DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 655 EC 305 139

AUTHOR Hammond, Joy
TITLE Developing and Implementing a Physical Education Program That Improves the Physical Education Service to Students with Disabilities at an Elementary School through Inclusion.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 61p.; Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova Southeastern University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adapted Physical Education; Consciousness Raising; Curriculum Development; *Disabilities; Elementary Education; *Inclusive Schools; *Inservice Teacher Education; Mainstreaming; Peer Relationship; *Physical Education; Program Development; Program Implementation; Social Integration; Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Academic Accommodations (Disabilities)

ABSTRACT

This report describes a practicum designed to improve physical education services for six elementary students (ages 5-9) with disabilities. The project used several strategies to improve physical education services, including: (1) inclusion of the children with disabilities in regular physical education classes; (2) inservice training for the physical education staff in adaptive physical education and inclusion techniques; (3) prior assessment of students with disabilities to give the staff guidance in designing appropriate physical education for them; and (4) an appropriate physical education curriculum that allowed for modifications and adaptations. Results of the project indicate the students with disabilities were able to achieve 14 of 18 physical education goals. There also proved to be other benefits for the students. Inclusion offered the students with disabilities an opportunity to interact socially with students without disabilities and provided a stimulating atmosphere in which to develop their physical skill levels. The students without disabilities gained a better understanding of their peers with disabilities and learned to appreciate individual differences. Appendices contain survey forms and a motor skills test. (Contains 39 references.) (CR)

Developing and Implementing a Physical Education Program that Improves the Physical Education Service to Students with Disabilities at an Elementary School through Inclusion

by
Joy Hammond
Cluster 67

A Practicum I Report Presented to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Nova Southeastern University
1996

APPROVAL PAGE

This practicum took place as described.

Phil Dockery
Verifier: Phil Dockery

Principal, Satilla Elementary School
Title

Douglas, Georgia
Address

March 20, 1996
Date

This practicum report was submitted by Joy C. Hammond under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova Southeastern University.

Approved:

4-15-96
Date of Final Approval of Report

Georgianna Lowen
Dr. Georgianna Lowen, Adviser

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

Developing and Implementing a Physical Education Program that Improves the Physical Education Services to Students with Disabilities at an Elementary School through Inclusion. Hammond, Joy C., 1996: Practicum Report, Nova Southeastern University, Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies. Physical Education/Disabilities/Handicapped/Inclusion/ Elementary Education.

This practicum was designed to improve the physical education services for elementary students with disabilities through the development of a systematic approach. Surveys to determine the scope of this problem were given to those involved. Findings confirmed that for students with disabilities to be provided with appropriate physical education a change must be initiated.

The writer implemented four solution strategies to focus on providing the students with disabilities a physical education program that met their needs. Inclusion was the most crucial component to the success of this practicum. Also, a more appropriate physical education curriculum, adequate staff training, and prior assessment were instrumental in the redefinement and expansion of the physical education services provided for the students with disabilities.

Analysis of the data revealed that by providing schools with adequate tools, training, and support appropriate physical education could be provided for all students.

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (X) do not ( ) give permission to Nova Southeastern University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova Southeastern University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing of materials.

4-15-96
Date

Joy Hammond
Signature

Chapter I: Introduction

Description of Community

The writer's community was a small public school district located in a prosperous, growing, and diverse county. Primarily, a rural agricultural community, the county had experienced an economic growth rate of nearly 18% over the past ten years. The 1990 census indicated the county's population was 32,000. The census also showed that 57% of the adult population did not possess a high school diploma and 34% did not attend beyond the eighth grade. Thirty-one percent of the county's families had an average income of under $10,000, a percentage which exceeded the state average of 20%.

Writer's Work Setting

The school district had a population of 6,500. The mission statement of the school system stressed providing educational experiences that meet the needs of all students. The county had ten public schools which included seven elementary schools that serve grades K-5.

The writer's school, located in a rural section of the county, was the largest of those elementary schools. The vision statement of the school emphasized providing developmentally appropriate instruction through effective instruction, performance assessment, and a partnership with parents and the community. The motto of the school was "Together=Better". The staff was comprised of 36 regular

classroom teachers, 3 special education teachers, 10 SIA/Chapter 1 teachers, 2 speech pathologists, 2 physical education teachers, 1 counselor, 1 nurse, 2 instructional coordinators, and 1 principal. Twenty-four teachers held a four year degree, 23 teachers held a five year degree, and 4 teachers held a six year degree. There were 5 beginning teachers on staff.

The elementary school had an enrollment of 828. The school community had many public assisted families, little home-school involvement, and many single-parent households. The student population was comprised of 62% white, 36% black, and 2% Hispanic. The school had a small enrollment of students with disabilities. Many of these students participated in regular physical education classes with nondisabled students and without special provisions. The target population for this practicum were the students with disabilities who require special provisions or adapted physical education. Table 1 shows a demographic profile of the student population and the target population for this practicum.

Table 1
Demographic Profile of Student Population

Number of Students

	K	1	2	3	4	5
RACE White	101	89	95	83	70	68
Black	65	49	43	47	56	46
Hispanic	2	3	6	1	3	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	1	0
Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	168	141	144	131	130	114
GENDER Male	99	73	77	66	55	69
Female	69	68	67	65	75	45
SOCIO-ECONOMIC Chapter I/ SIA	70	60	64	58	65	53
Free/ Reduced Lunch	120	92	96	79	89	75
TARGET POPULATION	1	1	5	0	0	0

Writer's Role

The writer was one of two physical education teachers at the school. The writer held the degree of Master of Science in physical education and was state certified in this area for grades Pre-K through 12. At this school, the writer co-taught physical education to all students in grades K-5 including those student with disabilities.

The writer's responsibilities were promoting physical development and physical fitness in all students. The writer planned activities that develop competencies in a wide variety of physical skills and movement principles which included the areas of sports, fitness, movement education, rhythms, and individual, dual, and group activities. The writer promoted the belief that physical education at the elementary level should provide opportunities for students to explore, experiment, and come in contact with a wide range of physical education activities. The writer also evaluated the physical education program to determine if the program goals were being met. This included testing students to determine fitness goals and objectives as well as fitness progress.

The writer was affiliated with many professional and community organizations. The writer had attended numerous physical education conferences including adapted physical education conferences. Past employment experiences included teaching college physical education, adapted physical education at a retardation center, elementary and middle school physical education.

Chapter II: Study of the Problem

Problem Statement

The problem to be solved in this practicum was the needs of students with disabilities in physical education were not being met at the elementary (K-5) level. Students with disabilities were not receiving the most appropriate physical education. These students were demonstrating little improvement in basic gross motor skill development and little or no improvement in locomotor development. The regular elementary physical education program had not been effective for these students.

Problem Description

As a physical education teacher, the writer had become aware of the problem that the needs of students with disabilities were not being met. The school had been placing students with disabilities in regular physical education with very limited direction and little support. These students were also not assessed before being placed in regular physical education.

Although the school district emphasized the importance of providing appropriate physical education to all students, it had provided little guidance in meeting this challenge. No additional training had been provided for the physical education staff in adapted physical education to help ensure adequate instructional procedures when working with students with disabilities. Most of the physical education staff

lacked preparation, training, and experience in an adapted physical education.

Due to large enrollments in physical education classes, all students were placed in regular physical education classes. The regular physical education curriculum allowed for very little modifications for individual differences, and it was very sports-based. Students with disabilities in physical education had experienced little participation or success and had not been appropriately challenged.

All students even those with disabilities need to be provided appropriate physical education. Federal and state laws require this for all students. The writer's opinion was that the students with disabilities at the targeted school were not being provided equal access to appropriate, comparable physical education.

Problem Documentation

There was significant evidence to support the existence of this problem. At the beginning of the 1995-96 school year, surveys were given to the administrative staff as well as several elementary physical education teachers in the county on the needs of students with disabilities in physical education. In the fall of 1995, the writer also formally and informally observed students with disabilities in physical education. The writer used a checklist to record these findings.

The surveys completed by the administrators in the county's special services department and at the targeted school revealed that little has been done in the county to

provide appropriate physical education to students with disabilities (See Appendix A). Table 2 summarizes that data. These findings suggested that, even though a curriculum manual was available describing services in physical education for students with disabilities, it was either not adequate or the physical education staff were not trained in how to use it.

Table 2
Summary of Administrative Survey on Adapted PE Needs

Need	Response Agree	Disagree
PE for all students	1	2
Use of aides in PE	3	0
Teachers competent in adapted PE	1	2
Sufficient in-service for PE staff	0	3
Adequately budgeted for adapted PE	3	0
Adequate facilities for adapted PE	3	0
Curriculum manual available	3	0
Administrators aware of PL 94-142	3	0
Parents are informed and involved	1	2

Note. The number of administrators surveyed was 3.

The surveys completed by other elementary physical education teachers in the county affirmed similar inadequacies and frustrations (See Appendix B). Table 3 summarizes these findings. The surveys revealed that the elementary physical education teachers were not aware that a

curriculum manual was available for students with disabilities. The survey also indicated that the students with disabilities did not receive prior evaluation before being placed in physical education, and the physical education teacher was rarely included in a student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Most of the respondents felt that students with disabilities were not receiving comparable physical education to nondisabled students and that the county administration was unaware and uninvolved.

Table 3
Summary of PE Teachers' Survey on Adapted PE Needs

Need	Response Agree	Disagree
Curriculum manual is available.	0	4
Students receive prior evaluation.	0	4
All students receive comparable PE.	0	4
Parents are aware and involved.	1	3
PE teachers are involved in IEPs.	1	3
Present adapted PE is appropriate.	0	4
PE teachers keep necessary records.	0	4
PE staff receives sufficient training.	0	4
Administrators are aware and involved.	1	3
School district has specific placement standards.	0	4

Note. The number of PE teachers surveyed was 4.

Teacher observations of students with disabilities in the physical education setting confirmed that these students were not being served appropriately (Appendix C). Table 4 summarizes these findings which showed students with disabilities were seldom meaningfully involved or appropriately challenged. Most of the students rarely were involved in tasks that met their skill levels or addressed their individual needs.

Table 4
Summary of Teacher Observations in PE for Students with Disabilities

Student Experience	Observation			
	Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Always
Meaningfully involved		*		
Experiencing success		*		
Acquiring competence in skills			*	
Participating in fitness		*		
Social-emotional development			*	
Appropriately challenged		*		
Enjoying experience			*	
Tasks meet skill level		*		
Addresses individual needs	*			
Little time waiting	*			

Causative Analysis

There were a number of sources leading to this problem. A primary source contributing to the problem was the regular physical education curriculum was not adequate for all students especially students with disabilities. The curriculum provided very few provisions for modifications. Since very few students have required special provisions, the curriculum had basically remained unchanged over the past few years.

A second cause of the problem was that students with disabilities were placed in regular physical education classes then were assessed rather than being assessed and then placed in the most appropriate setting. Due to overcrowded classes and limited options, students with disabilities were placed in regular physical education classes usually with other classes in their grade level. The regular physical education teacher then made an informal assessment of the student and modified the curriculum as much as possible.

A third cause of the problem was most of the students with disabilities were placed in the regular physical education class without adequate support and had to follow the existing curriculum that was designed for students without disabilities. Most of these students either experienced continued failure or did not even participate. Support personnel was often limited, and since physical

education classes were so large, students with special needs were often neglected.

A final cause was the physical education teachers were not prepared to adequately accommodate students with disabilities in their classes. The teachers had very little training in the adapted physical education area. Many of these teachers had never worked with students with disabilities and had developed a negative attitude about it. The school system provided no inservice training in this area and did not have an adapted physical education specialist as a resource.

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

A review of the literature showed that others have become concerned with this problem. Jansma and Decker (1988) found there was an increasing number of students with disabilities being included in regular education and regular physical education classes. Current reports indicated that approximately 11 percent of public school enrollments were considered handicapped compared to 5 percent in 1975 (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1993). The U.S. Department of Education (1991) revealed an estimated 93 percent of children with disabilities were educated in regular education programs. Sherrill (1994) found that about 95 percent or more of all students with disabilities were in regular physical education classes.

Many had stressed that present physical education curriculums were improper for these students. Rizzo and Davis (1991) proposed that our nation had failed to provide appropriate physical education to many school children especially neglecting those with disabilities. Block and Kreb (1992) noted that "many administrators purposely manipulated the meaning of mainstreaming to conform to available resources and preestablished programs" (p.98). Loovis (1986) pointed out that physical education for students with disabilities was still an underdeveloped area of public school programming. Miller (1994) stressed that unfortunately many administrators had used mainstreaming to place students with disabilities, often with varying levels, into regular physical education classes with no guidance and inadequate curriculums.

The literature indicated that students with disabilities were rarely correctly assessed before being put into physical education classes. Holland (1987) discovered that many of these students were placed before being assessed to determine the most adequate physical education setting. Miller (1994) had similar findings and stressed that administrators had placed these students in regular physical education without proper evaluation. Johnson and Lavay (1989) found evidence to suggest that motor skills assessment often occurred after placement, and the assessment was usually not an appropriate skills assessment for students with disabilities.

Research has also been conducted indicating that in physical education students with disabilities did not receive proper support. Churton (1987) observed that physical education was almost never included in an IEP program even though it was referred to in the definition of special education according to Public Law 94-142 (U.S. Office of Education, 1977). Rizzo and Davis (1991) stressed that most regular physical education programs did not adequately address the needs of students with disabilities. Block (1994b) and Melograno and Loovis (1991) found that students with disabilities had been assigned into regular physical education classes without necessary help and forced to follow curriculums designed for students without disabilities.

Two of the most significant problems limiting opportunities for successful learning in physical education for students with disabilities were a teacher's ability to teach students with disabilities and a teacher's attitude towards students with disabilities (Grivenski, 1991). Block (1994a) found that many regular physical education teachers had very little training in adapted physical education and had little or no practical working experience with students with disabilities. He also suggested that negative attitudes and lack of information had kept regular physical education teachers from providing appropriate physical education to students with disabilities. Heenan (1994)

conveyed that most regular physical education teachers felt unprepared to teach students with disabilities because they believed students with disabilities needed continuous individual attention.

In this writer's work setting, all of these factors had added to the problem. More and more students with disabilities were being included in regular physical education without prior evaluation. The physical education curriculum had remained unchanged. The physical education teachers were provided little supplementary support and no additional inservice training, and they were not included in the student's IEP. For the students with disabilities to receive appropriate physical education, a change was initiated.

Chapter III: Anticipated Outcomes and Evaluation Instruments

Goals and Expectations

The following goals and outcomes were projected for this practicum. The goal of the writer was that the needs of students with disabilities in physical education would be met at the elementary (K-5) level. This goal included the understanding that all children have varying styles and rates of performance and learning, and children should not be expected to all learn from the same approach. It was the writer's belief that comprehensive knowledge of the learning process and learning styles along with adequate knowledge of gross motor development would lead to appropriate physical education for every child.

Expected Outcomes and Measurement of Outcomes

The writer had six students with disabilities who were the target group for this practicum. These students were pre-tested using the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development (Brigance, 1978) to determine their current gross motor developmental skill level and areas needed to be improved (See Appendix D). This instrument was chosen for a number of reasons. It was an informal developmental measure that was already used with these students to measure other developmental areas. Also, it was criterion-referenced so that the assessments were based on developmental skills and behaviors. Most importantly, the scores obtained were age level so that they could easily be used to plan instruction especially in physical education.

Each student had three specific outcomes that he/she worked on during the implementation process. The following section outlines each child, his/her disability, his/her pre-test scores, desired outcomes, and measurement instrument to be used.

I. Student A was a nine year old student who was confined to a wheelchair due to cerebral palsy and was diagnosed as moderately intellectually disabled (MOID). She was determined to be at the 3.0 developmental age level in gross motor skills.
   a. By the end of this implementation period, Student A will catch a thrown playground ball with hands and chest from a distance of 5 feet.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.
   b. By the end of this implementation period, Student A will throw a tennis ball overhanded a distance of 10 feet.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.
   c. By the end of this implementation period, Student A will successfully maneuver her wheelchair around three cones placed every 5 feet along a 20 ft. course.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by being able to successfully complete the task, two consecutive days.

2. Student B was a 6 year old student who was diagnosed as severely mentally handicapped (SMH). He was determined to be on the 3.0 developmental age level in gross motor skills.
   a. By the end of the implementation period, Student B will skip on one foot.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

b. By the end of the implementation period, Student B will catch a thrown playground ball with hands and chest.
   (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
   (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

c. By the end of the implementation period, Student B will throw a tennis ball a distance of 10 feet.
   (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
   (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

3. Student C was an 8 year old student who was diagnosed as moderately intellectually disabled (MOID) and was limited physically due to dwarfism. He was determined to be on the 4.0 developmental age level in gross motor skills.
   a. By the end of the implementation period, Student C will be able to skip, alternating feet.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.
   b. By the end of the implementation period, Student C will catch a bounced tennis ball with both hands.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.
   c. By the end of the implementation period, Student C will throw a tennis ball a distance of 20 feet.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

4. Student D was a 5 year old student who was diagnosed as moderately intellectually disabled (MOID). He was determined to be on the 4.0 developmental age level for gross motor skills.
   a. By the end of the implementation period, Student D will be able to skip, alternating feet.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.

(2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

b. By the end of the implementation period, Student D will be able to catch a thrown playground ball with hands and chest.
   (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
   (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

c. By the end of the implementation period, Student D will throw a ball from a position in the back of the head, with body rotation and a forward step.
   (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
   (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

5. Student E was a 7 year old student who was diagnosed as moderately intellectually disabled (MOID). She was determined to be on the 5.0 developmental age level in gross motor skills.
   a. By the end of the implementation period, Student E will be able to gallop skillfully, without difficulty.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.
   b. By the end of the implementation period, Student E will be able to catch a thrown tennis ball with one hand.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.
   c. By the end of the implementation period, Student E will throw a ball with a mature or skilled form: shifts weight as body rotates in preparation for throwing, with horizontal adduction of the arm, and follow-through as the elbow extends.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

6. Student F was a 7 year old student who was diagnosed as moderately intellectually disabled (MOID). He was determined to be on the 4.0 developmental age level in gross motor skills.
   a. By the end of the implementation period, Student F will be able to skip, alternating feet.

      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.

      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

   b. By the end of the implementation period, Student F will be able to catch a thrown playground ball with both hands and arms extended.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.
   c. By the end of the implementation period, Student F will throw a ball from a position in back of the head, with body rotation and with a forward step.
      (1) This will be assessed by the physical education teacher.
      (2) Achievement will be measured by improvement of one developmental age level in this area on the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development.

Chapter IV: Solution Strategy

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions

The problem to be solved in this practicum was the needs of students with disabilities in physical education were not being met at the elementary (K-5) level. Federal laws have increased the educational possibilities for students with disabilities.

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142) was the initial legislation that provided free and appropriate education, including physical education, for all eligible children between ages 3-21 (Sherman, 1994). The Education of the Handicapped Acts Amendments of 1983 (PL 98-199) provided funds for states to develop and implement early intervention systems for children with disabilities from birth to age five (Gallagher, 1989). The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986 (PL 99-457) required states to provide services for all eligible pre-schoolers, 3-5 years (Gallagher, 1989). The Individual with Disabilities Education Act of 1990 (PL 101-476) called for "educating students with disabilities to the greatest extent possible with nondisabled students" (Sherrill, 1994, p.25).

The state law required schools to provide 60 hours of physical education annually for each student grades kindergarten through eighth. The state law also stated that physical education services should be made available to every student with disabilities. The following types of

physical education programs should be provided to students with disabilities, as specified in the student's IEP, regular physical education with or without modifications or adapted physical education (Georgia Board of Ed., 1994).

Two major placement options were ascertained from the literature. The first option was the least restrictive environment (LRE). Sherrill (1994) and Stein (1994) believed that the LRE, addressed in PL 94-142 and PL 101-476, was the best way to go for placing students with disabilities in physical education. LRE standards offered a range of alternative placements from total integration in the regular classroom to total segregation (Stein, 1994). Aufesser (1991) pointed out that placement and curricular decisions in LRE were based on individual needs and abilities not on the disability. He also explained that, in physical education, the LRE placements should include from full time regular physical education with support, part time regular physical education and part time adapted physical education, adapted physical education with regular physical education for specific activities, full time adapted physical education in a regular school, or adapted physical education in a special school.

The other option for physical education placement was inclusion. Block (1994b) proposed that inclusion where students with disabilities received an individualized program within the regular setting was the most appropriate

method. Giangreco and Putnam (1991) defined inclusion in physical education as adapted physical education within the regular physical education setting. Block (1994b) contended that inclusion allowed the regular physical education teacher to use supplementary aids and services such as school personnel, peer grouping, special equipment and materials, and various instructional modifications to initiate learning for students with disabilities within the regular setting. Block (1994a) and Nichols (1990) suggested that, with the use of ancillary aids and services, teachers could effectively instruct students with disabilities. Block (1994a) found that using inclusion in regular physical education more meaningfully challenged the students with disabilities than separate physical education.

One successful solution strategy was incorporating a physical education curriculum that was appropriate to learners of all levels and to the various special needs of all learners. Block and Volger (1994) proposed that an effective physical education curriculum for all students was one that used instruction based on assessed capabilities of each student and that used materials and procedures which permitted students to progress at a pace appropriate to their own abilities. In physical education, adaptive instruction allowed students with disabilities to use different equipment, perform skills in different ways, receive different instruction, and be allowed to acquire skills at different rates.

Another solution was to give physical education teachers adequate training in adapted physical education. Rizzo and Vispoel (1991) found that the more competent teachers felt, the more favorable were their attitudes. Their findings also pointed to the importance of giving teachers hands-on experience in teaching students with disabilities. Heikiaro-Johnson and Sherrill (1994) stated that the successful physical education teachers were those who had the involvement, knowledge, and skills to plan, develop, and implement appropriate instruction. Successful teachers learned to provide a class environment that not only ensured learning but also encouraged acceptance of individual differences (Melograno & Loovis, 1991).

Assessing students prior to placement was one more strategy. Heikinaro-Johansson and Sherrill (1994) suggested that teachers had to be aware of students' backgrounds and abilities so they could appropriately modify instruction. Melograno and Loovis (1991) stressed that the most effective way to place students in the best physical education setting was to assess the student prior to placement.

Description of Selected Solutions

The literature offered an array of possible solutions. The most appropriate solutions for this writer's situation were inclusion, inservice training, prior assessment, and an appropriate curriculum. This combination of solutions more effectively refocused instruction in physical education to an individualized approach.

The first solution was inclusion. Due to large classes

and only two physical education teachers, separate physical education instruction was not practical. Two or more classes had physical education together. Inclusion allowed students with disabilities to participate in regular physical education classes but with adequate modifications when necessary. It also allowed for more opportunities for students with disabilities to have social acceptance and peer interactions.

Another solution was prior assessment of students with disabilities in physical education. Assessment gave the physical education staff guidance in designing appropriate physical education for individual students especially the students with disabilities. It also directed the use of support personnel and equipment. With prior preparation, these resources were more effectively and efficiently used.

The next solution was inservice training for the physical education staff in adaptive physical education and inclusion techniques to more effectively serve the students with disabilities included in regular physical education. Training gave the staff guidance in adequate instructional procedures and considerations for working with the various handicapping conditions. Professional preparation in this area enhanced positive attitudes and competence in teaching these students.

The final solution was to adopt a more appropriate physical education curriculum that allowed for modifications and adaptations. A curriculum that addressed individual differences allowed the physical education teacher to teach

all students in the same class. This included classes that had students with disabilities. These students experienced successful learning in the regular physical education environment with nondisabled peers.

There were several reasons why these solutions were successful. The first reason was that inclusion provided opportunities not available in separate settings (Block, 1994b). Block and Bryan (1993) found inclusion in physical education provided more turns, more reinforcement, and even more direct instruction for students with disabilities than separate adapted physical education.

Using the ecological model for inclusion outlined by Block (1994a), the physical education staff facilitated the inclusive practices and strategies necessary to implement inclusion in the regular physical education program. First, the students' present level of performance was determined using the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development and their objectives were developed. Second, the new regular physical education curriculum was examined to establish what objectives were being covered during implementation and make matches. Third, instructional modifications and curricular adaptations were mede. Fourth, the amount of support personnel needed was determined. Last, the physical education staff and the regular physical education students were informed on what students with disabilities they would have and how they could be helpful in the process of inclusion.

This model for inclusion worked very well for this

writer's situation. The Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development was an appropriate instrument to use to determine their present level. The new curriculum was easily adapted to accommodate these students. Only one additional support person was needed to help a student in a wheelchair. The other students were monitored by the regular physical education teacher and her paraprofessional. The physical education staff and the regular physical education students were very receptive to the change and were supportive in the implementation process.

Another reason was that students with disabilities were already required to be assessed in physical education on their IEP. Prior assessment of these students met this mandate, and the physical education teachers had direction in developing more appropriate physical education goals and objectives for these students. They learned what assessment information should be gathered and how physical education in a student's IEP could appropriately be addressed.

Prior assessment of the students with disabilities was very instrumental in improving the services delivered to these students in physical education. Rainforth, MacDonald, York, and Dunn (1992) reminded special educators that students with disabilities must be assessed to determine their present level of educational performance so that appropriate instructional practices are maintained. Browder (1991) affirmed that assessment guided the teacher and was used as the basis for instructional decision making and responsive program modification.

The assessment process in this practicum reflected the fundamentals outlined by Block (1994a). These steps included the following: 1) assessing the physical skill level of the student, 2) using this data to develop goals for the student, 3) comparing individual goals to the regular physical education goals, 4) planning for any need for modifications or accommodations, and 5) preparing the physical education staff as well as the peers without disabilities. The writer used the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development to determine the students' present levels of performance. This process enabled inclusion of these students into regular physical education classes to be a positive and effective transition.

A third reason was that through adequate training the physical education staff developed a better understanding and acceptance of a student's individual differences. They learned to develop strategies that successfully and meaningfully challenged each child. With this additional training and a good physical education curriculum, the staff learned to individualize instruction within the group setting.

Inservice education provided groundwork for the physical education staff on the best integration practices and strategies for an inclusive physical education program. The staff had many concerns about inclusion as many do facing inclusion. The literature showed that one of the

main reasons that inclusion failed was that those directly involved with the process were not adequately prepared (Block, 1994a).

Hord et al. (1987) confirmed that anyone involved in a change had concerns and that these concerns had a major influence on whether a full inclusion program would be successful in a school. They suggested that it was up to those who lead the change to identify these concerns. The writer of this practicum identified her staff's major concerns and explored specific strategies for addressing these concerns about full inclusion.

The main reason for the success was that an appropriate curriculum improved the overall physical education program. Physical education curriculums that allowed for varying styles and learning rates were sound physical education programs. Block (1994b) emphasized that, with augmented aids and help, quality physical education programs and teachers could adequately benefit students with disabilities. He also stressed that good physical education programs were already designed to accommodate individual differences even in those students without disabilities.

The curricular focus of the elementary physical education program prior to this practicum was on the development of sports skills. The skills that were taught were the ones needed for successful participation in various sports. This type of curriculum was less flexible for

individual differences.

To accommodate more individuals, the physical education staff adopted a new curricular focus. This focus reflected more on the development of movement skills and concepts. The movement skills included locomotor, nonlocomotor, manipulative, and nonmanipulative. These skills were then used with movement concepts such as space awareness, relationships with objects and others, and quality of movement. The areas covered in this type of program were already appropriate for students with disabilities or easily modified to include them (Graham, Holt/Hale, & Parker, 1993; Wessel & Kelly, 1986).

The writer of this practicum found this to be true with her target population. The curriculum addressed most of the objectives the students had; it was already individualized to meet a wide range of abilities. In a few cases, modifications were needed and support personnel were used. This curriculum allowed the physical education staff to facilitate effective integration of the students with disabilities in the regular physical education classes.

Report of Action Taken

Implementation of this practicum began in November of 1995. During the first week, the practicum writer gained permission for this change process from her principal and the community special education director. Also, the physical education staff met and adopted a new physical education curriculum for their students. They decided to change the focus of the physical education program to the

development of movement skills and concepts rather than on the development of sports skills. This included movement skills such as locomotor, nonlocomotor, manipulative and nonmanipulative. It also included the concepts of space awareness, relationships with objects and others, and quality of movement.

During the second week, the physical education staff and support personnel participated in an inservice training on how to best implement this practicum. The training session was conducted by the practicum writer who had experience in adapted physical education. The training session included information on the new physical education program, instructional strategies, possible modifications and accommodations, various teaching styles, management techniques, routines, and safety procedures.

Also, during this week, the practicum writer pre-tested the students with disabilities included in this practicum. She used the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development to assess the students' present skill levels. Then, using these results and determining what regular physical education areas were being covered, she developed the physical education objectives (expected outcomes) for this practicum.

The regular physical education students were prepared for inclusion by discussing positive ways in which they could interact with and assist the students with disabilities in the physical education class. In addition, one physical education paraprofessional and one special

education paraprofessional provided the support personnel. The physical education paraprofessional helped to instruct and monitor the whole class. The special education paraprofessional was used to assist Student A who is in a wheelchair. This support person was prepared during the staff training session. The practicum writer discussed with the support person Student A's specific objectives, her medical/health concerns, the daily routine, teaching procedures, suggestions for modifying and accommodating activities, and suggestions for encouraging Student A to interact with peers.

Over the next nine weeks, the students with disabilities discussed in this practicum participated in an inclusive physical education program within a regular second grade physical education class. During this period, locomotor and nonlocomotor movement skills and the manipulative skills of throwing and catching were the focus of instruction. In addition, Student A worked on her other objective of maneuvering her wheelchair.

Student A was MOID, had cerebral palsy, and was confined to a wheelchair. Student A had a paraprofessional as a support person. Activities that use arm and upper body movement were substituted for this student when the class worked on locomotor movements. The student also worked on her objective of maneuvering her wheelchair. When the focus of instruction was throwing and catching, modifications were

made such as the use of suspended balls, larger or smaller balls, textured balls, larger targets, lower targets, peer assistance, and varying distances.

Student B was SMH. The modifications for this student included a peer partner and role model, a softer ball, minimum verbal directions, extra demonstration, physical assistance when providing instruction, skills broken down into smaller components, and a lot of positive reinforcement and redirection.

Student C was MOID and limited physically due to dwarfism. The modifications for this student included smaller and lighter balls, decreased distances, larger and lower targets, and peer assistance when necessary.

Student D, Student E, and Student F were all MOID. None of these students were limited physically. These students mostly followed along with regular physical education classes. The practicum writer did use more verbal cues, demonstration, and role models with these students as well as emphasizing staying on task.

The students without disabilities in the physical education class were somewhat apprehensive about the change at first. However, once the program began all involved became more comfortable with the change. The nondisabled students became very accepting and helpful. Many of them talked with the students with disabilities, provided feedback and positive reinforcement, assisted them when necessary, and helped to keep them on task.

During the final week, the students with disabilities were again tested using the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development to determine if the objectives (expected outcomes) were achieved.

Chapter V: Results

Results

The setting for this practicum was a small, rural elementary (K-5) school. The problem which was solved was the needs of students with disabilities in physical education were not being met. The strategies chosen by this writer to solve this problem focused on inclusion which allowed students with disabilities to participate in regular physical education classes but with adequate modifications. To restructure the physical education program in this direction, a new curriculum was adopted that appropriately addressed learners of all levels and the various special needs of all learners. Staff training was provided for the physical education staff on the concept and practice of inclusion and how to include the students with disabilities in the regular physical education classes using the new curriculum. All students with disabilities were assessed so that the physical education staff could appropriately modify instruction and/or equipment.

The outcome measures were as follows:

1a. By the end of this implementation period, Student A will catch a thrown playground ball with hands and chest from a distance of 5 feet.

This outcome was met.

Student A had some difficulty with this due to limited use of one hand but she did successfully meet the objective.

b. By the end of this implementation period, Student A will throw a tennis ball overhanded a distance of 10 feet.

This outcome was met.

Student A was able to successfully do this with her dominant hand.

c. By the end of this implementation period, Student A will successfully maneuver her wheelchair around three cones placed every 5 feet along a 20 foot course.

This outcome was not met.

Student A was absent about half of the time so very little time was spent on this objective. Also, due to limited upper body strength and control, this was somewhat difficult for her.

2a. By the end of this implementation period, Student B will skip on one foot.

This outcome was met.

Student B, after a lot of practice and role modeling from peers, was able to meet this objective.

b. By the end of the implementation period, Student B will catch a thrown playground ball with hands and chest.

This outcome was met.

Student B was able to successfully meet this objective.

c. By the end of this implementation period, Student B will throw a tennis ball a distance of 10 feet.

This outcome was met.

Student B was able to successfully meet this objective.

3a. By the end of this implementation period, Student C will be able to skip, alternating feet.

This outcome was not met.

Student C, due to illness, was absent 18 out of 24 sessions during the implementation period. He did show some improvement in this area.

b. By the end of this implementation period, Student C will catch a bounced tennis ball with both hands.

This outcome was not met.

Student C was not present to work on this objective.

c. By the end of this implementation period, Student C will throw a tennis ball a distance of 20 feet.

This outcome was not met.

Student C was not present to work on this objective.

4a. By the end of this implementation period, Student D will be able to skip, alternating feet.

This outcome was met.

Student D was able to successfully meet this objective.

b. By the end of this implementation period, Student D will be able to catch a thrown playground ball with hands and chest.

This outcome was met

Student D was able to successfully meet this objective.

c. By the end of this implementation period, Student D will throw a ball from a position in the back of the head, with body rotation and a forward step.

This outcome was met.

Student D required a lot of practice with this skill but was able to successfully meet the objective.

5a. By the end of this implementation period, Student E will be able to gallop skillfully, without difficulty.

This outcome was met.

Student E was able to successfully meet this objective.

b. By the end of the implementation period, Student E will be able to catch a thrown tennis ball with one hand.

This outcome was met.

Student E was able to successfully meet this objective.

c. By the end of the implementation period, Student E will throw a ball with a mature or skilled form: shifts weight as body rotates in preparation for throwing with horizontal adduction of the arm, and follow-through as the elbow extends.

This outcome was met.

After a lot of practice, Student E was able to meet this objective.

6a. By the end of this implementation period, Student G will be able to skip, alternating feet.

This outcome was met.

Student G was able to successfully meet this objective.

b. By the end of this implementation period, Student G will be able to catch a thrown playground ball with both hands and arms extended.

This outcome was met.

Student G was able to successfully meet this objective.

c. By the end of this implementation period, Student G will throw a ball from a position in back of the head, with body rotation and with a forward step.

This outcome was met.

Student G was able to successfully meet this objective.

Discussion

Fourteen of the eighteen specific outcomes that the writer planned to achieve were met through the implementation of this practicum. The goal of this practicum was to improve the physical education opportunities for elementary students with disabilities. This goal was reached through inclusion, an improved physical education curriculum, prior assessment, and adequate staff training. Utilizing these various components, the success of this practicum produced observable and measurable educational progress as well as overall improvement of the physical education program for elementary students with disabilities.

The most crucial component to the success of this practicum was implementing the practice of inclusion. This practicum used an ecological approach to facilitate inclusion which many leaders in this field have endorsed and have found very effective (Block, 1992, 1994a; Auxter & Pyfer, 1989; Wessel & Kelly, 1986; Williams, Fox, Thousand, & Fox, 1990). Block (1994a) described this approach as determining what age appropriate skills the student needs and planning a program to develop these skills. He stressed that several factors determined what skills to teach such as the student's age, interest, strengths, weaknesses, grade level content areas, and local recreational program offerings.

The inservice training provided for the physical education staff was also very effective. This preparation for inclusion included responding to the concerns, explaining the concept and practice of inclusion, discussing the major issues relating to creating an inclusive environment, describing the benefits for inclusion to all involved, and identifying resources and support personnel. The training also introduced the staff to the new curriculum which the staff used to develop and implement a plan of action for inclusion in their physical education program. This preparation included developing individual goals for the students, comparing the individual goals to the goals of the regular physical education class, determining the need for any modifications or accommodations, and identifying the need for any additional resources or support personnel. The inservice training enabled the physical education staff to grow in instructional creativity and effectiveness.

There were some outcomes that were not reached. Student C, due to illness, was absent 18 of 24 sessions during the implementation period. Even though his outcomes were not met, he did show some improvement in the skills he was present to work on. Student A, also due to illness, was absent 10 of 24 sessions during the implementation period. Even though she only met two of her outcomes, she demonstrated considerable improvement in all the skills she worked on.

These improvements showed that even though these students missed a lot of class time a little intervention

can achieve results. Individualizing instruction and modifying tasks to meet an individual's needs gave these students a direction. This direction aided in developing certain skills and would ultimately help in reaching desired outcomes.

Many other positive benefits occurred as a result of this practicum and the implementation of inclusion. Inclusion offered the students with disabilities an opportunity to interact socially with students without disabilities. The inclusive environment also offered the students with disabilities a more stimulating atmosphere to develop their physical skill levels. These students were able to participate in age-appropriate activities along side peers without disabilities. The students without disabilities gained a better understanding of their peers with disabilities and even learned to appreciate individual differences. These students' learned how to successfully interact and assist with their peers with disabilities.

Another outgrowth was the interest this practicum gained from other elementary physical education teachers facing similar situations. This practicum gave these instructors a guide in developing an appropriate physical education program for their students with disabilities. It has made them more aware of what the state as well as the school system mandates as specific placement standards. It has demonstrated to them the importance of prior assessment of these students as well as the importance of the physical education teacher's participation in the students' IEP's.

Most importantly, they have gained knowledge that would help them become more aware and involved.

A final impact of this practicum was its implications. Providing appropriate physical education services to students with disabilities involved more than just placing the student in a regular physical education class. As this practicum has proven, an appropriate physical education program can be provided for these students within the regular physical education classes. This type of integration does take considerable planning and preparation. This process should include collaborative efforts in assessing and determining individual goals, matching these goals to the regular physical education curriculum, modifying and accommodating where necessary, and preparing all staff involved. With appropriate planning and adequate support, quality programming can be offered in an inclusive setting.

In summary, appropriate physical education can be provided for students with disabilities. By implementing solutions strategies like the ones discussed in this practicum, physical education teachers can more meaningfully involve and appropriately challenge their students with disabilities. These strategies can help to develop an array of teaching techniques, to individualize instruction, and to accommodate a wide range of abilities which will help not only those students with disabilities but also those students without disabilities. With strong leadership, quality programs can be developed to provide meaningful

learning opportunities for an increasingly diverse population of children and youth.

Recommendations

This writer offers several recommendations for initiating the type of change implemented in this practicum. First, it is essential to empower others. Inservice educational programs should be conducted for administrators and school staff on inclusion practices and strategies. Students without disabilities are a valuable component that can be utilized in assisting their peers with disabilities. Parental involvement opportunities should be encouraged and promoted to enhance the educational opportunities for their children. Empowering others produces more people working toward the same goal.

Second, it is necessary to identify support needs related to successful change. A curriculum that is conducive to inclusion must be developed. All relevant staff must receive appropriate training. The facilities and equipment should be reviewed to make sure they are adequate. Additional resources such as materials, funding, or resource people should be identified and made available. Adequate support eases the transition.

Third, it is crucial to periodically evaluate the program. Evaluation can be used to measure progress or identify weak areas. Evaluation provides insight into the effectiveness of the various materials and methods. Evaluation can be a significant marketing and development tool for an inclusive program.

Finally, it is vital to become an advocate for the change. On the local level, teachers, parents, and administrators must collaborate in the educational decision making and policy development process to institute quality programming. On the state level, one should work toward system changes within the state to ensure broader opportunities for inclusion. On the national level, one must stay current on legislation and educational programs presently available. Staying informed and involved brings about many possibilities that might otherwise be untapped.

Dissemination

The results of this practicum report will be presented at the local level during a school faculty meeting, a physical education teachers' meeting, a school board meeting, and Parent-Teacher Organization meeting. The presentation will consist of slides taken during the implementation and a discussion of the practicum concept and its results. The recommendations from this practicum will also be highlighted. At the state and national level, the results will be disseminated by attending the state and national physical education conferences and sharing these findings with colleagues. Finally, the writer plans on preparing articles for publication in physical education professional journals.

REFERENCES

Aufesser, P.M. (1991). Mainstreaming and least restrictive environment: How do they differ? Palestra, 7, 31-35.

Auxter, D. & Pyfer, J. (1989). Principles and methods of adapted physical education. St. Louis: Times Mirror/Mosby College Publishing.

Block, M.E. (1992). What is appropriate physical education for students with profound disabilities? Adapted Physical Education Quarterly, 9, 197-213.

Block, M.E. (1994a). Including students with disabilities in regular physical education Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., Inc.

Block, M.E. (1994b). Why all students with disabilities should be included in regular physical education. Palestra, 10, 17-24.

Block, M.E. & Bryan, C. (1993). [Separate v. inclusive adapted physical education: Effects on quality of physical education services for students with physical disabilities]. Unpublished raw data.

Block, M.E. & Krebs, P.L. (1992). An alternative to least restrictive environments: A continuum of support to regular physical education. Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 9, 97-113.

Block, M.E. & Vogler, E.W. (1994). Inclusion in regular physical education: The research base. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 1, 40-43.

Brigance, A.H. (1978). Brigance diagnostic inventory of early development. North Billerica, MA: Curriculum Associates.

Browder, D. (1991). Assessment of individuals with severe disabilities: An applied behavior approach to life skills assessment (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Churton, M.W. (1987). Impact of Education of the Handicapped Act on adapted physical education: A 10-year overview. Adapted Physical Education Quarterly, 1, 1-8.

Cowden, J. (1980). Administrator inservice training program for program implementation in adapted and developmental physical education. (ED 204 29 B) Washington DC: Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).

Gallagher, J.J. (1989). The impact of policies for handicapped children on the future early education policy. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 121-124.

Georgia Board of Education (1994). Georgia Special Education Rules. (pg. 80). Atlanta: Georgia Department of Education.

Giangreco, M.F. & Putnam, J.W. (1991). Supporting the education of students with severe disabilities in regular education environments. In M.H. Meyer, C.A. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds.), Critical issues in the lives of people with severe disabilities (pp. 245-270). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., Inc.

Graham, G., Holt/Hale, S., & Parker, M. (1993). Children moving: A reflective approach to teaching physical education. (3rd ed.) Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Grivenski, Steven. (1991). Promoting success in physical education: Cooperatively structured learning. Palestra, 7, 26-29.

Heenan, J. (1994). Inclusive elementary and secondary physical education. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 65, 48-50.

Heikinaro-Johansson, P. & Sherrill, C. (1994). Integrating children with special needs in physical education: A school district assessment model from Finland. Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 11, 44-56.

Holland, B.V. (1987). Fundamental motor skill performance of non-handicapped and educable mentally impaired students. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 22, 197-202.

Hord, S., Rutherford, W., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jansma, P., Decker, J., Ersing, W., McCubbin, J., & Combs, S. (1988). A fitness assessment system for individuals with severe disabilities. Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 5, 223-231.

Johnson, R.E. & Lavay, B. (1989). Fitness testing for children with special needs: An alternative approach. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 60, 50-53.

Loovis, E.M. (1986). Placement of handicapped students: A perpetual dilemma. Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 3, 193-198.

Melograno, V.J. & Loovis, E.M. (1991). Status of physical education for handicapped students: A comparative analysis of teachers in 1980 and 1988. Adapted Physical Education Quarterly, 8. 28-42.

Miller, S.E. (1994). Inclusion of children with disabilities: Can we meet the challenge? The Physical Educator, 51, 47-52.

Nichols, B. (1990). Moving and learning: The elementary school physical education experience. (pp. 25-34). St. Louis: Times Mirror/Moxby.

Ornstein, A. & Hunkins, F. (1993). Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and theory. (pp. 167-168). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Rainforth, B., MacDonald, C., York, J., & Dunn, W. (1992). Collaborative Teams for students with severe disabilities: Integrating therapy and educational services. Baltimore, MA: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., 105-156.

Rizzo, T.L. & Davis, W.E. (1991). The functional exclusion of adapted physical education. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 8, 53-55.

Rizzo, T.L. & Vispoel, W.P. (1991). Physical educators' attributes and attitudes toward teaching students with handicaps, Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 8, 4-11.

Sherman, A. (1994). Mainstreaming: A value-based issue. Palestra, 7, 36-39.

Sherrill, C. (1994). Least restrictive environment and total inclusion philosophies: Critical analysis. Palestra, 10, 25-53.

Sherrill, C. & Megginson, N. (1994). A needs assessment instrument for local school district use in adapted physical education. Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 2, 147-157.

Stein, J.U. (1994). Total inclusion or least restrictive environment? Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 65, 21-25.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991). Thirteenth annual report to Congress: Implementation of Individuals with Disabilities Act. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Office of Education (August 23, 1977). Education of Handicapped Children: Implementation of Part B Education of the Handicapped Children Act. Federal Register Part II. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wessel, J. & Kelly, L. (1986). Achievement-based curriculum development in physical education. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.

Williams, W., Fox, T., Thousand, J., & Fox, W. (1990). Level of acceptance and implementation of best practices in the education of students with severe handicaps. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 25, 120-131.

APPENDIX A

ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY

ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY OF PE FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Please check the answer which you feel best represents the existing services in our school/school district.

1. Students with disabilities at the elementary school level receive daliy PE services.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

2. Teacher aides are used to supplement the PE program services available to students with disabilities.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

3. The PE staff possess the necessary competencies and knowledges in adapted PE techniques.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

4. The regular PE staff are provided in-service training in adapted PE techniques annually.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

5. The school district adequately budgets for adapted PE equipment.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

6. The facilities provided for students with disabilities enrolled in PE are adequate.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

7. Students with disabilities receive prior evaluation to determine the most appropriate PE placement.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

8. A curriculum manual describing services in PE for students with disabilities is available.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

9. Administrators are knowledgeable about statements in PL 94-142 regarding PE instruction for students with disabilities.

   __strongly agree _agree __disagree __strongly disagree

10. Parents of students with disabilities are made aware of adapted PE services available.

    __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

This survey was adapted from the Cowden Administrator Survey of Opinions Toward Adapted Physical Education (Cowden, 1980).

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF ADAPTED PE NEEDS

SURVEY OF ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION NEEDS

Please check the answer that best represents your opinion of the services that now exists at your elementary school.

1. A curriculum manual describing PE instruction/service for students with disabilities is available.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

2. Students with disabilities receive prior evaluation to determine most appropriate PE placement.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

3. Students with disabilities in regular PE classes receive comparable attention and instruction as regular students.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

4. Parents of students with disabilities are aware of adapted PE services and involved in the decisions about it.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

5. PE personnel participate in the IEP planning process for the students with disabilities.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

6. There is an appropriate adapted PE program available to students with disabilities.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

7. The PE teachers of students with disabilities keep written IEP records on them.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

8. The regular PE staff receive appropriate in-service training annually in adapted PE.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

9. The county and school administrations are actively aware and involved in the PE programs provided for students with disabilities.

   __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

10. The school district has specific eligibility guidelines for placement in adapted PE.

    __strongly agree __agree __disagree __strongly disagree

This survey was adapted from the Survey of Adapted Physical Education Needs (Sherrill & Megginson, 1984).

APPENDIX C

TEACHER OBSERVATIONS

TEACHER OBSERVATIONS IN PE FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Class: _____
Lesson: _____
Date: _____

Please check the response that best represents the student with disabilities' experience as you observe it in this particular PE class.

N - Never
S - Seldom
O - Occasionally
A - Always

	N	S	O	A
1. The student is meaningfully involved.				
2. The student is experiencing success.				
3. The student is acquiring competence in physical skills.				
4. The student is participating in a fitness activity.				
5. The student is acquiring desired social-emotional skills.				
6. The student is appropriately challenged.				
7. The student is enjoying the overall PE experience.				
8. The student is given tasks to perform that meet his/her skill level.				
9. The lesson appropriately addresses the individual needs of each student.				
10. The student spends little time waiting.				

APPENDIX D

GROSS MOTOR SKILLS TEST

Inventory of EARLY DEVELOPMENT
(Birth to Seven Years)

B. Gross-Motor Skills and Behaviors

Assessment	Page	
B-1	23	***Standing:*** 1-0 1. Stands on one foot with one hand held. 2. Stands on other foot with one hand held. 2-0 3. Stands on tiptoes momentarily. 4. Stands on one foot momentarily. 3-0 5. Stands on other foot momentarily. 6. Stands on one foot for five seconds. 4-0 7. Stands on one foot for ten seconds. 5-0 8. Stands on other foot for ten seconds. 6-0 Notes:
B-2	25	***Walking:*** 1-0 1. Walks well and rarely falls. 2. Walks sideways two steps. 3. Walks erect with synchronous arm swings. 4. Walks backward two steps. 2-0 5. Walks backward a distance of 6 feet (2 m). 6. Walks on tiptoes three steps. 7. Walks on a straight line. 3-0 8. Walks forward heel-to-toe three steps. 4-0 9. Walks forward on line heel-to-toe a distance of 6 feet (2 m). 5-0 10. Walks backward toe-to-heel six steps. 6-0 11. Walks backward toe-to-heel a distance of 6 feet (2 m). 7-0 Notes:
B-3	27	***Stairs and Climbing:*** 1-0 1. Creeps up stairs. 2. Creeps down stairs backward. 1-6 3. Walks up stairs, with one hand held. 4. Walks down stairs, with one hand held. 5. Walks alone up stairs, both feet on each step. 2-0 6. Walks alone down stairs, both feet on each step. 7. Walks up stairs, alternating feet, with one hand held. 8. Walks down stairs, alternating feet, with one hand held. 3-0 9. Walks up stairs, alternating feet while holding rail. 10. Walks down stairs, alternating feet while holding rail. 4-0 Notes:
B-4	29	***Running:*** 1-0 1. Runs stiffly, with some falling. 2-0 2. Runs well, rarely falling. 3. Runs well, stopping and starting with ease. 3-0 4. Runs leaning forward with most of weight on the balls of the feet and arms swinging at sides more than outward. 5. Skips on one foot. 4-0 6. Gallops, but inefficiently. 7. Runs 50 yards (45 m) in fifteen seconds. 5-0 8. Runs 50 yards (45 m) in twelve seconds. 9. Skips, alternating feet. 6-0 10. Gallops skillfully, without difficulty. 7-0 Notes:
B-5	31	***Jumping:*** 1-0 1. Attempts jump with one hand held. 2. Attempts jump without hand held. 2-0 3. Jumps off floor with both feet. 4. Jumps over small object such as a chalkboard eraser. 2-6 5. Broad-jumps (both feet together) a distance of 2 inches (5 cm). 6. Jumps four times consecutively. 3-0 7. Broad-jumps over an object or string 2 inches (5 cm) high. 8. Broad-jumps a distance of 10 inches (25 cm). 4-0 9. Jumps forward ten times. 10. Jumps backward once. 5-0 11. Jumps rope three consecutive jumps. 12. Jumps backward two consecutive jumps. 6-0 13. Jumps rope ten consecutive jumps. 14. Jumps backward five consecutive jumps. 7-0 Notes:
B-6	33	***Hopping:*** 2-0 1. Hops once on preferred foot, with one hand held for balancing support. 3-0 2. Hops on preferred foot one hop. 3. Hops on preferred foot three hops. 4. Hops on preferred foot five hops. 5. Hops on other foot one hop. 4-0 6. Hops on other foot three hops. 7. Hops on other foot five hops. 5-0 8. Hops a distance of 10 feet (3 m) on preferred foot. 6-0 9. Hops a distance of 10 feet (3 m) on other foot. 10. Hops a distance of 50 feet (15 m) on preferred foot. 7-0 Notes:
B-7	35	***Kicking:*** 1-6 1. Rolls playground ball by pushing foot against it without losing balance (no backward swing). 2-0 2. Kicks flexing lower leg on backward swing and with very little or no arm opposition (movement). 3. Walks up and kicks a stationary playground ball. 3-0 4. Kicks playground ball with a definite backward and forward leg swing and with definite arm opposition (movement). 4-0 5. Does a coordinated kick with good backward and forward leg swing, arm opposition (movement), and follow-through. 5-0 6. Takes two or more coordinated steps and kicks a playground ball. 6-0 7. Runs forward and kicks a rolled playground ball. 7-0 Notes:
B-8	37	***Balance Beam:*** 1-6 1. Walks balance beam with both hands held. 2-0 2. Stands with both feet on balance beam without assistance. 3-0 3. Walks forward using hands to aid balance. 4-0 4. Walks balance beam with hands at side. 5-0 5. Walks balance beam heel-to-toe. 6-0 6. Walks balance beam backward toe-to-heel 7-0 Notes:
B-9	38	***Catching:*** 3-0 1. Catches a bounced playground ball by "hugging" it to the body. 2. Catches a bounced playground ball with hands and chest. 3. Catches a thrown playground ball by "scooping" under the ball and trapping it to the chest. 4. Catches a bounced playground ball with both hands. 4-0 5. Catches a thrown playground ball with hands and chest. 6. Catches a thrown playground ball with both hands and with arms extended. 5-0 7. Catches a bounced tennis ball with both hands. 6-0 8. Catches a thrown tennis ball with both hands. 9. Catches a thrown tennis ball with one hand. 7-0 Notes:
B-10	40	***Rolling and Throwing:*** 1-0 1. Rolls a playground ball back and forth in a game while in a sitting position. 2. Hurls a tennis ball. 7-0 3. Throws a ball with both hands from an overhead position 3-0 4. Throws a playground ball by holding the ball above the shoulders, using almost exclusive arm movement, with no change in feet position and with little or no body rotation 4-0 5. Throws a tennis ball a distance of 10 feet (3 m) 6. Throws a ball from a position in back of the head, with horizontal rotation of the body, and with feet stationary. 5-0 7. Throws a ball from a position in back of the head, with body rotation and with a forward step 8. Throws a tennis ball a distance of 20 feet (6 m) 6-0 9. Throws with a mature or skilled form: shifts weight as body is rotated in preparation for throwing, with horizontal adduction of the arm, and follow-through as the [illegible] 7-0

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

EC305189

Title: Developing & Implementing a Physical Education Program that Improves the Physical Education Service to Students with Disabilities at an Elementary School through Inclusion	
Author(s): Joy C. Hammond	
Corporate Source: Nova Southeastern University	Publication Date: 4-15-96

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

☑ ← Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Check here
Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

Sample sticker to be affixed to document → ☐

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

or here
Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

Level 2

Sign Here, Please Joy C. Hammond

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Joy C. Hammond	Position: PE Teacher
Printed Name: Joy C. Hammond	Organization: Satilla Elementary School
Address: 106 Touchton Drive Douglas, GA 31533	Telephone Number: (912) 384-9588
	Date: 4-15-96

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC , or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price Per Copy:	Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
College of Education - Agate Hall
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Facility
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305
Telephone: (301) 258-5500