DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 876 EC 304 266

AUTHOR Fox, Lynn H.; Thompson, Deborah L.
TITLE Bringing the Lab School Method to an Inner City School.
INSTITUTION American Univ., Washington, DC. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 1 Aug 94
NOTE 49p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Style; Educational Practices; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; *Holistic Approach; Inner City; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Laboratory Schools; *Learning Disabilities; *Low Achievement; Teacher Workshops; Teaching Methods; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS District of Columbia

ABSTRACT

A 5-day workshop for staff of an inner city school addressed the teaching approach of the Lab School of Washington (District of Columbia) and covered the nature of learning disabilities (LDs), tools to identify unique learning styles of students, and innovative teaching methods for all students with and without LDs. Eighteen elementary mainstream teachers from Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School (Washington, D.C.) and 2 administrators attended a 1-week workshop focusing on the application of teaching techniques designed for students with severe LDs to students who do not have a specific LD but might be academically unsuccessful because of lack of motivation and a history of failures. Special emphasis was placed on teaching content through multisensory methods, a holistic approach to language arts, infusing a wide range of art activities into the teaching of academic subjects, and understanding the model of multiple intelligences developed by Howard Gardner. Teachers had opportunities to observe summer classes for learning disabled and the "Academic Club" approach pioneered by Sally Smith. The teachers expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the workshop and interest in continued association with the Lab School and more workshops during the academic year, specifically additional instruction on the concepts of task analysis and diagnostic-prescriptive teaching. Appendices include: workshop topics, a teacher role questionnaire, and the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile. (SW)

Bringing the Lab School Method to an Inner City School

Lynn H. Fox, Ph.D. and Deborah L. Thompson, Ph.D.

The American University

August 1, 1994

Research funded by the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation

ABSTRACT

Eighteen teachers from Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School attended a one week workshop at the Lab School of Washington under the direction of Professor Sally Smith. The teachers were given an opportunity to learn about techniques for teaching the severely learning-disabled and how these techniques might also be used with children who did not have a specific learning disability, particularly those who might be academically unsuccessful because of lack of motivation and a history of failure. Special emphasis was placed on teaching content through multi-sensory methods and a holistic approach to language arts, infusing a wide range of art activities into the teaching of academic subjects, and the understanding of the model of multiple intelligences developed by Howard Gardner. Teachers had opportunities to observe the summer classes for learning disabled and the "Academic Club" approach pioneered by Professor Smith. The teachers expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the workshop, a desire to continue the association with the Lab School and a hope for more workshop experiences during the coming academic year. They also felt it was important to provide them more instruction, especially on the concepts of task analysis and diagnostic-prescriptive teaching. They wanted the MLK teachers to work more collaboratively with the Lab School so that there would be more continuity in philosophy and teaching styles as the children move through the grades from pre-school to upper elementary.

Bringing the Lab School Method to an Inner City School

Description of Program

The Lab School of Washington received a grant from the Helen Sperry Lea Foundation to underwrite a pilot Teacher Training Institute for inner city teachers from the Anacostia neighborhood in Southeast Washington, D.C. The institute was designed to bring the Lab School method to teachers of mainstream students, i.e., non-LD students. Teachers attended a five-day workshop on the Lab School Approach that introduced them to practical techniques and materials that they could put to use upon returning to their classrooms in the fall.

Foremost in the workshop was the diagnostic-prescriptive approach to instruction. The diagnostic-prescriptive approach involves determining the individual strengths and weaknesses of each student through various diagnostic procedures and then making appropriate instructional decisions based on those diagnoses (Collins and Cheek, 1989). In addition to the diagnostic-prescriptive procedures, the teachers participated in hands-on workshops in reading, writing, math, behavior management and teaching through projects and experiences. The schedule of topics and activities for each of the five days is shown in Appendix A.

The objective of the program was to provide inner city mainstream teachers with: 1.) an understanding of learning disabilities; 2.) tools to identify the unique learning styles of their students, and 3.) innovative teaching methods which will work with all of their students, LD and non-LD alike. In addition, the teachers were introduced or refreshed in their knowledge of the following theories and theorists: multiple intelligences as proposed

by Howard Gardner and the implications of this for teaching; the works of Jean Piaget and the importance of hands-on learning to construct knowledge; and the philosophy of the Lab School and methods for working with students with special needs especially the integration of the arts.

The Participants

Eighteen teachers, the principal and the assistant principal participated in the five-day workshop. The teachers were mainly primary teachers (re-K-3) and specialists, e.g., reading, special education, etc. Only one upper grade teacher participated. In terms of experience, the teachers ranged from 5 months to 31 years. A summary of teacher characteristics is shown in Appendix B. Teacher training was varied. There were traditional elementary education majors as well as non-traditional majors such as international business and business administration.

Base-line Measures

Prior to beginning the workshop, participants were administered five baseline measures: Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile {TORP} (DeFord, 1985), Teaching Scale, Frequency of Reading/Math Activities, Role of the Teacher (Sprinthall and Sprinthall, 1990), and a content pre-test. See Appendix C for copies of the five baseline measures.

The Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile is a 28 item likert scale measure that gauges teachers' philosophy of reading instruction--phonics, traditional skills and whole language. Accordingly, the scores on the TORP fall into three categories: a score of 65 and below indicates a phonics orientation, scores for a skills orientation fall between 66-110, and scores between 111 to 140 indicate a whole language orientation.

The Teaching Scale is a twenty item likert-type instrument that measures the degree to which the workshop participants teaching philosophy coincides with that of the Lab School. This measure was administered at the beginning and end of the workshop.

The Frequency of Reading/Math Activities was a chart on which teachers recorded their frequency of use of particular classroom activities in reading and math. The activities were selected to reflect some typical reading and mathematics instructional strategies used most often by elementary teachers.

The Role of Teacher checklist asked teachers to rank order the importance of twelve different instructional roles/activities. Three items clustered in each of four categories: the teacher in the traditional role as transmitter of knowledge, the teacher as leader of discovery and inquiry, the teacher as child-centered respondent, and the teacher as active leader responding to developmental differences.

The content pre-test/posttest covered the special topics of the workshop. The questions included content regarding Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences, characteristics of at risk students, and a task analysis of a calendar activity.

What teachers learned in the workshops

The content pretest was administered on Sunday evening prior to the start of the workshop to determine the extent of familiarity with the proposed workshop topics. The same test also served as a post-test to determine the extent to which the workshop material was understood by the participants. The content measure was not a comprehensive measure of all the material covered, but was a representative sample of key points from across the various sessions and topics of the workshop.

The pretest was scored for mastery, partial knowledge, or no knowledge. A table showing the content topics and numbers and percent who had knowledge or partial knowledge is shown in Table 1. Most teachers had some partial knowledge but there was only one teacher who had complete mastery of two questions and two others who correctly answered one question. On the post-test the teachers had mastery of all the questions and had in their own words learned a great deal about practical ways to implement creative teaching methods. Many of the teachers commented that the D.C. Public School System was advocating a break from traditional teaching methods, especially the reliance on worksheets and textbooks, encouraging the implementation of more developmentally appropriate methods of teaching, and the use of more individualized approaches to instruction. The LSW workshop gave the participants something they had needed desperately: direct instruction in how to accomplish those objectives and opportunities to see teachers using these methods with students in a classroom setting.

Table 1

Number of teachers who had partial knowledge or mastery on the content pre-test, by topic

Topic	Partial Knowledge	Mastery
Gardner's theory of intelligence	1	1
Learning styles	2	0
Defense mechanisms used to mask disabilities	4	0
Case study methods	10	0
Integrating art into reading class	9	0
Enhancing self-esteem in the classroom	9	3
Steps in the diagnostic\ prescriptive teaching method	10	0
The work of Jean Piaget	6	0
Characteristics of "at risk" students	6	0
Task analysis	3	0
Lesson plans using task analysis	0	0

Changing teachers' attitudes and philosophy of instruction

The methods advocated by LSW include the following: 1.) diagnostic-prescriptive approaches to instruction which incorporate both the child's level of functioning and interests in order to challenge and motivate the child; 2.) discovery or cognitive constructivist views of learning and teaching which are drawn from the works of Bruner and Piaget which allow the child to explore their environment and learn through manipulatives and iconic representations rather than through symbolic systems; 3.) whole language learning in which reading and writing, spelling and grammar are integrated into all aspects of learning about interesting things, ideas, and eras of history; and 4.) an integrated curriculum in which a large variety of art activities are included to stimulate thinking and offer opportunities for multi-sensory learning. The Lab School approach really involves a philosophy of instruction based on both a developmental perspective of the child and an understanding of the inquiry method of teaching.

It was hypothesized that some teachers would be more receptive to the teachings of the workshop because the methods and ideas presented would be compatible with the teachers' existing philosophy. Teachers who have very traditional views of teaching were presumed to be more resistant to learning the methods employed at the Lab School. It was also hypothesized that it would be harder to change attitudes than to teach content.

An attitude scale (the Teaching Scale) consisted of 20 likert-type items. It was devised to reflect the philosophy of the Lab School. The instrument was pilot-tested (somewhat informally) on a few teachers at the Lab School who scored 100. A score of 80 would reflect general agreement with the philosophy of the LSW whereas a score of 100

would reflect perfect agreement. A score of 60 to 80 would reflect a position of undecided to mixed agreement and a score between 20 (the lowest possible) and 60 would reflect basic disagreement with the LSW positions.

The attitude measure was administered before and after the workshop. The pretest results suggest a group already predisposed towards accepting the LSW approach so there was little room for improvement in attitude on the posttest for most of the teachers. The scores for teachers pre and post are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Scores on the Teaching Scale before and after the workshop

Person	pre	post	
1	68	78 *	
2	78	86 *	
3	72	78 *	
4	93	87	*Higher posttest score
5	83	92 *	
6	84	87 *	
7	93		
8	60	73 *	
9	76	78 *	
10	84	87 *	
11	80	83 *	
12	94	95 *	
13	80	88 *	
14	72	78 *	
15	80	85 *	
16	90	84	
17	71		
20	73	75	
MEAN	79.5	83.4	

The majority of teachers scored 80 or above on the pretest and only one person scored below 60. Most scores did increase slightly over the week, but the changes in many cases were small. One explanation for the high scores on the attitude pre-test is that the teachers volunteered to participate in the workshop and were not paid beyond receiving graduate credit for the experience. It is perhaps then not surprising that those who attended the workshop were, in general, predisposed to want to learn how to individualize instruction, to learn how to employ the arts to teach academic skills, to learn how to integrate curricula, and to learn how to use more creative approaches to deal with "at risk" learners.

Predicting who will benefit the most from the workshop

Two instruments were used to predict which teachers would be influenced the most by the workshop experience. The TORP (DeFord, 1985) is a measure developed to assess the extent to which a teacher agrees with a traditional basal approach to teaching reading versus a more literature-based and whole language methodology. The TORP has been found not only to be a good measure of teachers' philosophies about teaching reading (phonics, traditional basal, or whole language) but also serves as an indicator of teachers who are most likely to welcome new ideas in the classroom (Chism et al., 1984). Since the workshop involved re-thinking instruction for LD and other at-risk students, the scores on the TORP would suggest those teachers most receptive to change. The scores on the TORP are shown in Appendix C.

For comparison, the TORP was also administered to eighteen pre-service undergraduate students enrolled in the Teacher Education program at The American

University. The range of undergraduate TORP scores, as shown in Table 3, almost mirrors the in-service workshop participants. A distribution of TORP scores can be found in Appendix D.

Table 3

Distribution of scores on the TORP for workshop participants and preservice undergraduate education students at TAU

Orientation	Workshop Participants	Undergraduates
Whole Language	6%	6%
Traditional	88%	94%
Phonics	6%	0%

The range of scores for in-service teachers showed that all had either a phonics or traditional skills orientation. Only one in-service teacher scored in the whole language range, despite the fact that on the background questionnaire, a majority of the participants described their approach to reading instruction to be a "whole language approach."

This mismatch between perception and reality is not surprising in view of the general confusion surrounding whole language. Whole language is a teaching philosophy rather than a specific type of reading instruction, and as such, can not be packaged and marketed as a more traditional approach can. Many school systems have adopted literature-based reading curricula, wherein teachers alternate between using selected children's literature titles and the traditional reading texts. Contrary to popular beliefs, however, whole

language is not having students reading children's literature and then drawing a picture or writing a story nor is it redesigning the basal readers to include more children's literature. Whole language involves much more than using children's literature to teach reading. Weaver (1990) notes that whole language is a belief system about the nature of learning, and how learning can be fostered in the classroom (p. 3). Whole language is a philosophy grounded in progressive education, language experience approach, and open education (Edelsky, Altwerger, and Flores, 1991) and informed by research in psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, emergent literacy, anthropology, cognitive and developmental psychology and education (Weaver, 1990). Whole language involves teachers shifting and revising their ideas about how students learn.

In addition to the TORP, teachers were asked to rank order twelve different possible roles of teachers from the most important to least important to them. These roles clustered into one of four orientations to teaching: the traditional role of teacher as imparter of knowledge, the method of inquiry and student discovery, the developmental approach to teaching and the student-directed approach to teaching. The roles most and least preferred by the workshop participants are shown in Appendix E.

Basically there were seven teachers whose preferred orientation was developmental or inquiry and least preferred was the traditional method. This would be the most compatible with the LSW approach. The least compatible with LSW would be high agreement with the traditional role and rejection of the developmental or inquiry role. Only three of the teachers held this view. The remaining nine ranged across the other possibilities. By comparison, classes of graduate and undergraduate pre-service students

enrolled in the Teacher Education program at The American University were administered the Role of Teacher instrument and registered higher percentages of the Traditional Role for the teacher. Table 4 shows the comparison of the in-service workshop teachers to the pre-service students.

Table 4

Percentages of teachers ranking the traditional role of teacher as either their most or least preferred role, compared with pre-service education students at TAU

Particiapant	Traditional is Highest (%)	Traditional is Lowest (%)
In-Service Participants	5	55
Preservice–Undergraduate	50	14
Preservice–Graduate	56	17

It is possible that the differences in perception of role resulted from the fact that the MLK teachers are predominantly those who teach pre-kindergarten, kindergarten and the early primary grades. On the other hand, the college students represent a mix of people majoring in both elementary and secondary education programs with very few if ant persons intending to teach pre-kindergarten or kindergarten. The traditional role with its emphasis on structure and the passing on of knowledge is more compatible with upper grade and secondary teachers' images of teaching than with the images held by those who work with very young children.

A question of interest was how the self-reported measures of attitude, preferred role

and style of teaching reading relate to the teachers' reports of the day to day activities in their classes. For the purposes of this report, eight reading activities were examined for strength of traditional versus non-traditional instruction. The four traditional activities were: skills worksheets, silent reading from basal, oral reading from basal, and reading homework. The four more non-traditional activities were: read aloud (teacher), SSR/DEAR–also known as Sustained Silent Reading or Drop Everything And Read, use children's literature instead of basal reader, computer games such as Reader Rabbit.

An interesting trend appears in these data. The teachers who employ the most traditional activities to teach reading were also those who scored lowest on the TORP, Role of Teacher and Teaching Scale. The eclectic or Group 2 teachers had more skewed scores which reflects their use of both traditional and non-traditional methods. Group 3 selected the more child-centered activities and they scored the highest on the TORP, the Teaching Scale and the Role of the Teacher.

The workshop participants fell into three groups: those who used traditional instructional techniques (Group 1), those who used a mixture of techniques (Group 2), and those who used more child-centered activities (Group 3). See Table 5.

Table 5

Distribution of teachers by reported frequency of use of traditional and nontraditional teaching methods*

Group 1	Used traditional activities more frequently than non-traditional ones	9
Group 2	Mixed traditional and non-traditional about equally	4
Group 3	Used non-traditional activities more frequently than traditional ones	4

*N = 17–One workshop participant did not complete the activities chart.

Basically four teachers who had high scores on the TORP had positive attitudes to begin with and five of the seven who had role orientations compatible with the LSW also had positive attitudes on the attitude measure. The more nontraditional teachers also reported a higher percentage of personal use of the computer. The degree of agreement among measures is shown in Table 6. One person whose attitude score fell below a 60 also scored very low on the TORP (phonics orientation) and preferred the traditional role of teacher.

Table 6

Frequency of Reading Activities–Traditional v Child-Centered

Measure	Traditional	Eclectic**
Score Range on TORP	59-87	67, 86-110
Traditional Role of Teacher Ranked Lowest (%)	60%	87%
Mean Score–Pre on TS	76	84
Mean Score–Post on TS	82	86
Reported Personal Use of Computers (%)	12.5	87

**Eclectic Group includes the middle-of-the-road mixed teachers and the Group 3 child-centered teachers.

What is needed to fully evaluate both the effectiveness of the workshop training and the ability of various instruments to predict which teachers benefit most, is a longitudinal follow-up of the teachers who participated in the workshops and reports and observations of what they actually do in their classes in the coming school year.

Teacher evaluation of workshops

The teachers from Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary school were extremely positive about their experiences. A summary of the quantitative evaluation of the workshop is shown in Table 7. No aspect received an unsatisfactory or poor rating. The vast majority rated each aspect as "excellent".

Table 7.

Teacher ratings of various aspects of the workshops (in percent):

Facet of Workshop	Unsatisfactory——————————————Excellent				
	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-workshop communication			5.5	5.5	89
Facilities				16.5	83.5
Organization				5.5	94.5
Content Information				11	89
Notebooks/handouts					100
Small Group Projects			5.5	16.5	78

When asked if the workshop provided information which the teachers could use or implement in their work, the response was unanimously "YES!" They also were unanimous in saying they would recommend the workshop for others. Several teachers commented that the workshop had motivated them to teach in new ways. One teacher said "My vocabulary for classroom use has changed." Other teachers commented that this was the first time they had learned anything about how to teach the learning disabled as opposed to just being able to recognize them. Several teachers specifically mentioned that the workshop had expanded their ideas for incorporating art into their classroom and some were interested in trying to replicate the Lab School "Club" activities and approach. Many felt that being able to observe the classes at the Lab school had been a very important part of the workshop. The observations had motivated and inspired them to do more in their own classes.

The teachers felt that the workshop had been a wonderful beginning for them, but that they needed more help. As one teacher explained, " the District of Columbia School

System has told us we need to do more developmental teaching, more learning centers, and fewer worksheets, but they didn't show us how to do this...you have, but we still need more help." Many felt it would be useful to have the teachers and researchers from the Lab School observe them teaching and work with them to implement new strategies.

The teachers indicated a desire to develop a long term relationship with the LSW staff. They expressed needs in several areas: learning how to access resources and to undertake interesting projects on small budgets, for example, how to create a "rain forest" in the classroom as was done at the Lab School; how to acquire and use computers in the classrooms; how to develop more integrated whole language activities; how to teach mathematics more creatively; how to identify and work with LD students in their classes; and more help with how to develop lesson plans using the task analysis approach.

What follow up do teachers think would be useful in the upcoming school year?

When asked for suggestions for additional workshops, the teachers responded with two basic themes: more breadth and depth on the basic topics from the workshop for themselves and the need for their fellow teachers at the school who had not participated in the summer workshop to have the same or similar training. In particular, teachers were interested in learning more about how to do "task analysis" and how to use it to develop their teaching plans. They were also interested in getting more help with implementing diagnostic-prescriptive instruction, with working with the learning disabled among their students, and with developing more creative teaching ideas.

Although the teachers had gained a lot from observing at the Lab School they expressed interest in having after-school workshops at their own school during the school

year. One idea that was expressed by a teacher was heatedly endorsed by all: have some opportunities during the school day for them to visit and observe at the Lab School and have the Lab School teachers and staff visit and work with them in their classes at Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School. The teachers also felt strongly that an effort should be made to reach every teacher at Martin Luther King, Jr. so that the benefits of the workshops could be school-wide.

Many felt that the teachers of the lower grades, particularly those who attended the summer workshop had been somewhat attuned to the ideas presented before they came. They felt that the teachers who needed to hear the Lab School message the most were the teachers of the upper grades at Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School who were essentially missing from the summer experience. The one fifth grade teacher who had participated was very vocal in expressing the feeling that she had "learned a great deal from the workshop: "For one thing, I'll never yell 'shut up' to my class again!" Overall the teachers were very satisfied with what they had learned at the workshop. They did feel, however, that there was still more that they needed to learn.

References

Chism, N., Gray, E., Kienzle, B. J., Kumpf, G., McClure, A., & Yocum, J. (1984, April). Facilitating and inhibiting factors in the transfer of knowledge about language development to classroom practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Collins, M. D. and Cheek, E. H. (1989). Diagnostic-prescriptive reading instruction. Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown.

DeFord, D.E. (1985). Validating the construct of theoretical orientation in reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly. 20, 351-367.

Edelsky, C., Altwerger, B., & Flores, B. (1991). Whole language: What's the difference? Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Sprinthall, N. A. & Sprinthall, R.C. (1990). Educational psychology: A developmental approach (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Weaver, C. (1990). Understanding whole language: From principles to practice. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

APPENDIX A

Schedule of LSW Workshop Topics and Activities

1994 LAB SCHOOL TECHNIQUES IN READING AND MATHEMATICS WORKSHOP
(6/24/94)

SUNDAY JULY 17

6:00- 8:30 Introduction, tour of school, dinner

MONDAY JULY 18

8:45- 12:00 WHO ARE THE LEARNING DISABLED?
HOW DO WE TEACHER THEM?

Sally L. Smith
Director/ Founder, The Lab School of Washington

12:00- 12:50 Lunch

12:50- 2:45 READING DIAGNOSTICS AND REMEDIATION:
COMPREHENSION AND CODING

Sara Hines; Director of Tutor Training Program

2.45- 3:00 Break

3:00- 5:00 HOW TO MAKE READING MATERIALS
All teachers will make materials for their immediate use

Sara Hines

TUESDAY JULY 19

8:45- 10:00 THE USE OF ALL THE ART FORMS AND ACADEMIC CLUBS
TO TEACH ACADEMIC SKILLS

Sally L. Smith

10:00- 10:15 Break

10:15- 11:40 Visit arts and clubs

11:40- 12:00 Discuss observations with SLS

12:00- 12:50 Lunch

12:50- 2:00 Visit arts and clubs

2:00- 2:15 Break

2:15- 2:45 HOW A SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR VALUES THE ARTS
Discussion of how learning takes place using the arts and hand-on activities rather than textbooks and workbooks

Neela Seldin, Director of Primary/ Elementary Program

2:45- 3:00 Break

3:00- 3:30 IDENTIFICATION OF LEARNING DISABILITIES IN THE YOUNG CHILD

Neela Seldin

3:30- 5:00 BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

Neela Seldin

WEDNESDAY JULY 20

8:45- 9:50 DIAGNOSTIC PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING

Sara Hines

9:50- 10:00 Break

10:00- 10:40 Observe tutoring

10:40- 11:40 Observe language arts

11:40- 12:30 Lunch

12:30- 1:45 Discussion on Tutoring and Language Arts Teaching

Sara Hines

1:45- 2:45 HOW TO MAKE LANGUAGE ARTS MATERIALS
All teachers will make materials for their use.

2:45- 3:00 Break

3:00- 4:15 LOOKING AT THE WHOLE CHILD CASE STUDIES

Noel Kerns, Director of Intermediate Program
Domi Long, Classroom teacher
Judy Erickson, Occupational Therapist
Jude Gilespie, Speech-Language Pathologist

4:15- 4:30 Break

4:30- 5:00 ACTIVITIES AND GAMES FOR THE CLASSROOM

Noel Kerns, Domi Long, Judy Erickson, Jude Gilespie

THURSDAY JULY 21

8:45- 11:00 THE WRITER'S LAB: TEACHING WRITING TO NONREADERS
Using miniatures and a sand tray, making up stories, trying them out on peers, translating to the computer, making stories into books, creating covers, ending with "Meet the Author" sections.

Sara Hines and Writing Teacher Ellie Zartman,

11:00- 11:15 Break

11:15- 12:00 Visit library to see student made books and study computer generated HyperCard creations

12:00- 1:00 Lunch

1:00- 2:45 MATH DIAGNOSIS AND REMEDIATION:
COMPUTATION AND PROBLEM SOLVING

Noel Kerns

2:45- 3:00 Break

3:00- 5:00 HOW TO MAKE MATH MATERIALS
Master teachers demonstrates work they have made. Teachers play the games. All teachers will make and test materials for their own students

Noel Kerns and Classroom Teacher Julie Tiss

FRIDAY JULY 22

8.45- 10:30 PROJECT LEARNING- TOTAL INVOLVEMENT

Building a Curriculum on African Folk Tales-
Domi Long and Julie Tiss

Building a curriculum on Anacostia River Club
Sara Hines

Building a Curriculum on a Found Object,
i.e. an arrowhead or a wounded bird
Teacher to be determined

10:30- 10:45 Break

10:45- 12:15 SUMMARIZING THE WEEK: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?
Panel discussion with 20 teachers

Sally L. Smith, Sara Hines, Neela Seldin, Noel Kerns

APPENDIX B

A Summary of Teacher Characteristics

Demographics of Workshop Participants

Teacher #	Yrs.of Experience	Grade or Subject Taught
1	9	Special Education
2	16	Third
3	26	Second
4	5 months	First
5	15	Pre-Kindergarten
6	17	Special Education/EMR
7	23	Pre-Kindergarten
8	24	Second
9	1	Pre-Kindergarten
10	19	Special Education/Speech & Lang. Impair
11	26	Reading, 3-6
12	31	Second
13	18	Kindergarten
14	20	Kindergarten
15	13	Kindergarten
16	30	Fifth
17	2	Kindergarten
20*	1	Pre-Kindergarten Sub

*Principal (18) and Assistant Principal (19) are not included on this table.

APPENDIX C

Five Baseline Measures:

Questionnaire
Role of Teacher
TORP
Knowledge of Content Test
Teaching Scale

Workshop for Martin Luther King, Jr. Teachers

Summer 1994

1. Name_____
(First) (Last)

Address:_____

_____
(City,State,Zip)

Phone:_____
(AC)

2. Grade/special area you taught last year:_____
3. Grade/special area you expect to teach next year:_____
4. Years teaching at this school:_____
5. Total number of years teaching:_____

6. EDUCATION

Degree	Year Received	Major
Bachelors	_____	_____
Masters	_____	_____
Other:Specify	_____	_____

7. Check the professional associations to which you belong (Include state/local memberships:

National Council of Teachers of English _____
National Science Teachers Association_____
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics_____
American Educational Research Association_____
National Association for the Education of Young Children_____
Learning Disabilities Association_____
National Council for the Social Studies_____
International Reading Association_____
Association for Childhood Education International_____
National Education Association _____
American Federation of Teachers_____
Council for Exceptional Children_____
Other:_____

8. Please indicate the number of courses and/or workshops you have participated in since fall of 1989. (Include any degree work.)

Topic	Course	Workshop Year
Special Education-general	___	___
Learning Disabilities	___	___
Pupil Assessment	___	___
Developmental Reading	___	___
Diagnostic Reading	___	___
Children's Literature (general)	___	___
Content Area Reading	___	___
Whole Language	___	___
Cooperative Learning Methods	___	___
Using Computers in the Classroom	___	___
Constructivist Methods in Mathematics	___	___
Multicultural Literature	___	___
Gender Equity	___	___
Hands-On Science	___	___
Writing Process	___	___
School Administration	___	___
Other_____	___	___

9. Which phrase below best describes your reading instruction? If you don't teach reading, how would you teach reading?:

_____basal instruction with no outside literature

_____basal instruction with some children's literature

_____whole language

10. Circle the journals you read most frequently:

Language Arts	Arithmetic Teacher	Learning
Reading Teacher	Science and Children	Hornbook
Young Children	Social Education	Book Links
Primary Voices	Education Today	Early Childhood Today
Instructor	Teaching, Pre-K-8	Other_____

11. Did you have any LD students in your class last year? If so, how many?

12. What special arrangements did you make to accommodate the LD students?

13. Are you comfortable using the computer? Which type?

14. How often did your class use the computer lab? Were you the instructor?

15. What computer programs/software do you use?

16. What is the value of computers in the classroom?

On the next page you will find a chart. Please check the appropriate amount of time you devote to each activity.

Name_____ Date_____

Read the following list of suggested "roles" for the teacher. Rank order from 1 to 12 with one for the most important, 2 for the next most important to 12 for the least important. Be sure each of the statements has a unique "rank". There is no single "correct" order. Different orderings reflect different philosophies and assumptions about teaching and learning.

RANK The role of the teacher is:

_____ A. To impart knowledge and skills, to transmit the culture.

_____ B. To employ a process approach, particularly learning how to learn.

_____ C. To provide an atmosphere that allows each student to develop at his or her individualized pace.

_____ D. To understand the developmental needs of students and use an appropriate form of differentiated teaching.

_____ E. To focus on basic education for achieving literacy in the three R's as the building blocks for future learning.

_____ F. To view teaching and learning as a discovery activity.

_____ G. To be a resource person on call to meet the psychological and intellectual needs of students.

_____ H. To discern the developmental status of the students and select from my repertoire of those teaching methods that fit the students' needs.

_____ I. To make sure that the students master the facts prior to any individualizing of instruction.

_____ J. To help students understand the structure of the academic discipline under investigation.

_____ K. To help students experience close interpersonal relationships in the classroom.

_____ L. To combine doing and reflecting at different levels depending on the students' ability to draw meaning from the experience.

Name_____ Date_____

Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (TORP)
(DeFord, 1985)

For each statement below, circle the one best answer that reflects the strength of your agreement or disagreement: SA means "strongly agree," while SD means "strongly disagree."

1.	A child needs to be able to verbalize the rules of phonics in order to assure proficiency in processing new words.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
2.	An increase in reading errors is usually related to a decrease in comprehension.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
3.	Dividing words into syllables according to rules is a helpful instructional practice for reading new words.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
4.	Fluency and expression are necessary components of reading that influence good comprehension.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
5.	Materials for early reading should be written in natural language without concern for short, simple words and sentences.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
6.	When children do not know a word, they should be instructed to sound out its parts.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
7.	It is a good practice to allow children to edit what is written into their own dialect when learning to read.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
8.	The use of a glossary or dictionary is necessary in determining the meaning and pronunciation of new words.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD

9.	Reversals (e.g., saying "saw" for "was") are significant problems in the teaching of reading.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
10.	It is a good practice to correct a child as soon as an oral mistake is made.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
11.	It is important for a word to be repeated a number of times after it has been introduced to insure that it will become a part of sight vocabulary.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
12.	Paying close attention to punctuation marks is necessary to understanding story content.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
13.	It is a sign of an ineffective reader when words and phrases are repeated.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
14.	Being able to label words according to grammatical functions (nouns, etc.) is useful in proficient reading.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
15.	When coming to a word that is unknown, the reader should be encouraged to guess and go on.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
16.	Young readers need to be introduced to the root forms of words (run, long) before they are asked to read inflected forms (running, longest).	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
17.	It is not necessary for a child to know the letters of the alphabet in order to learn to read.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
18.	Flashcard drills with sight words is an unnecessary form of practice in reading instruction.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD

19.	Ability to use accent patterns in multisyllable words (pho' to graph. pho to' gra phy, pho to gra' phic) should be developed as part of reading instruction.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
20.	Controlling text through consistent spelling patterns (The fat cat ran back. The fat cat sat on a hat.) is a means by which children can best learn to read.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
21.	Formal instruction in reading is necessary to insure the adequate development of all the skills used in reading.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
22.	Phonic analysis is the most important form of analysis used when meeting new words.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
23.	Children's initial encounters with print should focus on meaning, not upon exact graphic representation.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
24.	Word shapes (word configuration) should be taught in reading to aid in word recognition.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
25.	It is important to teach skills in relations to other skills.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
26.	If a child says "house" for the written word "home," the response should be left uncorrected.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
27.	It is not necessary to introduce new words before they appear in the reading text.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
28.	Some problems in reading are caused by readers dropping the inflectional endings from words (e.g., jumps, jumped).	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD

Name_____ Date_____

Read the following list of suggested "roles" for the teacher. Rank order from 1 to 12 with one for the most important, 2 for the next most important to 12 for the least important Be sure each of the statements has a unique "rank". There is no single "correct" order. Different orderings reflect different philosophies and assumptions about teaching and learning.

The role of the teacher is:	RANK
A. To impart knowledge and skills, to transmit the culture.	_____
B. To employ a process approach, particularly learning how to learn.	_____
C. To provide an atmosphere that allows each student to develop at his or her individualized pace.	_____
D. To understand the developmental needs of students and use an appropriate form of differentiated teaching.	_____
E. To focus on basic education for achieving literacy in the three R's as the building blocks for future learning.	_____
F. To view teaching and learning as a discovery activity.	_____
G. To be a resource person on call to meet the psychological and intellectual needs of students.	_____
H. To discern the developmental status of the students and select from my repertoire of those teaching methods that fit the students' needs.	_____
I. To make sure that the students master the facts prior to any individualizing of instruction.	_____
J. To help students understand the structure of the academic discipline under investigation.	_____
K. To help students experience close interpersonal relationships in the classroom.	_____
L. To combine doing and reflecting at different levels depending on the students' ability to draw meaning from the experience.	_____

Name_____ Date_____

PRETEST

(PLEASE NOTE: In this week's workshop, we want to provide you with a wealth of new and useful information and teaching strategies. Therefore, the purpose of this pretest is to ascertain the level of your background knowledge in selected areas so that we can best tailor the workshop to meet your needs.

1. Howard Gardner has proposed that there are seven broad types of intelligence and typical tests of intelligence only measure two of the seven. Name the seven types proposed by Gardner and encircle the two tapped by traditional tests of intelligence.

2. When your class is participating ia Writer's Workshop activities, you notice that two students are drawing elaborate pictures but not writing. What does this suggest to you and how would you handle it?

3. What are some of the defense mechanism children employ to try to hide their learning disability from teachers and peers?

4. Describe the steps involved in diagnostic prescriptive teaching.

5. What learning style was most common in your class last year? What behaviors did you observe that suggested this to you?

6. How has the research and theory of Jean Piaget influenced your teaching style and philosophy?

7. List the types of information a teacher would look for and record in compiling a case study of a difficult child?

8. List ways to integrate some art activities into the reading program besides just drawing pictures to illustrate stories.

9. List ways that will heighten children's self-esteem.

10. List the differences between the "typical" child at risk due to learning -disabilities and the "typical" child at risk due to poverty.

11. List some reasons that a child might be disruptive in school?

12. List four behaviors that would suggest a preschooler may have a specific learning disability.

13. List five common misconceptions about learning disabilities.

14. Do a task analysis of what is involved in using a calendar.

15. Outline a lesson plan to teach "using the calendar."

Teaching Scale

For each statement below, circle the number that reflects the strength of your agreement or disagreement: SA means "strongly agree." SD means "strongly disagree."

1.	A child's failure to learn means that the child is not trying hard enough.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
2.	Praising less-than-perfect work discourages students from doing their best.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
3.	Since different children have different intelligences, the teacher has to present materials in different ways.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
4.	Excellence in teaching demands the diagnostic/prescriptive approach.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
5.	Apart from emotionally disturbed children, if students misbehave, it is often because the are frustrated and feel defeated becasuse they can't get organized to do the work.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
6.	Individualizing according to each child's strengths and weaknesses is not possible in a classroom.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
7.	Hands-on (project) learning can overwhelm and frustrate unsuccessful students.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
8.	Although art activities do not foster the development of academic achievement, they help promote self-esteem.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
9.	Critical thinking is less important than the mastery of basic skills and knowledge.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD

10.	Each day the teacher must provide opportunities for students to say "I can do it."	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
11.	Being taught the approach to a task is less important than learning the task itself.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
12.	Nonreaders or poor readers need to learn the basics before dealing with lesson content.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
13.	Frequent praise can decrease a student's level of intrinsic motivation.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
14.	How children play is key to how they learn.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
15.	Teaching the fourth "R"--relationships--cognitive and social, are a part of a teacher's responsibilities.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
16.	Drawing is a bridge to writing.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
17.	Reading ability is predictive of intellectual capacity.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
18.	Effective discipline is based on denying students access to their favorite activities.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
19.	A child's misbehavior reflects poor home training.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD
20.	All children are gifted and talented, and it up to the teacher to unleash their talents and gifts.	1 SA	2	3	4	5 SD

APPENDIX D

Distribution of Scores on the TORP

Comparison of TORP Scores

Workshop Participants v Undergraduate Reading Methods Students

Teacher	Score
1	87
2	85*
3	incomplete
4	98
5	94
6	82
7	90
8	77*
9	86
10	83
11	59
12	110*
13	89
14	81*
15	67*
16	66
17	78
20	68

*Skipped one question on TORP.

Undergraduate	Score
1	87
2	86
3	83
4	104
5	73
6	71
7	103
8	66
9	106
10	94
11	90
12	87
13	93
14	78
15	91
16	119
17	100
18	86

APPENDIX E

Distribution of Teachers by Highest and Lowest Scores on the Preferred Role of Teacher

Person	Grade Level	High	Low
1	Special Ed.	Inquiry	Traditional
2	3	Student Directed	Traditional
3	2	Student Directed	Inquiry
4	1	Developmental	Traditional
5	Pre-K	Student Directed	Traditional
6	Special Ed.	Student Directed	Traditional
7	Pre-K	Student Directed/ Developmental	Traditional
8	2	Traditional/Student Directed	Developmental
9	Pre-K	Student Directed	Traditional
10	Special Ed.	Student Directed	Traditional/ Inquiry
11	Reading	Inquiry/Student Directed	Traditional/ Developmental
12	2	Developmental	Traditional
13	K	Inquiry	Traditional
14	K	Developmental	Traditional
15	K	Inquiry	Developmental
16	5	Developmental	Traditional
17	K	Developmental	Inquiry
20	Pre-K	Inquiry	Student Directed