning groups. In the words of one collaborative team member, "We've taken the technology of cooperative group learning for kids and applied it to our adult teams. We meet as cooperative groups. Everyone shares in the common goal, that goal being the most appropriate education for the students we serve."

In a collaborative team, members perceive themselves as positively interdependent, as "sinking or swimming together". They also are expected to exhibit certain interpersonal and small group skills which have been related to successful cooperative group work. These include basic group management skills that result in an organized team with an established set of expectations;

leadership behaviors which help the team to accomplish its tasks and maintain positive working relationships; and skills for managing conflict or creating constructive controversy.

Members of teams frequently are at different levels in terms of their competence and confidence in performing collaborative skills. However, all of these skills can be taught and learned. In some school districts, direct instruction in collaborative teaming skills has been arranged for staff. Teachers also have chosen as annual professional growth goals the development of select collaborative teaming skills.

One issue which all schools attempting to implement a collaborative teaming process must address is how the school's organizational structure can be modified to create opportunities for staff to meet. One Vermont school district has dealt with this issue by contracting a permanent substitute who rotates among schools and relieves regular classroom teachers so they may participate in meetings concerning students in their class. Another school district has instituted the practice of reserving every Friday morning for team meetings. All professional and paraprofessional support personnel (e.g., special education teachers, nurses, counselors) are expected to hold their Friday mornings open until they are notified of scheduled meeting times for students on their caseload. During the times when they are not scheduled for meetings, they relieve classroom teachers so that they may attend their Friday meetings.

In this same district, it was decided that students would benefit if the junior high school content area teachers had a common daily planning period that supplemented their individual planning times. This was considered a priority in the development of the master schedule for the following year. These teachers now have a structured agenda for their common planning period which addresses a host of curricular issues and includes meetings with students,

families, or pupil support staff.

Subgroups of collaborative teams also need time outside of team meetings to jointly adapt curriculum or instructional approaches for upcoming lessons, plan for team teaching activities, and modify instructional programs for individual students. Administrators need to appreciate and support this type of collaborative time by coordinating the school's schedule so events are scheduled other than during times when collaboration occurs, setting an expectation that teachers will collaborate, and arranging incentives and rewards for collaboration.

Collaborative teaming empowers teachers and students by enfranchising them through their participation in decision-making processes. It facilitates the distribution of school leadership responsibilities beyond the administrative arm of the school, to the broader school community. Readers wishing an expanded description of the collaborative teaming process and strategies for implementing the process in heterogeneous schools are referred to The Homecoming Model: Educating students who present intensive educational challenges within regular education environments by Jacque Thousand et al. Readers who wish to learn more about specific collaborative skills are referred to Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills by David and Roger Johnson, published by Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Note: Reprints of this article, including citations, are available from the authors.

Dr. Jacqueline Thousand is Assistant Professor and Project Director with the Center on Developmental Disabilities, 499C Waterman Bldg., University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05401.

Richard Villa is Director of Pupil Personnel Services for the Winooski School District in Vermont.

Team Membership: Who's on First?

By Linda Kjerland, Judy Neiss, Barb Franke, Chris Verdon, and Ellen Westman

Role definition is vital to any successful team effort. With the new and altered roles that accompany formation of an integrated team, it's especially important to thoughtfully delineate and negotiate each member's contribution. The following is an overview of team roles presented by the authors at the 1987 ARC-Minnesota conference:

Parents

- present family values and priorities for the child's functioning
- provide insight into the child's functioning in a variety of environments
- provide a vision of the child's future

Regular Education Teachers

- see and include the child as a member of the class, not a visitor
- seek and use others to adapt learning activities to include the child in meaningful ways
- incorporate IEP goals in typical activities and interactions according to the team's instructional plan

Special Education Teachers

- provide consultation and collaboration
- adapt the curriculum, materials, and equipment
- incorporate IEP goals in typical activities and interactions

Management Aides

- facilitate the child's direct participation with other children and adults
- incorporate IEP goals in activities and interactions as directed

Therapists

- insure functional approaches to addressing therapy needs in typical activities and interactions i.e., self care, get on bus or swing, find bathroom, play games with other children

- adapt the curriculum, materials and equipment
- incorporate IEP goals in typical activities and interactions

Administrators

- draw together regular and special education resources
- insure staff training and team consultative support
- assist in problem solving logistical and programmatic issues

There are some common pitfalls in team development to be aware of, including:

- leaving, by default, too much responsibility in adapting curriculum to paraprofessionals/management aides
- having paraprofessionals/management aides spend their time shadowing the child to prevent distractions
- placing children in music, art, or gym classes without opportunity for those staff to participate in problem solving
- not designating the key and frequent communication link between home and school.

Communication among team members is vital to the successful implementation of an integrated education. Teams need to meet frequently - at least monthly - even when services appear to be going smoothly. During these short (20-60 minutes) meetings, it's important to review and revise expectations, recognize successes, and transfer successful strategies learned from one child to other children.

Linda Kjerland is Project Director for Project Dakota Outreach, Dakota, Inc., in West St. Paul, Minnesota. Judy Neiss, Barb Franke, Chris Verdon, and Ellen Westman are parents of children with disabilities.

Feedback, continued from page 13

summarized this perspective when asked what recommendations he would give for others initiating regular class integration of students with severe disabilities:

I guess my advice would be to learn about the level of accomplishment that a special education student can hope to have. In education, we must find it rewarding to share in the students' accomplishments. It was difficult for me to find rewards in working with [students with multiple disabilities] because things changed so slowly and the progress was so minute in comparison with other regular education students. . . . [The special education teacher] could see change so it seemed good for [the student with multiple disabilities] to be there. Therefore, there was some reward for me.

In conclusion, regular class integration at the two middle

schools resulted in new relationships for both students and teachers, with everyone reaping benefits from those relationships. Not only did individuals learn and grow as a result of the experience, but the school also grew through the development of a greater sense of community and independence among its students and staff. The recommendation that came through loud and clear in the survey was, "Keep it going!"

Drs. Jennifer York and Terri Vandercook are with the Minnesota University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities, at the University of Minnesota. Cheri Heise-Neff is Integration Site Coordinator at John Glenn Middle School in Maplewood, Minnesota. Ellen Caughey is Integration Site Coordinator at Roseville Area Middle School in Little Canada, Minnesota.

What's In An IEP?

Writing Objectives For An Integrated Education

Jennifer York and Terri Vandercook

It's IEP time... UGH! Why has writing an IEP become a task to dread, perceived as a necessary evil for legal compliance, rather than a hopeful and affirming process? Maybe it's because we're making it too hard. As IEP teams strive to state objectives that are meaningful and functional in the daily lives of the students, they need to have a clear picture of the outcomes desired for each individual, a vision of the places in which priority skills are demonstrated. Following are some assumptions and a process for IEP development intended to guide teams through the planning of integrated current and future outcomes for individual learners.

Principles for IEP Development

The purpose of an education for all children is preparation for adult life and participation as members of their communities. The educational priorities of IEP teams must be based on, and implemented in, integrated learning environments if this educational goal is to be reached for children with disabilities. For this reason, five underlying principles of the IEP process are integration, individualization, teamwork, dynamism, and environmental referencing.

(1) **Integration:** As much as possible, children with disabilities are to be educated in the same environments as peers without disabilities. Special education should be a support and service (instead of a place) and should be provided in regular education and other typical environments to the greatest extent possible. Increasingly, IEP teams are planning for elementary-aged learners to receive the majority of their instruction in regular education classes and for secondary-aged learners to receive instruction in both regular education and community environments.

(2) **Individualization:** Educational needs and priorities are determined individually for each student. Given the overwhelming number of places in which individual students should learn to participate and the enormous number of skills that would enhance participation, educational team members who know the student best (especially parents) must collaborate in making decisions about program priorities.

(3) **Teamwork:** The essential need for teamwork is becoming increasingly evident as teams plan for children with even the most severe disabilities to be integrated and valued members of regular school and community environments. Children with severe disabilities have varied and multiple assets and difficulties; pooling the expertise, perspectives, and resources of a variety of individuals is necessary to design and implement their educational programs. Teams include at least parents, peers, special educators, regular educators, therapists and others as needed. All team members share responsibility for program development and student success.

(4) **Dynamism:** IEPs are dynamic documents reflecting a student's current program. An IEP should be updated and modified as student needs and abilities change and as team members learn more about the student in educational environments and activities. Modifications are not limited to the annual review meeting; parents and school personnel should maintain contact throughout the school year and collaborate in decisions regarding appropriate modifications in the IEP as the need arises.

(5) **Environmental referencing:** IEP goals and objectives must communicate not only targeted

skills, but also the environments in which performance (outcomes) are desired. Skills learned are only useful if demonstrated in typical daily settings and activities, e.g., on the playground at recess, during reading group, at home, and in the community.

A Process For IEP Development And Implementation

(1) **Get the big picture:** Before a team can effectively plan for the integrated education of an individual learner, all team members must share a common philosophy and vision about the learner's education. First, the principles of IEP development must be clearly in mind. Second, the team identifies settings in which learner performance should be enhanced. The list of potential environments is derived from (a) an outline of the environments and activities in which peers without disabilities spend their school day, (b) home and community environments used by the family and same age peers without disabilities, and (c) future school, home, community, and work environments. By identifying places, a vision begins to develop of the learner participating in these settings.

(2) **Identify initial IEP priorities:** From the list of places identified in the first step, the team selects priority environments for the current IEP. With the priority environments identified, the team discusses anticipated learner needs and supports for each environment and then projects initial goals and objectives.

(3) **Integrate the learner in the regular class and other priority environments:** With the initial plan in place, instruction begins in the designated priority environments. It is not until

Integrated Education: MAPS To Get You There

Terri Vandercook and Jennifer York

The McGill Action Planning System (MAPS) (Forest, Snow, & Lusthaus, in press) is a positive and affirming process that assists a team of adults and children to creatively dream and plan, producing results that will further the inclusion of individual children with labels into the activities, routines, and environments of their same age peers in their school community. The principles underlying and guiding the process include (1) integration, (2) individualization, (3) teamwork and collaboration, and (4) flexibility.

The MAPS planning typically occurs in one or two sessions. Participants are arranged in a half circle, with the facilitator positioned at the open end of the circle. The information and ideas generated during the process are recorded on large chart paper which serves as a communication check during the session and as a permanent record when the planning is finished. The role of the facilitator is to elicit participation of all team members in the collective design of an integrated school and community life for the individual student.

Following are the seven questions which comprise the MAPS process:

- (1) *What is the individual's history?*
Aside from the individual for whom the planning is occurring, family members are the most important members of the circle because they typically know the individual better than anyone else. Because of this, family members, and the individual to the greatest extent possible, are asked to spend a few minutes talking about the individual's life history, including some of the milestones.
- (2) *What is your dream for the individual?*
This question is intended to get people to develop a vision for the individual's future, to consider what they want for that person, and to look beyond the current reality. Those dreams can become reality if there is a common commitment to strive for them. The dream question forces team members to identify the direction they are heading with the

individual; only then can specific plans to be made for realizing the vision. This is not to say, however, that the vision, plans, or expectations are set in concrete; they will be challenged continually as more is learned about how to facilitate inclusion in the school community and as positive outcomes are realized. Depending upon the age of the individual, it may be difficult to dream for them as an adult; if that is a problem, team members can be encouraged to think just a few years ahead.

- (3) *What is your nightmare?*
This is a very difficult question to ask the parents of any child, yet an extremely important one. The nightmare presents the situation that the members of the individual's team and others who care for him or her must work very hard to keep from happening. Parents frequently relate the nightmare as a vision of their child being alone.
- (4) *Who is the individual?*
Everyone in the circle participates in responding to this question. The participants are asked to think of words that describe the individual, i.e., what comes to mind when they think of the person? There are no right or wrong words. Participants take turns going around the circle until all thoughts have been expressed. Participants can pass if nothing comes to mind when it is their turn to supply a descriptor. When the list is complete, the facilitator asks certain people, usually family and peers, to identify the three words from the list that they feel best describe the individual.
- (5) *What are the individual's strengths, gifts, and abilities?*
So often when educational teams get together, they dwell upon the things that the individual cannot do as opposed to identifying and building upon the strengths and abilities of the individual. The facilitator asks the participants to review the list which described

the individual as a way to identify some of his or her strengths and unique gifts. In addition, they are instructed to think about what the individual can do, what he or she likes to do, and what he or she does well.

- (6) *What are the individual's needs?*
This question provides an opportunity for all the team members to identify needs from each of their unique perspectives. When the list of needs is complete, family, friends, and educators are asked to prioritize the identified needs. The list of assets and the identified needs are a primary basis for design of the educational program.
- (7) *What would the individual's ideal day at school look like and what must be done to make it happen?*
Because MAPS is a process to assist teams to plan for the full integration of students with high needs into regular age-appropriate classes, frequently attention to this question begins by outlining a school day for same age peers who do not have labels. Next, the team begins to strategize ways that the needs identified in the previous question can be met in the context of the regular education day. Finally, initial planning occurs for the supports needed to achieve successful integration. As learners reach middle and high school age, the ideal school day will include instruction in both regular education and a variety of community instruction sites, e.g., home, worksites, stores, and recreation places.

The MAPS process provides a common vision and road map for all team members, which enables them to be supportive and effective in furthering the integration of learners with disabilities into regular school and community life.

Drs. Terri Vandercook and Jennifer York are with the Minnesota University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities, at the University of Minnesota.

Cath, Jess, Jules, and Ames...A Story of Friendship

by Terri Vandercook, Diane Fleetham, Sharon Sinclair, and Rebecca Rice Tettie

Catherine, Jessica, Julie, and Amy are fourth grade classmates and friends who attend Battle Creek Elementary School in St. Paul. All four are accurately described as loving, beautiful, giggly, funny, endearing, and charming young women. Catherine is a child who has Rett Syndrome and requires assistance from others in order to participate and contribute at home, at school, and in her community. When the time came for her to attend the public school, it was very important to her mother that she attend school with typical children, and not just with peers who also had identified disabilities. She knew that Catherine should be around typical peers to learn from them, to get to know them, and for them to know her. Until last year, the majority of her educational program took place in a self-contained special education classroom within the elementary school. Not surprisingly, being educated in a separate room isolated Catherine from her same age peers without disabilities. She had been provided with some short-term opportunities for interacting with peers via a Special Friends approach (Voeltz et al., 1983). The Special Friends approach provides an initial strategy that might be used to bring children with and without identified disabilities together and give them the opportunity to interact and get to know one another in special activities; but, it was never intended to be an acceptable substitute for participating in typical, naturally occurring interactions (regular class involvement).

Catherine has many friends both at school and in her neighborhood, but Julie, Amy, and Jessica are her closest friends and comprise that inner circle we can all relate to as essential for achieving a desirable quality of life. Jessica, Julie, Amy and others are naturally skilled at getting the best out of Catherine, and so they are wonderful teachers, as well as friends. Toward the end of last school year, Catherine's educational team decided to design a school day that provided her with more opportunities to be a regular member of the third grade class of



Catherine and Jessica work on movement skills with guidance from occupational therapist Sharon Sinclair.

which Julie, Amy, and Jessica were part. The McGill Action Planning System process (MAPS) (Forest, Snow, & Lusthaus, in press) was used to assist in this goal. The planning team included family members, special educators, regular educators, therapists, peers (Amy, Jessica, Julie) and Catherine. The MAPS process confirmed and deepened the relationship between Catherine and her friends. Amy, Julie, and Jessica got to know her family, her history and her needs from others' perspectives. They were recognized as valued and contributing members of Catherine's team.

When Jessica, Julie, and Amy were invited to join the planning session for meeting Catherine's needs in regular classes and other typical school environments, they took their role very seriously. Prior to the meeting, they came up with an entire list of activities that she could be a part of. They included specific strategies for helping her to learn and participate as well. They did not stop with simply generating the list; they quickly sprung into action and facilitated her participation by including her in the classroom Easter egg hunt, developing a collection of picture books of people for her to look at, assisting her to do Mousercize in gym class, developing

match-to-sample games called "egg carton A,B,C's" and "egg carton 1,2,3's", and getting more friends for her. They also gave her a nickname, "Cath", to go with theirs: Jess, Jules, and Ames. During physical education, Cath had many partners and each one, boy or girl, was pleased and proud to help their friend participate. They had fun as well.

The relationships which Cath enjoys with her peers did not come easily or automatically, as is illustrated by the following story. Cath was walking out to the playground during gym time with Jules, Ames, and Jess and a boy came over and said, "Hi Catherine!" One of the girls said, "I thought you didn't like Catherine!". He responded, "I used to be afraid of her, but that was before I knew her. Now I like her!" That ended the conversation and he joined the gang in walking to the playground.

One of the first questions asked in the MAPS process is, "What is your dream for Cath as an adult?" Catherine's mom hoped that as an adult Cath would live with friends that she cared about and who cared about her. Jess responded immediately that she hoped that she and Jules and Ames could be the friends that live with her when she grows up; Jules and Ames nodded affirmatively. The dream question in the MAPS process is followed by the very difficult question, "What is your nightmare?" Catherine's mom responded that her nightmare for Cath was to be alone. The responses to these two questions illustrate beautifully why this story of friendship is so important. It is a step toward the dream and away from the nightmare.

One of the last questions asked during the MAPS process was, "What are Catherine's needs?" One of the needs identified by the educators on the team was a need for other people to be able to accept and deal with Cath's drooling because she drools a lot. Her friends very matter-of-factly and comfortably address the need by taking her bandana to help her wipe her mouth or chin. Her difficulty in swallowing fluid is part, a very small

Cath, continued on page 19

Cath, continued from page 18

part, of just who Catherine is. Her peers accept it. That acceptance is not confined to just Ames, Jess, and Jules. When the class of third graders were asked last year what they had learned from having Cath in their class, one boy raised his hand and explained that they had learned how to help her use her bandana to wipe her mouth. When the entire class was asked if that was okay with all of them, they all nodded eagerly and tried to explain more explicitly that it was really very easy: "you just take her hand and..."

The descriptor most frequently used in communicating the outcomes for Catherine's inclusion in regular class activities with her peers was "happy". In fact, the first observation from everyone, including the regular third grade teacher, special education support staff, family, and peers was, "Cath is so happy!" Her third grade classmates said that they could tell she was happy to be with them because she had smiles on her face more often.

If the primary goal of education is to prepare students to be participants and contributors in the community,



Catherine and Amy read together.

now as well as in the future, then the integration of students with disabilities is extremely important for Cath, Jess, Jules and Ames. Each of these children is enriched by having the opportunity to learn from one another, grow to care for one another, and gain the attitudes, skills, and values necessary for our communities to support the inclusion of all citizens. As V.W. von Goethe

observed, "The things which our friends do with and for us form a portion of our lives; for they strengthen and advance our personality." Cath, Jess, Jules, and Ames are definitely strengthening and advancing one another, and are providing a joyous and hopeful vision for us all!

Reference

Voeltz, L.M., et al. (1983). The Special Friends Program: A trainer's manual for integrated school settings (Revised Edition). Honolulu. University of Hawaii, Department of Special Education.

Dr. Terri Vandercook is Associate Director of the Minnesota University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities at the University of Minnesota. Diane Fleetham is Catherine's mother and a third grade teacher at Webster Elementary School in St. Paul. Sharon Sinclair is an occupational therapist, and Rebecca Rice Tettie is a communications disorders specialist, both with the St. Paul Public Schools.

IEP, continued from page 16

learners have an opportunity to participate in regular classes and other instructional environments that actual needs and specific supports can be identified accurately. This is the main reason that initial IEP planning can only be tentative.

- (4) **Conduct a MAPS session:** The McGill Action Planning System (MAPS) is a process which capitalizes on peer, family, and professional collaboration in planning for the total integration of learners with disabilities into regular education environments. A unique and essential component of MAPS is peer involvement. It is the peers without disabilities who are the most knowledgeable about life within the school. Time and again, the peers have emerged as the best problem-solvers and supporters for achieving successful integration. The MAPS process, therefore, cannot

commence until learners with disabilities have been members of the regular education community and school life, only then can friends without disabilities be identified and their involvement recruited. Similarly, regular education teachers need time to get to know the learner with disabilities before active participation in the MAPS process is possible. [More information on the MAPS process is provided elsewhere in this newsletter.]

- (5) **Revise and implement IEP priorities:** Through the learner's actual involvement in the designated environments, and with the focused outcomes of the MAPS process in mind, the team can revise the IEP to reflect the clarified needs, priorities, and supports in the instructional environments. It is at this point in the process that teams precisely identify environmentally referenced IEP goals and objectives. With objectives

delineated, instructional programs and data collection methods are developed.

In summary, when developing IEP goals and objectives we must think about the places and activities that we want students to participate in, now and as adults. Families, peers, and educational service providers must work together to identify priority environments and activities for each student. Both assessment and instruction need to occur in a variety of school, home, and community environments to maintain a focus on teaching functional activities and skills. IEP goals and objectives then reflect this functional, environmentally referenced approach.

Dr. Jennifer York is a Project Director and Research Associate with the Minnesota University Affiliated Program (MUAP) on Developmental Disabilities, at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Terri Vandercook is Associate Director of the MUAP.

Upcoming Events

The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps (TASH)

1988 International Conference Washington, D.C., December 8-10.

Minnesota Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps (MNASH)

1989 Community Integration Conference/Annual Membership Meeting, Twin Cities, April 5-6 1989.

Minnesota University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities (MUAP)

National Integrated Education Conference, Minneapolis, MN, October 19-21, 1989.

Integrated Education Workshops (co-sponsored with the Minnesota Department of Education). Locations and dates to be announced.

Case Management Conference (co-sponsored with Minnesota Department of Human Services), Thunderbird Hotel, Bloomington, MN April 18-19, 1989.

ARC-Minnesota

Parent Integration Support Group, ARC Office, Minneapolis, MN, Dec. 14, Jan. 14, Feb. 8, Mar. 10, Apr. 12, May 13, June 14

AccessAbility, Inc.

Education Integration Support Group, AccessAbility, Minneapolis, MN Monthly meetings.

Minnesota Department of Education

Coordinator's Conference, Brainerd, MN Craiguns Resort, April 11-13, 1989.

For further information on specific events, contact the sponsoring agencies.

We're Changing

During the coming months Minnesota University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities will be making a transition - from an old name to a new title: Institute on Community Integration. The new name will, we hope, more clearly reflect our commitment to improving community services and social support for persons with developmental disabilities and their families.

IMPACT

Feature Issue on Integrated Education Winter 1988

Managing Editor: Vicki Gaylord
Charlie Lakin

Issue Editors: Jennifer York
Teri Vandercook

Impact is published by the Minnesota University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities. MUAP is funded by a grant from the Administration on Developmental Disabilities, Department of Health and Human Services.

The mission of the MUAP is to apply its resources to improving the quality and community orientation of professional services and social supports available to individuals with developmental disabilities and their families. MUAP efforts are directed at facilitating the independence and social integration of citizens with developmental disabilities into the mainstream of community life.

Inquiries about MUAP or *Impact* can be directed to MUAP, 6 Pattee Hall, University of Minnesota, 150 Pillsbury Drive SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455, (612)624-4848.

Upcoming Issues of IMPACT

Supported Employment	Spring 1989
Early Intervention	Summer 1989
Leisure/Recreation	Fall 1989



**Minnesota • University
Affiliated Program on
Developmental Disabilities**

6 Pattee Hall
150 Pillsbury Drive
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Non Profit
U.S. Postage
PAID
Minneapolis, MN
Permit No. 155