DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 298 SP 037 060

TITLE	Research, Issues, and Practices. Proceedings of the Annual Curriculum and Instruction Research Symposium (4th, Vermillion, South Dakota, April 26, 1996).
INSTITUTION	South Dakota Univ., Vermillion. School of Education.
PUB DATE	Apr 96
NOTE	117p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Hands on Science; Higher Education; High Risk Students; *Inclusive Schools; Instructional Improvement; Listening Skills; *Mentors; *Portfolio Assessment; Principals; *Social Studies; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS	Caldecott Award; Newbery Award

ABSTRACT

The goals of the Curriculum and Instruction Research Symposium are to promote the professional sharing of current education issues, provide a forum for dialogue concerning relevant educational topics, and share faculty research interests. The 10 papers presented at the 1996 conference are: (1) "Appreciative Listening: The Forgotten Art" (Connie Hoag); (2) "Controversial Issues in Social Studies Education" (Robert W. Wood); (3) "Inclusion in South Dakota's Early Childhood Settings" (Gera Jacobs, Joanne Wounded Head, Gail Matthews, and Gui-Ping Zhang); (4) "Utilization of Hands-On/Minds-On Science Teaching Processes in Selected Elementary Schools" (Paul Otto); (5) "Inclusion: Principals' Perceptions in a Four State Region" (Gary Zalud); (6) "Causes and Prevention: School Violence" (Sherry Feinstein and Lynne Roach); (7) "Competency Portfolios and Their Application in the School Setting" (Marilyn Urquhart and Lana Danielson); (8) "Mentoring in the PDC: A Strategy That Builds Professionalism" (Sharon Lee and Rosanne Yost); (9) Improving Academically At-Risk Students' Classroom Performance in Regular Education Settings" (Bill Sweeney); and (10) "An In-Depth Study of Caldecott and Newbery Winning Books" (Maurine V. Richardson and Margaret B. Miller). (ND)

RESEARCH, ISSUES, AND PRACTICES

Fourth Annual
Curriculum and Instruction
Research Symposium
Conference Proceedings
University of South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota 57069

April 26, 1996 Delzell Education Center

SYMPOSIUM PREFACE

The Curriculum and Instruction Research Symposium was conducted on April 26, 1996 to promote the professional sharing of current educational issues. Other goals of this symposium included providing a forum for dialogue concerning relevant educational topics, and the sharing of faculty research interests.

This symposium report document contains a myriad of educational issues, topics and research, and is the written report reflecting the oral presentations. We believe the publication of this document will continue to serve as a forum to encourage professional dialogue and as an acknowledgment of current, relevant research in the field of education.

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support received from the School of Education to help defray the cost of the publication of the symposium events.

Robert W. Wood
Constance L. Hoag
Garreth G. Zalud
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
School of Education
University of South Dakota
September, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPRECIATIVE LISTENING: THE FORGOTTEN ART

Constance L. Hoag
Associate Professor
Delzell School of Education
University of South Dakota

INTRODUCTION

The publication of the teacher friendly text Appreciative Listening: The Forgotten Art was focus of this presentation. The compilation of information from a variety of listening researchers, the sharing of common knowledge about listening's importance in communication and the current place of listening in educational circles was noted. Further, guest authors from the University of South Dakota Curriculum and Instruction's Department contributed specific chapters containing examples as to how appreciative listening influences the areas of reading (in elementary and middle school settings), social studies and children's literature. Finally, examples were provided describing appropriate evaluation procedures to be used in the teaching and practicing of appreciative listening.

FORMAT

The format of the text was presented in keeping with the book, in five sections. Section One: From Communication to Listening focused on the historical and futuristic perspectives. Chapter One entitled *Humans as Communicators* related the inter-dependency of the communication process, including: 1) the environment, 2) the language/set of symbols, 3) the listener, 4) the speaker, 5) the channel and 6) the feedback. Chapter Two, *The Basics of Listening* cited The Listening Post (1995), International Listening Association's (ILA) definition of listening to be, "Listening is the process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to spoken and/or non-verbal messages." Further references were made to the 1926 study by Rankin and the replication by Werner in 1975 as to the analysis of daily communication use. Table One presents this comparison. Loban's analogy of the communication processes added appropriate information and appropriate perspectives as the importance of listening:

> We write the equivalent of a book a year,
> We read the equivalent of a book a month,
> We speak the equivalent of a book a week,
> We listen the equivalent of a book a day. (1963)

Other strategic information included the recognition and use of non-verbal language and the thought-speed ratio factors. Information from several sources including Steil (1979), Steil, Summerfield and deMare (1983), Jalongo (1991), Wolff, Marsnik, Tacey and Nichols (1983) and Wolvin and Coakley (1992) contributed to the presenting of the myths about listening.

Section Two: Educational and Curricular Realities, Chapter Three focused on the fact that *Listening is The Most Neglected Educational Skill.* In support of this

information, a quote from Ralph Nichols, the "Father of Listening" was cited. Nichols (cited in Steil, Barker & Watson, 1983) stated, "Our schools are upside down." He contends we teach the most that which is used the least in life and in schools...and we teach the least that which is used the most in life and in schools. In support of this position a chart was presented from Steil, Barker and Watson (1983, p. 5) and is found as Table Two at the end of this chapter. Further justification and support for the teaching of listening is presented with Public Law 95-561, cited from the 1978 Title II Elementary and Secondary Education Act United States Government Code Annotated mandating the teaching of listening in elementary and secondary schools and other sources.

Section Three focused on The Teaching of Appreciative Listening. In chapters four *Appreciative Listening* and five *Teaching Appreciative Listening* the researchers cited included Wolff, Marsnik, Tacey and Nichols (1983) and Waack (1987). Those authors found appreciative listening builds sensitivity to words and language, builds enjoyment of sounds, language, nature, music, plays and poetry and builds participation is word games and word play. Further, Waack (1987) found appreciative listening is linked to individuals' enjoyment of what is heard, enjoyment is linked to pleasure, pleasure is linked to aesthetics and aesthetics is linked to judgment and evaluation of perceptions. This section concluded with specific strategies to enhance preparation to teach and improve appreciative listening.

Section Four was devoted to the work of four Guest Authors. Chapter six focused on the *Social Studies-Listening Connection* written by Dr. Robert W. Wood. Chapter seven by Maurine V. Richardson, emphasized the use of *Children's Literature Techniques to Teach Appreciative Listening*. Chapter eight connected *Reading and Listening* with Dr. Garreth G. Zalud and chapter nine by Dr. Lisa A. Spiegel focused on using *Middle School Literature to Improve Appreciative Listening*. Each author presented multiple ways to make the curricular connections and provided multiple examples teachers can use in their classrooms.

Section Five focused on Evaluation Procedures (Chapter 10) included several types of *Evaluation Procedures* and the *Epilogue and Listening Challenges* (Chapter 11). The principles and cautions to guide the authentic assessment of appreciative listening are provided to assist teachers to use assessment in an appropriate context. Specific charts, a rubric, examples of self-assessment and ideas for a listening log are enclosed. The epilogue includes a review of the text goals...to provide practicing educators with a teacher friendly, ready to use examples to enhance the teaching of appreciative listening in elementary and middle school classrooms. Finally, educators were challenged to make the teaching of listening important in each classroom. An extensive reference section is included, as well as a special listing of

other sources for listening examples and ideas in addition to those cited in the text was presented.

References

Jalongo, M. R. (1991) Strategies for Developing Children's Listening Skills. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Listening Post (1995) ILA: A Definition of Listening. pp. 1-4, 53.

Loban, W. (1963). The language of elementary school children. Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rankin, P. T. (1926). The importance of teaching listening. English Journal, pp. 623-630, (19).

Steil, L. K. (1982). The Secondary Teacher's Resource Unit. St. Paul: Communication Development, Inc.

Steil, L. K., Barker, L. L., & Watson, K. W. (1983). Effective Listening: Key To Your Success. New York: Random House.

Steil, L. K., Summerfied, J., & deMare, G. (1983). Listening, It Can Change Your Life. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

United States Government Code Annotated. (1987). Title 20 in Chapter 33., Education of the Handicapped, SubChapter1. p. 491.

Waack, W. (1987). Appreciative listening: The aesthetic experience. The Journal of The International Listening Association. pp. 789-86, 1 (1).

Werner, E. K. (1975). A study of communication time. {Unpublished masters thesis}. College Park: University of Maryland.

Wolff, F. I., Marsnik, N. C., Tacey, W. S., & Nichols, R. G. (1983). Perceptive Listening. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wolvin, A. D., & Coakley, C. G. (1992). (4th ed.) Listening. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IN SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Robert W. Wood
Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Garreth Zalud
Associate Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Sherry Feinstein
Assistant Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

INTRODUCTION

Social studies teachers bear a responsibility for insuring that students have the right to read and discuss a great variety of societal issues. Many of the societal issues facing the citizenry of South Dakota and the United States could be classified as controversial.

If these controversial issues are to be included in the social studies curriculum, the teacher needs to be prepared to assume certain obligations. The issues must be carefully selected with all viewpoints considered. Prior to this, however, it is imperative that an adequate educational environment be nurtured by the teachers, administration, and local school board.

Discussion about controversial issues can hardly be viewed as a recent educational trend, for it can be traced back to Protagoras and Socrates. During the 1920's and 1930's, Harold Rugg developed a series of social studies textbooks which directed its attention to contemporary controversial topics. These textbooks unleased a storm of protests from conservative laypeople because they revealed problems and flaws in the American way of life. The textbooks also brought criticism from liberal educators who stated that many of the complex matters were treated in a superficial way.

Similar publications dealing with controversial issues and topics have appeared in the 1940's through the present times. The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) has always been a strong proponent for the teaching of controversial issues. SOCIAL EDUCATION, the official journal published by the National Council for the Social Studies, has had past themed issues that dealt with controversial issues. The most recent treatment of controversial issues appears in the January, 1996 issue of SOCIAL EDUCATION.

Teachers are the center of the curriculum. In dealing with controversial issues it is imperative that they choose to enact clear roles when discussing controversial issues. Because of this, teachers' opinions about controversial issues are extremely important.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study investigated (1) the perceptions of social studies teachers regarding the degree of freedom they have to present or discuss selected controversial issues in the social studies curriculum; (2) the extent of controversial situations that have arisen during the past three years dealing with curricular materials and/or classroom

discussions; and (3) if there was perceived pressure during the past three years to have social studies teachers avoid or "soft-pedal" the use of certain materials or the discussion of certain issues or topics.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

A research questionnaire consisting of thirty-five questions which focused on controversial issues and social studies related issues was constructed by the investigators. After field testing, the questionnaire was revised prior to this research study.

The population for the study was the total number of social studies teachers in attendance at a luncheon at the South Dakota Social Studies Council Conference held in Pierre, SD on March 30, 1996. Thirty-two social studies teachers returned the questionnaire for analysis.

For the purpose of this article, six specific questions dealing with controversial issues were selected for analysis. The basic questions were: (1) How free are you or your colleagues able to discuss/teach in the classes issues pertaining to the following 16 social studies topics?, (2) Has any controversy arisen in your school or in the community in the last three years concerning the selection and/or use of social studies texts or other classroom materials?, (3) Has any controversy arisen in your school or in the community in the last three years concerning classroom discussion on social studies topics not directed to the selection and/or use of texts or other classroom materials?, (4) How serious were the controversies?, (5) How well were the controversies resolved?, and (6) If there has been pressure brought upon social studies teachers in your school or community to avoid or "soft-pedal" the use of certain materials, or the discussion or certain topics, what was the source of the pressure?

FINDINGS

The first survey question asked the social studies teachers how free they are able to discuss/teach in classes the issues pertaining to a list of 16 social studies topics/issues. Four possible responses on each of the 16 topics were presented. They Were Very Free, Free With Qualifications, Not Very Free, and Not At All Free. An Index of Freedom was determined for each topic. This Index of Freedom would be 100 if all responses were "very free" and zero if all responses were "not at all free." The method of determining the Index of Freedom is presented in Table 6. The Index of Freedom is an indicator of how free a teacher is able to discuss/teach about certain issues. The higher the Index the more free a teacher is able to discuss/teach a certain issue. The Index of Freedom presents total scores that provide relative rankings for

issues.

The topics listed in Table 1 are listed according to the Index of Freedom, from highest to lowest. The range of the Index of Freedom was from 93.73 for Global Education to a low of 49.36 for Gay/Lesbian Movement. Thus no topic is entirely free from restriction nor is any topic so restricted that it cannot be discussed with some degree of freedom.

The Index of Freedom for all topics is 78.80. Of the 16 topics, ten are above the average and six below. The topics Criticism of State Government, Criticism of Local Government, Religion, Abortion Rights, Criticism of Local Business, and the Gay/Lesbian Movement fall below the average.

The second survey question asked if any controversy had arisen in the school or community in the last three years concerning the selection and/or use of social studies texts or other materials, or in classroom discussions. There are fewer controversies centered around the textbook and other curricular materials than in classroom discussions. Eighteen percent of the respondents reported a controversy dealing with the content in the textbook or curricular materials and 30% reported a controversy centering around classroom discussions. Table 2 reflects responses to the reported controversies.

The third survey question asked the degree of seriousness of the reported controversies. Controversies centering around classroom discussions were more serious than those dealing with textbooks or curricular materials. Fifty percent of the respondents reported the controversies dealing with classroom discussion to be either very serious or moderately serious. Thirty-three percent of the respondents reported textbook or curricular material controversies as being very serious to moderately serious. Table 3 reflects responses to the question.

The fourth survey question asked the social studies teachers to evaluate the success of resolution of issues raised about controversies within the curriculum. Controversies centering around classroom discussions were not resolved as well as those over textbook or curricular materials. Fifty percent of the respondents reported that the classroom discussion controversy was only partially or really not resolved. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents thought that textbook and curricular materials controversies were resolved in a creatively and amicably or satisfactorily manner. Table 4 indicates responses on how well controversies were resolved.

The last survey question asked if there had been pressure brought upon social studies teachers to avoid or "soft-pedal" the use of certain materials or the discussion

of certain topics and to identify the source of the pressure. Table 5 shows that the 41% of the respondents reported that the source of pressure to avoid or soft-pedal topics came from parents. Religious groups were reported by 24% of the respondents as the second ranked source of pressure. Administrators and school board members were each mentioned 14% of the time by the respondents.

CONCLUSIONS

Social studies teachers generally have the freedom to teach a wide variety of potentially controversial issues. The combined Index of Freedom of the sixteen issues was 78.80. Those issues dealing with Gay/Lesbian Movement, Criticism of Local Business, Abortion Rights, Religion, Criticism of Local Government, and Criticism of State Government are those issues that seem to be the most controversial for social studies teachers. Teachers believe they have the greatest amount of freedom with global education and foreign aid topics.

A number of controversies have arisen during the past three years concerning the use of textbooks, curricular materials, and classroom discussions. It would appear that most of the controversies were minor to not very serious in nature. Classroom discussions evoked more serious controversies than the textbook or curricular materials being used in the schools.

When controversies arise educators attempt to resolve them. From the reported data, a majority of the reported controversies were either creatively and amicably or satisfactorily resolved. Textbook and curricular material controversies were resolved in a more positive manner than those centering around classroom discussions.

There was pressure placed on social studies teachers to avoid or "soft-pedal" topics. The most common source reported by the respondents came from parents. Religious groups ranked number two with administrators and school board members being tied for third.

In this ever changing society, social studies teachers are in a position to help students learn how to deal with potentially controversial issues or topics. Teaching about issues that might be labeled as controversial is an appropriate way for students to learn about values and differences of opinions held by individuals locally, state wide, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The goal of teaching about potentially controversial issues is to have children not to pass judgement on others but to help students gain a deeper understanding of values held by others as well as their own.

Positive citizenship outcomes is a major objective of social studies educators. The investigators of this study believe that it is imperative that opportunities be given to students to explore controversial issues in an open and supportive classroom. When controversial issues are explored in social studies classes, students will be more likely to enter into the "real world" better prepared to handle controversies, to understand differing value systems, and to be motivated to become actively involved in society.

According to Ehman (1977) students who recalled a wider range of views having been considered in their classroom were:

*more trusting in society
*more socially Integrated
*more politically confident
*more politically interested
*more trusting of other students and school adults
*more politically confident in regard to school decision-making, and
*more interested in school-level politics

Social studies teachers must create a classroom climate where issues can be openly discussed without fear that pressure groups will bring censorship into the classroom. Research supports the teaching of controversial issues as this approach helps students to think and to apply problem solving strategies to societal issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. When teachers are faced with a controversial topic they should consider working with community, religious, and parent groups to present data on both sides of the issue.

2. Faculty and administrators should receive training in how to deal with potentially controversial issues.

3. Schools and communities must work together to provide an environment where societal issues can be taught/discussed to produce the desired civic outcomes of the school and community.

References

Ehman, L. (1997). Social studies instructional factors causing change in high school students' sociopolitical attitudes over a two-year period. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Hahn, C. (1991). Controversial issues in social studies. Handbook on Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning, edited by James P. Shaver, 470-80. New York: Macmillan.

Harwood, A. M. & Hahn, C. L. (1990). Controversial issues in the classroom. ERIC Digest EDO-80-90-7.

Kelly, T. E. (1989). Leading class discussions of controversial issues. Social Education, 53, 368-70.

Onosko, J. J. (1996). Exploring issues with students despite the barriers. Social Education, 60 (1), 22-27.

Rossi, J. A. (1996). Creating strategies and conditions for civil discourse about controversial issues. Social Education, 60 (1), 15-21.

Soley, M. (1996). If it's controversial, why teach it? Social Education, 60 (1), 9-14.

Table 1

Freedom to Present Controversial Topics

Topic	Index of Freedom
Global Education	93.73
Foreign Aid	92.41
Multicultural Topics	89.77
Gender Equity Issues	87.43
Prejudice	86.77
Drugs/Alcohol	85.48
Faults in Our System of Government	84.45
Political Correctness	81.52
Character Education	80.53
AIDS	79.87
Criticism of State Government	75.52
Criticism of Local Government	69.91
Religion	68.12
Abortion Rights	65.52
Criticism of Local Business	64.10
Gay/Lesbian Movement	49.36
All Topics Combined	78.80

Table 2

Reported Controversies

Category	Textbooks/Materials	Classroom Discussion
Yes	18%	30%
No	64%	55%
Do Not Know	15%	12%
No Answer	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%

Table 3

Seriousness of Controversies

Category	Textbooks/Materials	Classroom Discussion
Very Serious	11%	8%
Moderately Serious	22%	42%
Not Very Serious	45%	33%
Minor	22%	17%
Total	100%	100%

Table 4

Resolving Controversies

Category	Textbook/Materials	Classroom Discussion
Creatively and Amicably	11%	0%
Satisfactorily	56%	50%
Only Partially	33%	42%
Really Not Resolved	0%	8%
Total	100%	100%

Table 5

Source of Pressure to Avoid or Soft-Pedal Topic

Category	Percentage
Parents	41%
Administrators	14%
Colleagues	0%
Community	7%
Students	0%
School Board Members	14%
Religious Groups	24%
Others	0%
Total	100%

Table 6

Computation of Index of Freedom

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses	Weight	Column 3 times Column 4
Very Free	98	61%	1.00	61.00
Free With Qualifications	59	36%	.67	24.12
Not Very Free	5	3%	.33	.99
Not At All Free	0	0%	.00	.00
TOTAL				86.11

* INDEX OF FREEDOM FOR THIS EXAMPLE IS 86.11.

INCLUSION IN SOUTH DAKOTA'S EARLY CHILDHOOD SETTINGS

Gera Jacobs
Assistant Professor

Joanne Wounded Head
Gail Mathews
Guji-Ping Zhang
Graduate Students
School of Education
University of South Dakota

There has been a great deal of discussion in the Early Childhood Special Education literature concerning the inclusion of young children with special needs into integrated settings. Federal Law requires that young people be educated in the "Least Restrictive Environment" (Turnbull & Turnbull, 1990). For many children the least restrictive environment would be an inclusive preschool or kindergarten setting, designed for all children. Bailey and McWilliam (1990) state that providing services in an integrated setting is "the procedure of choice" (p. 34) for young children with disabilities. Salisbury and Vincent (1990) maintain that there is no longer any question about whether the integration of young children with special needs is a good idea or not; the question is how to make it happen.

The South Dakota Early Childhood Inclusion Support Project was established in 1995 in order to help answer the question of how to "make inclusion happen" in South Dakota. The Project is funded by the South Dakota Office of Special Education, in collaboration with the South Dakota University Affiliated Program at the University of South Dakota. The purpose of the Project is to establish a statewide support system for school districts, teachers, and parents as the state moves toward greater inclusion of young children with special needs into integrated settings. The Project's goals include providing training, technical assistance, and information, as well as organizing a network of professionals and parents who are interested in sharing information and expertise about providing services to young children in inclusive settings. Another goal of the Project is to is to collect information regarding inclusive practices in South Dakota. To achieve this goal a survey was sent to the Directors of Special Education in each of the state's school districts and cooperative educational agencies in order to determine the current level of inclusion in the state, perceived barriers to inclusion, districts' training needs, and attitudes toward inclusion. Sixty-six percent of the state's 178 school districts responded, including districts of all sizes, geographically located all across the state. The districts responding to the survey represent two-thirds of the state's three to five year old children on Individual Education Plans (IEPs). This paper will present the findings of the survey and future directions for research.

PRESCHOOL SETTINGS

The first question on the survey asked districts to report where their three to five year old children on IEPs received the majority of their services and where they spent the majority of their school day. Results showed that 65% of the 1,475 children on IEPs represented in the survey received the majority of their services in a segregated Early Childhood Special Education Preschool (see Table 1). Nine percent of the children were receiving services in a therapy room. Only 12% of the children were receiving services in an integrated preschool, defined as a preschool setting

where there were at least 25% representation of children with special needs and 25% representation of children without identified special needs. Seven percent of the children were reported to be receiving their services in a Head Start program and another three percent in a preschool designed primarily for children without special needs. Two percent were receiving their services in their own home. The remaining two percent were receiving services in "other settings," including childcare in another home, a day school, or residential facility. A few of the districts reported more than one primary setting where children received the majority of their services; the data reflect the percentage of the total number of responses in each category.

Districts were also asked to identify where the children were spending the majority of their school day, if this information was available to them. Data on this question were supplied for 51% of the children on IEPs in the participating districts. Forty-six percent of these children were spending the majority of their school day in a segregated Early Childhood Special Education Preschool, with five percent spending the majority of their school day in a therapy room. Eighteen percent of the children were spending the majority of their school day in an integrated preschool, nine percent in Head Start, and seven percent in a preschool designed for children without special needs. The remaining six percent were spending the majority of their school day in "other settings," including three percent in childcare in another home.

KINDERGARTEN SETTINGS

Districts were asked to report where the kindergarten children on IEPs in their districts were receiving the majority of their services. The 117 districts that responded to the survey represent 6,527 of the state's kindergarten children; 706 of these children were on IEPs. Of these children, 44% of them were receiving the majority of their services in the regular kindergarten classroom (Table 2). Twenty six percent were receiving their services in a resource room, sixteen percent in a therapy room, five percent in a segregated Early Childhood Special Education Preschool, four percent in a self contained classroom, two percent in a preschool designed for children without special needs, and one percent in an integrated preschool. One child was receiving services at a residential facility and two percent in "other settings." As in the preschool data, some of the districts reported more than one primary setting where children received the majority of their services; the data reflect the percentage of the total number of responses in each category.

When asked where the kindergarten children spent the majority of their school day, responding districts only reported on 43% of the children on IEPs. Of these children, 88% were spending the majority of their school day in the regular kindergarten room, three percent in a therapy room, two percent were spending the

majority of their school day in the resource room, and two percent in an integrated preschool. One percent of the children were spending the majority of their school day in a segregated Early Childhood Special Education Preschool and another one percent in a self contained classroom. The remaining three percent were spending the majority of their school day in "other" settings.

PERCEIVED BARRIERS TO INCLUSION

Districts were asked to rank order a list of barriers they perceived to be hindrances to the inclusion of children birth through five with special needs into classroom or programs with children without specially identified needs. They were asked not to put any number beside items they did not consider to be barriers. All nine items that were listed were ranked by some districts as barriers. An analysis was conducted on the responses to determine which barriers were ranked in the top three most often. The barrier listed in the top three most often was *cost*, followed by *training, number of trained personnel, physical space, attitudes, time, availability of programs, materials and resources,* and *rules and regulations.*

PERCEIVED TRAINING NEEDS FOR INCLUSION

The survey asked districts to rank order a list of training needs they believed to be important for the implementation of more inclusive practices. They were asked not to put a number beside any training ideas they believed were not needed. All possible items were ranked by some districts as training needs. An analysis was conducted on the responses to determine which training topics were ranked in the top three most often. The training need listed by districts in the top three most often was "collaboration between special education and regular education." This was followed by training in *curriculum in integrated classes, behavior issues in the Early Childhood setting, working with parents, transition between programs, child development, administrative issues on inclusion,* and *ADA regulations and legal issues.*

PERCEIVED BEST PRACTICES

Districts were asked to identify what they perceived to be the best way to provide services for young children under five years of age with special needs. A total of 79% of the districts responding said that Integrated Settings were the best way to deliver services. Only 14% felt that settings designed exclusively for children with special needs was the best way to provide services. Five percent indicated that both settings were the best way to provide services and two percent said "it depends."

SUGGESTIONS FOR INCLUSION

Districts were asked to provide suggestions that would help those who want to include young children with special needs into integrated settings, based on their experiences or information they had learned. A semantic analysis was conducted on the data revealing four major categories of suggestions given by the school districts. These categories were collaboration, classroom/intervention strategies, personnel issues, and program considerations. Those citing collaboration as a suggestion to help inclusion, included collaboration between agencies, collaboration between educators, and collaboration with parents. Classroom/intervention strategies included suggestions to keep a child-centered focus, have small class size, and to use peer modeling and developmentally appropriate practices. Personnel issue suggestions included a need for training, the need for additional support staff, and the need to build awareness and improve attitudes. Suggestions for program considerations included the need for additional funding, making programs available, determining appropriate settings, and establishing a philosophy that promotes inclusion. These categories are similar to those found in the research literature as suggestions for establishing successful inclusive programs (Diamond, Hestenes, & O'Connor, 1994; McLean & Hanline, 1990; Odom & McEvoy, 1990; Rose & Smith, 1992.)

INCLUSIVE COMMUNITY BASED ACTIVITIES

The final question on the survey asked districts to identify community based activities offered in their community that included young children with special needs.

The most frequently reported activity was *recreational activities*, which was reported by 56% of the districts. This was followed by *church-sponsored programs, literacy programs, organizations and clubs* (such as the YMCA and scouts), *community-sponsored social activities*, and *community educational programs*. Thirteen percent of the districts did not answer this question, and 15% said there were no programs available. Table 3 shows the community activities that were reported and the percentage of districts that listed them.

CONCLUSIONS

Data from the survey revealed that the majority of districts responding felt that integrated settings were the best way to provide services to young children with special needs. Unfortunately, the data also demonstrated that the majority of South Dakota's three to five year old children are receiving their services in segregated settings, designed exclusively for children with special needs.

In order to have successful integration, research has demonstrated that there must be teacher training and ongoing support (Guralnick, 1982; Hanline, 1985). Suggestions for training given by the districts through the survey will enable the Inclusion Project and other state agencies to provide needed training on inclusion.

Additional research will be conducted by the Project, focusing on collecting data from ten districts cross the state who are successfully implementing inclusive practices. This information will be collated and shared statewide to provide models for other districts to follow. Several successful models have been described in the literature, such as the Creative Preschool, a model program located in Tallahassee, Florida, described by McLean and Hanline (1990). This preschool provides services to all children and families through cooperative arrangements with community-based agencies and programs. The authors outline a system where multiple agencies, service providers, and parents collaborate to successfully meet the individual needs of young children with disabilities, as well as provide access to programs and services that may be appropriate to their families.

Heckman and Rike (1994) describe The Westwood Learning Center as a model, multi-level, educational program that includes a comprehensive, flexible system of service options. Preschool, kindergarten, first grade, and special services are organized around a "child-centered philosophy" (p. 31); individual needs of children are met as teachers, therapists, and parents have access to each other and to a wide range of materials, supplies and equipment. The authors state that this educational model provides advantages to the students, the teachers, and the parents. Heckman and Rike suggest that children experience a sense of belonging as well as make educational progress; teachers have clearly defined roles and are able to coordinate their skills and strengths with each other; and parents provide direct input and are active participants in their child's education. Models such as these, and models within the state will provide professionals with ideas to help them implement programs that will enable them to provide better inclusive programs.

The South Dakota Early Childhood Inclusion Support Project will also continue to provide training and technical assistance statewide. The Project has also established a support network of teachers, administrators, Head Start personnel, and childcare providers who are willing to share their expertise and experiences with others. Names and phone numbers of individuals willing to share their knowledge and ideas have been included in a book distributed statewide. Efforts such as these will help the state realize their stated belief that integrated services are best for young children with special needs.

References

Bailey, D.B., & McWilliam. (1990). Normalizing early intervention. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 10(2), 33-47.

Diamond, K.E., Hestenes, L.L., & O'Connor, C.E. (1994). Integrating young children with disabilities in preschool: Problems and promise. Young Children, 49(2), 68-73.

Guralnick, M. J. (1982). Programmatic factors in mainstreamed preschool programs. In P.S. Strain (Ed.) Social Development of exceptional children (pp. 71-92). Rockville, MD: Aspen.

Hanline, M.F. (1985). Integrating disabled children. Young Children, 40(2), 45-58.

Heckman, M., & Rike, C. (1994). Early learning center. Teaching Exceptional Children, 26(2), 30-35.

McLean, M., & Hanline, M.F. (1990). Providing early intervention services in integrated environments: Challenges and opportunities for the future. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, *10*(2), 62-77.

Odom, S.L., & McEvoy, M.A. (1990). Main streaming at the preschool level: Potential barriers and tasks for the field. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 10*(2), 48-61.

Rose, D.F., & Smith, B.J. (1993). Preschool main streaming: Attitudes barriers and strategies for addressing them. *Young Children, 48*(4), 59-62.

Salisbury, C.L., & Vincent, L.J. (1990). Criterion of the next environment and best practices: Main streaming and integration 10 years later. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 10*(2), 78-89.

Turnbull, H.R., & Turnbull, A.P. (1990). The unfulfilled promise of integration: Does Part H ensure different rights and results than Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act? *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 10*(2), 18-32.

TABLE 1

Survey Results Representing 1,475 Children 3 - 5 Years of Age on IEPs

SETTING	Percentage of Children who receive the majority of their services in this setting
Early Childhood Special Education Classroom designated only for children with disabilities	65%
Preschool Classroom which integrates children with and without special needs (at least 25% representation of both groups)	12%
Therapy Room	9%
Head Start	7%
Preschool Classroom or Daycare facility primarily designated for children without special needs	3%
Child's Own Home	2%
Other	3%

TABLE 2

Survey Results Representing 706 Kindergarten Children on IEPs

Setting	Percentage of Children who receive the majority of their services in this setting
Regular Kindergarten	44%
Resource Room	26%
Therapy Room	16%
Segregated ECSE Preschool designated only for children with disabilities	5%
Self Contained Classroom	4%
Preschool	2%
Integrated Preschool	1%
Residential Facility	>1%
Other	2%

Table 3

Community Based Activities that Include Young Children with Special Needs

Community Activities	Percentage of Districts Reporting Activity
Recreational Activities	56%
Church-sponsored Programs	21%
Literacy Programs	15%
Organizations and Clubs	8%
Community-Sponsored Social Activities	2%
Community Educational Programs	<1%
No Programs Available	15%
No Response Given to the Question	13%

UTILIZATION OF HANDS-ON/MINDS-ON SCIENCE TEACHING PROCESSES IN NINE NSF-SSI SOUTH DAKOTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Paul B. Otto
Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

A host of national studies has made it clear that students in the United states are not being adequately prepared in science when compared to national and international norms. The science education of today is not meeting the needs of our students both to lead meaningful, productive lives and to compete in the job market. The need for the development of a scientifically literate citizenry has been advocated by a number of groups and individuals (Boyer, 1983; Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1983; Center for the Assessment of Educational Progress, Educational Testing Service, 1987; Champagne, Audrey, 1988; International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, 1987; Mullis, & Jenkins, 1988; National Governors' Association, 1987; National Science Board Commission of Precollege Education In Mathematics, Science, and Technology (1983) (E. Gagne, 1985).

The medium in elementary school science teaching is the textbook (Hofwolt, 1984; Mechling and Oliver, 1983). Pizzini reported the use of a textbook 95 percent of the time by ninety-five percent of the teachers studied (cited in Foderaro, 1990). Donald Wright observed the use a single text or multiple text in up to eighty percent of the classrooms studied (cited in Mechling and Oliver, 1983).

The textbook appears to be firmly entrenched in teaching science in elementary schools. Not only does it serve as the center of pedagogy, but it in fact becomes the curriculum. The textbook is firmly entrenched without much hope in being uprooted. Mechling and Oliver (1983), in working with elementary school principals made the observation "maybe the textbook is now in four colors, but the old read-recite discuss way is as entrenched as ever. For students, knowing is more a function of reading, digesting and regurgitating information from the textbook or lab manual than it is of analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating" (p.43).

The exclusive use of a textbook relegates students to a passive role. Memorization becomes the modus operandi providing little opportunity for transfer of learning from one situation to another (E. Gagne, 1985).

Both the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS, 1989) and the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA, 1992), advocate hands-on, inquiry-based teaching with students doing science. The National Science Foundation Statewide Systemic Initiative Project (NSF-SSI) places emphasis on the teaching of science and mathematics using manipulatives, problem-solving-inquiry processes, infusing technology, integrating science, mathematics, language arts and social studies and the community.

Evidence over the past three decades consistently verifies the efficacy of the activity/inquiry approach to teaching science. Meta-analyses of hundreds of

experimental studies involving thousands of students indicate the hands-on inquiry curricula as superior to the traditional curriculum in achievement, reading readiness and skills of analysis, math, social studies, communication, and positive science attitude development.(Bredderman, 1983; Shymansky, et.al., 1983).

THE STUDY

During the past three years, a nine-school cooperative in the southeastern part of south Dakota has been funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) through a State Systemic Initiative (SSI) contract for the improvement of science education. A variety of inservice activities have been implemented through the project. Also, the project has had the luxury of a full-time project facilitator who has been available for continuous consultation and inservice.

The efficacy of the program has been of interest to the writer as he has been involved from its inception in the planning and implementation of the program activities. It was decided to examine the K-4 science teaching activities in the project schools because the baseline data has been established for the state of South Dakota at the K-4 level (Matthew, 1993).

The research questions of the South Dakota study dovetailed quite well with the interests of the present study.

1. What are the predominant methods used to teach in South Dakota public elementary schools (K-4) and how often are they used?
2. How much time per week is spent teaching science in South Dakota elementary (K-4) public schools?
3. How often are hands-on science activities used to teach science in South Dakota public elementary schools?

It was decided to utilize the Matrix Survey and the demographic questionnaire of the South Dakota study. The one page Matrix Survey was simple and required a minimum of time for completion. The Matrix Survey consisted of a fourteen-item matrix "teaching activities" vs. "days of the week" as well as a one-item "minutes science was taught" vs. days of the week matrix (see appendix A). Comments sections were included for each. The one-page nineteen-item Follow-up Questionnaire (Appendix B) included two extra items not included in the South Dakota study, #17. Please list the elementary school science teaching programs of which you have heard, and #18. Please list the elementary school science teaching programs with which you are familiar. Items 17 and 18 were added because the NSF-SSI inservice training of the teachers should have placed them in contact with a variety of programs. The project teachers were assessed on their stated familiarity without reference to overall

state data.

POPULATION

The principals in the nine elementary schools under study were contacted by telephone for initial approval. All of the principals agreed to cooperate in the study. On March 21, 1996, follow-up approval forms for the principal signatures, letters of explanation, Matrix Surveys for each K-4 teacher, and return addressed, postage-paid envelopes were mailed to the principals. Matrix Surveys for the second week were mailed on April 2, 1996. The Follow-up Questionnaire was mailed to the principals on April 15, 1996.

Surveys were mailed to seventy three K-4 teachers. The return rate for the Matrix Surveys was forty-eight percent for week one and thirty-eight percent for week two.

The total methodology occurrences for grades kindergarten through grade four, for both the South Dakota study as well as the present Study, appear in table one as percentages of the numbers responding. The occurrences are arranged in descending order on the basis of the present study. Doing hands-on science experiments was relegated to fifth place in the South Dakota study, while it was ranked in second place for the present study. The differences between the occurrences of 10 and 14 between the two studies were not significant. Even though variations between the occurrences of the various methodologies are observed, there is no significant differences in variances greater than chance occurrences.

Visual perusal of the average methodology occurrences per day in the present study, is of interest as it gives somewhat of the picture of the science teaching activities in the K-4 classroom in the schools studied. As can be seen in Table 2, the time devoted to hands-on teaching of science was up to 50% less on Mondays and Fridays than for the other days of the week. One can hypothesize that the preparation time for acquiring hands-on materials and the formal planning time required for their implementation are simply not convenient for the teacher on Mondays. The use of workbooks and the reading aloud of science texts were reported higher on Mondays, requiring less teacher effort. Fridays are sort of "spiraling down" days as evidenced by the higher incidences reported of outside readings, such as Ranger Rick.

The average number of minutes reported by the teachers in the present study was greater than those reported in the South Dakota study by a factor of 132% (Table 3). The average weekly time 144 minutes spent on science instruction reported in the

present study compares favorably with the national average, but is considerably less than that of Pennsylvania and North Carolina. An average of somewhere near 30 minutes a day is spent in science instruction in North Carolina (Coble and Rice, 1979). Illinois reported that their students 109 minutes of science instruction per week. Science in Pennsylvania was reported to be taught about 167 minutes per week on an average (Bellucci, 1973). The reported national average amount of time science is taught is 100 minutes per week or 20 minutes per day. (Bonnstetter, Penick and Yager, 1983).

An interesting phenomena can be observed in Table 4. The most time spent in teaching science is during mid-week. Both Monday and Friday appear to be days with the lowest amount of time devoted to the teaching of science.

The make-up in respect to gender of the faculty members in the present study was, as in the South Dakota study, principally female. There was twice the number of males reported in the present study compared to the South Dakota study. However, only six percent of the teachers in the study reported being male.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the present study was to replicate the South Dakota study to observe any differences in the reported science teaching practices of the K-4 teachers in a nine-school project which participated in an NSF-SSI project during the past three years. The South Dakota study which took place approximately three years ago was used as a source of baseline data as it was based on a state sample. The areas of interest were predominant science teaching methods, time spent teaching science per week and frequencies of hands-on science teaching methodologies employed.

While there were minor differences in rankings of the methodologies, the differences were not major, with the exception of hands-on science teaching activities. In the South Dakota study, hands-on science experiments were ranked in fifth place as to choice of teaching methodologies compared to second place in the present study. However, the differences in the percentages of teachers choosing this method of teaching were not significantly different. Both groups of teachers reported using class/group discussion not based on the textbook as the most frequently used activity.

More time was reported as being spent on teaching science in the present study than reported in the South Dakota study. Teachers in the present study reported teaching science on an average of 144 minutes per week compared to the teachers in the South Dakota study.

From the perspective of hard data, there does not appear to be any significant differences between the two studies in the areas under report. However, hands-on science activities rank higher as the methodology of choice in respect to the other methodologies reported in the present study. In personal comments furnished by the reporting teachers, there did seem to be a high awareness of the need to teach science more, and to teach it utilizing the hands-on/inquiry approach.

References

AAAS (1989). SCIENCE For All Americans A Project 2061 Report On Literacy Goals in Science, Mathematics, and Technology Sciences. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Bellucci, J. T. (1973). Science Teaching in Pennsylvania Public Elementary Schools: A report. Wilkes, PA: PA Educational Development Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 101 934).

Bonnstetter, R.; Penick, J.; & Yager, R. (1983). As cited in Matthew, K. L. M. (1993). A survey of methodologies used to teach science in South Dakota public schools K-4. Unpublished Dissertation. 28-31.

Boyer, E.L. (1983). High School: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Bredderman, T. (1983). Effects of activity-based elementary science on student outcomes: A quantitative analysis. Review of Educational Research, 53(4), 499-518.

Carnegie Corporation of New York. (1983). Education and economic progress. Toward a national education policy: The federal role. New York: The Corporation.

Center for the Assessment of Educational Progress, Educational Testing Service. (1987) The subtle danger: Reflections on the literacy abilities of America's Young Adults. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Champagne, Audrey B., ed. (1988). Science teaching: Making the system work. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Coble, C.R. & Rice, D.R. (1979). A project to promote elementary science in North Carolina, Part 1: Awareness. School Science and mathematics, 88 (8), 661-666.

Foderaro, L.W. (1990, January 7). High hopes. The New York Times:

Gagne, E.D. (1985). The Cognitive Psychology of School Learning. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Hofwolt, C.A. (1984). What can teachers do to **increase** their effectiveness in the science classroom. Are there methods and instructional strategies that are more effective than what teachers currently use? In D. Holdzkom and P. Lutz (Eds),

Research Within Reach: Science Education (pp.43-57). Washington, DC: NSTA.

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. (1987). The underachieving curriculum: A national report on the Second International Mathematics Study. Champaign, Ill: Stipes Publishing.

Matthew, K. L. M. (1993). A survey of methodologies used to teach science in South Dakota public schools K-4. Unpublished Dissertation.

Mechling K.R. and Oliver, D.L. (1983). Activities, **not textbooks:** What research says about science programs. PrinciPal, 62(4), 41-43.

Mullis, I. V.S. & Jenkins, L. B. (1988). The science report card, elements of risk and discovery: Trends and achievement based on the 1986 National Assessment. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

National Governors' Association. (1987). Making America work. Bringing down the barriers. Productive people productive policies. Washington, DC: The Association.

National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science, and Technology. (1983). Education Americans for the 21st Century: A report to the American people and the National Science Board.

NSTA (1992). Scope, Sequence And Coordination of Secondary School Science Volume I, THE CONTENT CORE, A Guide For Curriculum Designers. Wash., D. C.: National Science.

Shymansky, J.A.; Kyle, W.C.; and Alport, J.M. (1983). The effects of new science curricula on student performance. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 20(5), 387-404.

Science terms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, Vol 22, No. 4, 359-64.

Table 1

Averaged Methodology Occurrences for K-4

In descending Order According to the Present Study

Methodology	South Dakota Study	Present Study
Class/group discussion **not** based on the text	15%	15%
Students did a hands-on science experiment	10%	14%
Class/group discussion based on the textbook	15%	11%
Integration of science into other subject areas	12%	10%
Used a textbook: Student read aloud/silently	11%	9%
Students completed worksheets/workbooks		7%9%
Teacher demonstration completed for students	6%	8%
Students watched a TV/video program on science	5%	7%
Outside reading like Ranger Rick/Weekly Reader	7%	5%
Students acted out parts or did simulations		5%4%
Other	1%	4%
Students listened to cassettes/looked at slides	3%	2%
Students took a test (or reviewed for test)		2%1%
Class field trip	1%	1%

Table 2

Averaged Methodology Occurrences for K-4 per day

In descending Order (Present Study)

Methodology	Occurrence M	T	W	R	F
Class/group discussion **not** based on the text	16	21	21	19	15
Students did a hands-on science experiment	12	23	21	23	11
Class/group discussion based on the textbook	17	21	15	12	8
Integration of science into other subject areas	12	15	12	13	11
Used a textbook: Student read aloud/silently	19	13	11	11	3
Students completed worksheets/workbooks	11	12	9	15	10
Teacher demonstration completed for students	8	18	14	11	3
Students watched a TV/video program on science	8	10	16	7	6
Outside reading like Ranger Rick/Weekly Reader	4	2	1	6	11
Students acted out parts or did simulations	3	10	5	7	3
Other	2	3	5	4	3
Students listened to cassettes/looked at slides	2	6	5	2	0
Students took a test (or reviewed for test)	1	1	0	2	2
Class field trip	0	1	2	1	1

Table 3

Average Minutes of Weekly Science Instruction Grades K-4

Study	Week 1	Week 2	Average/Week
Present Study	134	155	144
South Dakota Study	107	111	109

Table 4

Average Minutes of Science Instruction During Days of Week Grades K-4

(Present Study)

M	T	W	R	F
27	32	34	33	21

Table 5

Demographic question #1: I am a: male, female

Gender of the Science Teachers	South Dakota Study	Present Study
Male	3%	6%
Female	97%	94%

THE OPINIONS OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS ABOUT INCLUSION

Garreth G. Zalud
Associate Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Robert W. wood
Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Sherry Feinstein
Assistant Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

The concept of least restrictive placement of students with disabilities has been around for more than twenty years. This idea was first introduced as a legal requirement for schools in the Individuals With Disabilities Act of 1975. As a natural social result of this law's requirements, educators began discussing and applying the principals in a practice which was referred to as mainstreaming when the placement of a student with exceptional needs involved a regular classroom setting.

More recently, a segment of professional educators have advocated that the concept of a continuum of services in which different levels of restrictive placements (or least restrictive placements) exists is not appropriate for students with disabilities. They support a notion of full inclusion of students with disabilities in regular education classrooms. Full inclusion (Rogers, 1993) has been described as "the belief that instructional practices and technological supports are presently available to accommodate all students in the schools and classrooms they would otherwise attend if not disabled. Proponents of full inclusion tend to encourage that special education services generally be delivered in the form of training and technical assistance to 'regular' classroom teachers." (p. 2).

This debate has serious implications for the future of special education. At a minimum, if accepted, full inclusion will affect the training of special education teachers, and their role in the service delivery process. At a maximum, full inclusion could represent the process that results in the dismantling of special education (Smith & Luckasson, 1995). Differences of opinion exist among professionals in both special education and regular education.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to survey elementary principals in South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Minnesota with regard to their opinions about inclusion.

THE METHOD

In order to select participants for the research, 400 public elementary school principals were randomly selected from the published educational directories for the States of South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Iowa to participate in the study. A total of 100 principals for each state were targeted as participants. Participation was voluntary, and of the 400 principals contacted, 239, or 59.75 percent of those contacted, participated in the research by completing and returning the survey.

A seven-question postcard survey (Appendix A) was designed to solicit opinions about various aspects of inclusion. Participants were asked to read and respond to each

item on the survey. Issues raised by the survey focused on the percentage of classes incorporating inclusion, the value of inclusion to students, teacher support for inclusion, teacher training for inclusion, and positive or negative aspects of inclusion. This survey was completed by circling or checking appropriate responses and by responding with comments. Each survey was coded so the investigators could classify information by state. The data was combined for analysis.

FINDINGS

The first survey question focused on the percentage of classes within the school that were inclusive. Responses to this question are summarized in Table 1. Forty-two percent of the total responses indicated that 100 percent of their classes were incorporating inclusion. In three of the four states, this was the most frequent response to the question. Twenty-two of the total responses indicated that 75 percent of their classes were inclusive. Eighteen percent of the total responses indicated that 25 percent of the classes were practicing inclusion. Minnesota had the highest rate of inclusion (69.9%) of the states surveyed.

The second question on the survey examined principal support for inclusion in their respective schools. Responses to this question indicated that the majority of principals in all four states supported inclusion. In three of the four states, more than eighty percent of the responses were either moderately or extremely favorable in support of inclusion. As a group, forty-four percent of the principals indicated extreme support and thirty-nine percent responded with a moderately favorable position.

Principals in Iowa were slightly less likely to favor inclusion. Of these principals, 23.3 percent indicated only a slightly favorable position, 28.4 percent indicated a moderately favorable position, and 38.3% percent stated they were extremely favorable in their support of inclusion. Table 2 summarizes the responses to this question.

Principals' perceptions of their teachers' support for inclusion was examined next in the survey. Principals tended to rank the support of teachers for inclusion in a favorable manner. Forty-nine percent of the total responses indicated a moderately favorable response and twenty percent of the responses indicated an extremely favorable response. In all four states the most frequent response was moderately favorable. Table 3 summarizes the data for this question.

The next question asked principals to rank the value of inclusion as it relates to the social needs of children with exceptionalities. As a total group and in each of the states, principals indicated inclusion is valuable socially to the special needs child.

Over ninety percent of the time, responses were in the top two categories. Table 4 summarizes the data from this question.

When asked about the value of inclusion to the academic needs of students with special needs, principals tended to respond more frequently with the middle two categories. As a group, 40 percent of the principals rated inclusion as moderately valuable to the academic needs of special students and 29 percent of the principals rated the value of inclusion to special students needs as being slightly valuable. Table 5 summarizes data for this question.

The principals were next asked to rate the value of inclusion to the social needs of non special needs children. Forty-six percent of the group of principals indicated that inclusion was extremely valuable to the social needs of non special needs children. Thirty-two percent of the total group indicated that inclusion was moderately valuable to the social needs of the non special needs children.

Principals in Nebraska tended to evaluate the value of inclusion on this factor slightly different that those in the other states. These principals tended to be more evenly spread across three categories in their ranking: slightly valuable, moderately valuable, and extremely valuable. Table 6 summarizes the data for this question.

The next question on the survey asked principals to rate the value of inclusion to the academic needs of non special needs children. Responses to this question were relatively even across all four categories. Twenty-one percent of the principals felt that their was no value associated with inclusion and the academic needs of non special needs children. Twenty-six percent of the group indicated the value was only slight. Thirty-one percent of the principals indicated a moderate value. Nineteen percent of the principals stated the value to be extreme. Table 7 summarizes the data for this question.

The next question on the survey asked principals to indicate the types of training their staff has received with regard to inclusion. Principals were asked to check all the types of training that applied to their schools and then to comment on types which were not listed on the survey. Responses indicated the most frequent type of training received was inservices, followed by conferences and workshops. There was more of a prevalence for college courses in Minnesota than in the other states surveyed. Additional types of training in inclusion were indicated by the comments of principals and are summarized in Table 8.

The final portion of the survey asked principals to comment on inclusion. Principals were asked to make positive and negative comments about the practices of

inclusion in their schools. The comments of the principals are summarized in Table 9.

DISCUSSION

The comments written by the responding elementary school principals and the data gathered lead us to conclude that principals in the four state region generally are supportive of the notion of inclusion. Additionally, these principals tend to believe that teachers in their respective schools also favor inclusion. The benefits of inclusion to the special needs children are viewed more strongly as social than as academic by these principals. The same can be said of the benefits of inclusion for the non special needs children. Principals tended to indicate social benefits more strongly than academic benefits when describing how inclusion relates to non special needs children.

Training for inclusion was reported to be similar in all four states surveyed. Generally, teachers are learning about inclusion through inservices, conferences, and workshops. To a lesser degree, college course work is also cited as a way that learning is taking place.

The principals' comments reflected a wide variety of opinions about inclusion. Common negative themes focused on the need for training, funding, fairness to non special needs children in the classroom, behavior problems of special needs children, and the appropriateness of inclusion for every child. Positive themes included the social benefits to students, the value of diversity in the classroom, the team work developed between faculty, and the reduction of labeling students.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It would seem that the principals and teachers in this region are supportive of inclusion, however, individual comments reflect concern over implementation practices. Based on the data and the comments, the following recommendations are made:

1. Schools, universities, and service units should make concentrated efforts to support implementation of inclusion through continuing education opportunities, workshops, inservices, and on site visits.
2. Efforts should be made to train regular teachers in ways to deal with the unique behavior problems associated with students with special needs.
3. Debate should continue with regard to the benefits of full inclusion versus pull out programs.
4. Efforts should be made to insure that adequate support, financial and personnel, are available before inclusion is attempted.
5. Additional research regarding positive practices and problems associated with

inclusion should be conducted and reported.

Inclusion currently is advocated by many. The implementation, however, is not without problems. In order for inclusion to work successfully, the knowledge base about perceptions and positive practices must be expanded.

Table 1

What percentage of classes in your school incorporate inclusion?

Percent-age	Total n %	NE n %	MN n %	IA n %	SD n %
0	10 4%	2 3.9%	1 1.9%	5 8.3	2 2.7%
25	44 18%	12 23.6%	1 1.9%	20 33.3%	11 14.7%
50	19 8%	3 5.9%	4 7.5%	5 8.3%	7 9.3%
75	52 22%	11 21.5%	5 9.4%	11 18.4%	25 33.3%
100	100 42%	21 41.2%	37 69.9%	15 25%	27 36%
No Answer	14 6%	2 3.9%	5 9.4%	4 6.7%	3 4%

NE - Nebraska
MN - Minnesota
IA - Iowa
SD - South Dakota

Table 2

How favorable are you in your support of inclusion?

Response	Total n %	NE n %	MN n %	IA n %	SD n %
Not 1	7 3%	1 2%	0 0%	6 10%	0 0%
2	31 13%	7 13.6%	1 1.9%	14 23.3%	9 12%
3	92 39%	21 41.2%	22 41.5%	17 28.4%	32 42.7%
Extreme-ly 4	106 44%	21 41.2%	30 56.6%	23 38.3%	32 42.7%
No Answer	3 1%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	2 2.6%

NE - Nebraska
MN - Minnesota
IA - Iowa
SD - South Dakota

Table 3

How favorable are your teachers in their support of inclusion?

Response	Total n %	NE n %	MN n %	IA n %	SD n %
Not 1	9 4%	1 2%	0 0%	6 10%	2 2.7%
2	57 24%	17 33.3%	5 9.4%	19 31.7%	16 21.3%
3	119 49%	23 45.1%	31 58.5%	27 45%	38 50.6%
Extreme-ly 4	47 20%	8 15.7%	15 28.3%	7 11.7%	17 22.7%
No Answer	7 3%	2 3.9%	2 3.8%	1 1.6%	2 2.7%

NE - Nebraska
MN - Minnesota
IA - Iowa
SD - South Dakota

Table 4

How valuable is inclusion to the special needs child (socially)?

Response	Total n %	NE n %	MN n %	IA n %	SD n %
Not 1	4 2%	2 3.9%	0 0%	2 3%	0 0%
2	8 3%	1 2%	1 1.9%	3 5%	3 4%
3	80 33%	21 41.2%	12 22.6%	24 40%	23 30.6%
Extreme-ly 4	143 60%	26 50.9%	39 73.6%	31 52%	47 62.7%
No Answer	4 2%	1 2%	1 1.9%	0 0%	2 2.8%

NE - Nebraska
MN - Minnesota
IA - Iowa
SD - South Dakota

Table 5

How valuable is inclusion to the special needs child (academically)?

Response	Total n %	NE n %	MN n %	IA n %	SD n %
Not 1	27 11%	2 3.9%	1 1.9%	16 26.6%	8 10.6%
2	69 29%	16 31.5%	13 24.5%	11 18.4%	29 38.6%
3	96 40%	23 45.1%	22 41.5%	25 41.6%	26 34.7%
Extreme-ly 4	38 16%	7 13.6%	14 26.4%	7 11.7%	10 13.3%
No Answer	9 4%	3 5.9%	3 5.7%	1 1.7%	2 2.7%

NE - Nebraska
MN - Minnesota
IA - Iowa
SD - South Dakota

Table 6

How valuable is inclusion to the non special needs child (socially)?

Response	Total n %	NE n %	MN n %	IA n %	SD n %
Not 1	12 5%	4 7.8%	0 0%	4 6.7%	4 5.4%
2	35 15%	14 27.5%	2 3.8%	9 15%	10 13.3%
3	77 32%	17 33.4%	19 35.8%	19 31.6%	22 29.3%
Extreme-ly 4	109 46%	15 29.3%	30 56.6%	27 45%	37 49.3%
No Answer	6 2%	1 2.0%	2 3.8%	1 1.7%	2 2.7%

NE - Nebraska
MN - Minnesota
IA - Iowa
SD - South Dakota

Table 7

How valuable is inclusion to the non special needs child (academically)?

Response	Total n %	NE n %	MN n %	IA n %	SD n %
Not 1	50 21%	11 21.6%	7 13.2%	16 26.6%	16 21.3%
2	62 26%	15 29.4%	14 26.4%	14 23.3%	19 25.3%
3	75 31%	14 27.5%	14 26.4%	20 33.3%	27 36%
Extreme-ly 4	45 19%	8 15.7%	16 30.2%	10 16.8%	11 14.7%
No Answer	7 3%	3 5.8%	2 3.8%	0 0%	2 2.7%

NE - Nebraska
MN - Minnesota
IA - Iowa
SD - South Dakota

Table 8

What types of inclusion training has your faculty received?

Response	Total n %	NE n %	MN n %	IA n %	SD n %
Conferences	155 65%	30 58.8%	31 58.5%	44 73.3%	50 66.7%
College courses	70 29%	12 23.5%	22 41.5%	12 20%	24 32%
Inservice	195 82%	44 86.2%	46 86.8%	45 75%	60 80%
Workshops	148 62%	31 60.8%	38 71.7%	37 61.7%	42 56%
Other	29 12%	5 9.8%	9 17%	9 15%	6 8%

** Percentages do not equal 100% due to respondents' ability to respond to more than one category.

* Minnesota: Other types of training received: special ed coop, special ed staff have inserviced our regular ed staff, much in school discussion, all is in a piecemeal, individual basis- not as a whole staff, pamphlets

* Nebraska: Other types of training received: literature, hands on experience, none, school sponsored workshops and training

* South Dakota: Other types of training received: video, bulletins, articles, on site visits, none, training through coop, a grant with BHSU

* Iowa: Other types of training: literature, actual inclusion support coaching, visitation to other schools, very little, none, on site visits, on our own (reading), individual involvement varies

NE - Nebraska
MN - Minnesota
IA - Iowa
SD - South Dakota

Table 9

Comments regarding inclusion:

Negative comments

- I feel inclusion is overused, I don't feel we can focus on student needs well enough
- Inclusion works with some students, it does not work with severely handicapped students. Each case needs to be evaluated individually
- Teacher time taken to meet academic needs of MMI students detracts from reg. ed.
- Not all students can handle inclusion all of the time - use COMMON SENSE to benefit everyone
- some academic skills just can't be adapted
- Negative - disruptive behaviors
- time consuming to collaborate to plan modifications
- Classroom not using authentic teaching, are not effective for handicapped students
- Spec. ed. teachers are pressured to work w unmanageably (sic) groups of students. Inclusion requires more, not less, staff.
- EBD students are very difficult, an on site specialist would be helpful (-) What rights do non EBD students have?
- distracting, especially for students that have difficulty focusing
- Neg. - resources/ scheduling
- Low incidence (extreme disability) sometimes of questionable benefit (socially or cognitive)
- Difficult only with severe EBD students where safety of child & others is a problem.
- Academic classes are difficult with students who have moderate to severe mentally
- Depending on disability, academics may be hindered for both mainstream class & inclusion student
- It takes time to keep special students on track - time away from regular students.
- EBD students in a discipline incident may take time away from Reg. Ed students
- Sometimes the regular ed classroom is not the best place for a special needs student. (behaviors, distractions, etc)
- Parents of some reg ed students are apprehensive about having their children in classes or rooms with spec. needs students
- Negative - scheduling - there are exceptions.
- Negative - We need more time and money to do this well
  Negative - Behavior of one student disrupts all students
- Some special needs students need life skills rather than academic skills.

Positive comments

- Self esteem for all students is a high priority
- Positives are for students, staff & parents. Challenges include preparing staff for a variety of special needs
- EBD has been our most recent challenge. The implementation of a school based elementary day treatment program school wide conflict resolution & peer mediation helped. Also- we hired a wonderful social worker
- Classroom teachers have persons to help them with their students who are in the class. This is necessary for the inclusion model
- Positive - good for special needs students social skills.
- All kids- reg ed and special ed - are unique, and deserve the best. We try to provide it for them. Our philosophy of inclusion is entitled "Common Sense". While all kids should be included, some are not mainstreamed due to unique circumstances. All the players are considered
- Children included in reg. ed activities feel more acceptance by their peers. Improved academic skills.
- Time for joint planning between special ed and regular ed staff!
- Reflectives (sic) real world. Students learn best from each other.
- The sensitivity of students toward handicap students has improved tremendously. We are working to improve our model
- Teachers are beginning to form collaborative partnerships. Students have more options to pull-out or self contained classrooms
- Positive- student acceptance of others, sharing, helping out, cooperative grouping, good experiences for all children.
- When it works it is great!
- We are pleased with our decision to make every inclusion decision based on the needs of the child. ALL children w special need have some time in the mainstream. Very few special needs children have no time out of the classroom.
- Takes time, effort, etc, etc
- Inclusion - more realistic reflection of society - tolerance and acceptance of others.
- Pos. - we really work as teams.
- Both the special needs & non special needs learn from each other (respect) Excellent in development of social skills of typical & sped students
- Very positive social benefits - all students.
- Inclusion for the sake of inclusion is not appropriate. Inclusion to provide relevant social, emotional, and academic support that is supported by a special educ. team is relevant
- (+) appreciation for diversity.
- Children learn from each other We are not all the same.
- Very positive except in severe cases

- We have to look at what is best and most appropriate for each child.
- Self esteem of special needs students is boosted greatly.
  Positive - more and better interaction of all children
- Positive - very beneficial for higher functioning students. Negatives - limited staffing for severe need students
- I am new this year, and I'm just beginning to encourage my staff to do more inclusion.
  I hope to do more next year
  Great for interaction

Nebraska

Negative comments

- teachers teaching as they did 15 years ago.
- Limited staff
- Only concern (& practice) is that it is not for ALL students (i.e. ADHD- some students).
- We use it largely (unfortunately) due to district parents' reluctance to "pull out" their children from the regular class
- When teachers take class time to "monitor and adjust" for special needs students they come up short for "regular" class time. What is being taught is not relevant to several in the classroom
- If we do inclusion we limit our SPED staff from doing pull out
- Disruptions by spec needs students are numerous.
- Too much time needed by classroom teacher for spec needs kids at the expense of regular ed students
- Moderate to mild students benefit greatly- severe loose total attention needed
  (-) Training, lack of support staff, budget cuts
- Neither the time or money to give the staff for the extra planning that needs to be done so as to have inclusion done the way it is supposed to be
- Many scheduling problems
- Lacks one-on-one attention
- Teacher planning and preparation time needs to increase from current levels to effectively promote its effectiveness
- It's good for SPED students but generally distracting for non SPED students.
- Inclusion is OK as long as they do not include B.D. students
- Most are willing to do it. Planning time is the biggest problem.
- No training set up for teachers out of school
- Academically, inclusion is a 50/50 proposition. Socially, it is 100% in my opinion. It has a negative effect on other students to a larger degree- (held up, etc.). However, free and equal does not mean free and appropriate in my opinion.

- Scheduling, management, personnel (enough of them) & coordination are difficult
- Teachers find it difficult to work with support staff in classroom because of limited time for planning

Positive comments

- Sp Ed is viewed as a service not a place / higher standards for sped-their curriculum is our gen ed curriculum.
- It still depends on each individual student's needs
- Allows regular ed students to peer model & "teach" SPED children. Promotes growth in teaching strategies/team teaching
- the focus is on the individual and their needs
- Awareness, social support, self well being & appreciation for all.
- Better education for the child.
- Keeps student in classroom (social).
- We use an aide to work with each classroom teacher during scheduled times. They work w/ sped as well as others in need. It takes the right kind of personality to do this
- Inclusion in our school tries to be appropriate for the child and we vary the time and class to fit
- It has allowed us to form appropriate sub groups
- Positive self concept means low drop out rate in high school
- We view each child's' needs as the determiner for inclusion. Some are included 99% - some only 30%. Physical needs are also a determiner as to what can be provided.
- Scheduling time for inclusion "in class" and for planning have been our biggest obstacles. The teachers have been slow to accept this method, but they are coming along
- Depends on degree of handicap.
- Helps regular students understand. SPED students gain self esteem

South Dakota

Negative comments

- Not enough personnel $$$'s are not there.
- Lack of staff - negative.
- It only works if the teachers are 100% in favor and willing to adapt their methods and materials.
- Negative - teachers are not sure how to deal with it - need more training - no money to do it

- the ed. pendulum should not swing to full inclusion. Our goal should be to meet total needs of all students and design programs to do so. Educators need to use what is effective not worry about the latest buzz word or fad!
- Staff feels threatened by extra teacher in classroom
- Strong PR efforts are needed so that Reg. Ed parents are accepting of challenged children
- Negative: 1. takes time away from other students also in need. 2. Does not address education issues of SPED kids.
- Prejudice is difficult to overcome for both parents & students
- When there is a behavior disability I don't see the advantage for the student or the class to include that student in the regular classroom when his misbehavior is disruptive
- It's not appropriate for all students - some teachers need to realize that the focus needs to remain of the sp. ed child in the classroom. Teachers need to avoid using sp. ed. tchr only like an aide.
- If a child is disruptive, all suffer
- I believe that the original law of least restrictive environment should be the criteria to determine the child's placement in an appropriate program. Placing students for the sake of inclusion is not always meeting needs.
- Lack of teacher training, lack of teacher time, positive peer interactions
- severe sped students are not included but LD and EMH are. Some teachers are hesitant to do the modifications necessary. there needs to be a lot of support given to classroom teachers socially - it really is necessary.
- still searching for effective models and a solid research base.
- We have begun using the label "inclusion" with our title 1 kids served in the reg room. No thanks!
- Depends on severity of disability - inclusion good for less severe. Sometimes with the more severe child, no one wins w/ inclusion.
- Negative - time it takes to make inclusion successful.
- Most difficult is the attitude of the reg. ed. staff
- Can slow down entire class/disrupt if there are behavior problems. Meeting the needs of 1 at the expense of many
- Socially it is very positive for the special needs but I work hard to ensure that the non special needs students do not receive a poorer education
- It is extremely tough for teacher with little Sp. Ed. skills to do it justice.

Positive comments

- It will not necessarily save $ if it is done properly. It teaches strategies that are good for all students. Uses group process skills that all students need.
- Administration support - (100%) positive

- Preparing teachers, public, Boards of Educ. to accept, understand concept, and to know there are some students for which inclusion may not be appropriate.
- More aides would be nice
- Positive - student without disabilities are more accepting.
- The longer we've used inclusion the easier everything correlates. Certain students are more difficult to accommodate.
- Positive - develops acceptance of differences. no negatives
- If IEP's are to meet needs of that individual child, there should be no need to focus on "inclusion" in itself. We include everyone unless they have obvious needs that the team decides cannot be met in the classroom
- Individual special needs children benefit as well as the non special needs children.
- Could use more support personnel.
- Most of our students are mild or LD so the inclusion is not a problem
- Inclusion is more adaptable in the primary grades
- Each child should be included on an individual bases. Full inclusion is not for all!
- develops a template for an integrated society and "true" civilization. Positive - students self esteem
- I rated the social aspect higher because it is important that we know our peers and can interact comfortably. The academic part depends on each individual and their capacity for learning.
- Sometimes inclusion is not humanly possible. People need to start to use their head.
- Students attend classroom in areas they can progress, like PE, music, art etc.
- Pos. Better communication between Reg. Ed & Sp. Services
- So far it is positive. It allows students to continue with their classmates. Less labeling.
- Is favorable for most children. But there are those that this doesn't work - they are all individuals
- Keeps all kids with peers.
- (+) Social actions are needed. Staff gets a picture of the real world for these children.
- If not disruptive (student), it is OK.
- Schedules sometimes limit the amount of inclusion that can be done.
- Positive - Working relationship amongst staff, social development of learner. Academic progress of others through incidental learning.
- Good communication & teamwork between everyone have been the keys to a positive situation. One frustration has been selecting "the right persons" to work as teachers' aides. In the beginning getting good communication & teamwork established a "we can do it" attitude was difficult
- giving the classroom teacher support (aides, in-service, resources) to make inclusion work!

Iowa

Negative comments

- Parents are overly zealous & idealistic
- We mainstream Severely Impaired children at grades 4-5 because that what we have (sic). Resource time too limited.
- If you have a small class, yet 3 that are Sp Ed it pulls the other down
- Con: Providing time for direct service pull out as needed.
- disrupts classroom, takes time away from others
- Inclusion not for everyone. Hard to place S & P kid in upper grades - conflict w/ Dev. Approp. Practices - Age/Stage
- Most negative responses are because the children disrupt the regular ed. rooms
- Neg. results if not carefully placed
- not enough time to prepare, T's lacking skills in meeting range of need, students w/ need take away time from class as whole.
- Requires extra staff. Is unrealistic in approach when "real world" parameters are considered.
- Neg: time it takes from teacher & learning of other students
- Not fully understood. Teachers not trained well enough
- Harder for teachers to adapt to special needs students.
- Teacher stress, Parent concerns (Reg. Ed)
- lack of training, staffing
- Inclusion usually is expensive to operate. Inclusion of BD students is inappropriate usually and unfair to others.
- Not enough assoc support to make academic goals. Lack of time for staff training/planning
- Easy for hearing impaired & phys. hand. Harder for LD, MD, especially in upper grades - costly.
- Negative: not enough time for staff planning
- Not for disruptive student.
- The problem is the definition of inclusion. We believe in an appropriate inclusive setting for all students, both ends of the bell curve TAG & Sp Ed!
- Negative feelings toward full inclusion - particularly behavior identified students
- Hard for teacher to deal with because of large classes
- Not feasible
- Not enough training for SpEd teachers & Regular Ed teachers
- Some parent resistance early on (reg. ed.), cost of certain staff ratio
- Some students don't function in large group & need pull outs.

Positive comments

- We do not include students if it is not appropriate
- The benefits of inclusion must be determined case by case. A school with 100% inclusion is more expensive to staff. Someone needs to be an advocate for the middle child!
- Best meeting each student's needs.
- "true" heterogenous groupings, like society, good role models for special needs.
- Positive: social/academic. (+) increased tolerance for differences, more T communication/collegiality, reduction of stigma attached to pull out students
- Our students are non-labeled, students w/ special needs have an IEP and we use teachers aides and spec. teachers to deliver services through RSDS.
- Reduced stigma, social gains.
- Very good for students included to be part of school.
- We haven't had anyone who fits this situation
- social experiences for sp ed student, feel a part of the group, better parent attitude
- social & academic, increased adult support.
- increased social skills, self esteem, academic learning
- Will work with aide help. Social benefits.
- Positive: reducing negative stigma on special needs kids. Negative: misunderstanding of what it is & how it can help the teachers and the students!
- Pos. Socially interaction with mainstream students.
- SP.ED. teachers work in the classroom and pull out when needed. The goal, however, is to return to the classroom quickly. We are not <u>full</u> inclusion as some students need pull out time, but <u>most</u> students are successfully included
- Students learn about ind. differences and to assist each other.
- Positive in a small school setting
- Some can be served adequately in reg. ed.

References

Rogers, J. (1993). The inclusion revolution. *The Research Bulletin*, 11, 1-6.

Smith, D. D. & Luckasson, R. (1995) Introduction to Special Education. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Appendix A

Dear Principal: Please rank the appropriate response to each of the questions below. Thank you.

In your school.....

1. What percentage of classes incorporate inclusion?

   0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

2. How favorable are you in your of inclusion?

   Not 1 2 3 4 Extremely

3. How favorable are your teachers in their support of inclusion?

   Not 1 2 3 4 Extremely

4. How valuable is inclusion to the special needs child?

   Socially: Not 1 2 3 4 Extremely

   Academically: Not 1 2 3 4 Extremely

5. How valuable is inclusion to the non special needs children:

   Socially: Not 1 2 3 4 Extremely

   Academically: Not 1 2 3 4 Extremely

6. Check the type(s) of training your faculty has received regarding inclusion.

   ___ conferences

   ___ college course work

   ___ inservices
   ___ workshops

   ___ other (please explain)

7. List positive and negative aspects of inclusion as it exists at your school.

SOUTH DAKOTA TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS

Sheryl Feinstein
Instructor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Lynne Roach
Director
Center on Economic Education
University of South Dakota

Robert W. Wood
Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

The topic of juvenile violence is of great concern in our schools, our state, and the nation. (Mulhern, Sean, et al, 1994) The U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (1993) recently released a statistical summary of juvenile offenders and victims, with the focus being youth violence. Juvenile violent crime arrest rates dramatically increased from 1988 to 1992. If that trend continues, by the year 2010, juvenile arrests for violent crimes will double. This alarming information must be tempered with the knowledge that the vast majority of juveniles are law-abiding. Ten percent of juveniles are involved in any crime, and only one half of one-percent (0.5%) are involved in violent crimes.

In 1991 thefts and violent crimes at or near schools had reached 3 million a year and 20% of high school students carried some type of weapon (McCart, 1994). Violence in schools impacts both students and teachers "...physically, psychologically, and academically" (NY State Education Department, 1994, p. 10). However, schools, because of their place in society and their involvement with youth, can play an important role in setting trends, developing strategies, and implementing protective factors that can counter instances of violence in schools (Cooledge, et al, 1995; McCart, 1994; NY State Education Department, 1994).

When looking at violence in schools nationwide, several questions arise. Is violence a problem in rural states such as South Dakota? If so, what types of violence are most prevalent? What are schools doing to provide training for teachers? What programs are being offered to teach students alternative ways to deal with conflict?

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This research study was exploratory in nature. It was modified from the 26th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallop Poll of the Public's Attitude toward the Public Schools. The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of South Dakota educators towards violence in their school. A survey consisting of eleven questions was developed and distributed to 40 individuals. Participants were chosen on the basis of their involvement in social studies and special interest in law-related education. Of the 40 surveys distributed, 25 were useable. This represents a 62% response rate. The data analysis is reported in percentages for each of the questions.

FINDINGS

The first three questions obtained demographic information concerning the respondents. Seventy-six percent (76%) were teachers while the remaining individuals were students, counselors, and non-educators closely associated with law and schools. Responses by their categories are shown in Table 1. The majority of

respondents in education were involved at the high school level (44%), with middle school/jr. high (20%) and elementary school (16%) having nearly equal representation. Responses by specific categories are shown in Table 2. School were nearly evenly divided between urban and rural locations. Responses by location are shown in Table 3.

Table 4 indicates the perceived degree of violence among students. There was a general consensus that there was either no problem or a small problem in the participants' schools. However, twenty-four percent marked either a 4 or a 5 on the Likert scale, indicating that they perceived the degree of violence to be on the very serious range of the continuum. Of those believing there was a serious degree of violence, half were rural and half were urban in location.

When asked if there had been a change in the level of violence at their perspective school, forty-four percent perceived an increase, forty-eight percent perceived it remaining the same, and no one perceived it as decreasing. Eight percent did not respond to the question. The data is reported by category in Table 5.

The type of violence most often cited to occur in schools was verbal insults (92%), with the next most prevalent area being fighting (72%). One individual believed violence to be racially motivated. Respondents were allowed to choose more than one category, so the total does not equal one-hundred percent.

When asked where most acts of violence occurred, forty-four percent believed they occurred in the school building as opposed to surrounding areas or on the school bus. Table 7 presents the data.

Question eight queried the amount of effort that was spent on addressing violence in their school. Over half (52%) of the respondents believed that it was less than adequate.

Question nine asked, "In your opinion, what are the causes for the increased violence in our nation's schools?" Participants were allowed to check more than one category. Those areas receiving the greatest frequency of responses were as follows: breakdown of family (84%), increase use of drugs/alcohol (80%), desensitized attitudes towards violence (76%), and increase in media violence (72%).

Table 10 reflects the steps schools have taken to stop or reduce violence in or around their school. The majority of respondents said their schools had suspended or expelled students when they were violent (68%). Over one-third of the schools provided counseling (44%), started a disciplinary code (44%), and instituted some form

of dress code (44%). Participants were able to indicate more than one category so the total does not equal 100%.

The eleventh and final question stated, "Has your faculty received training in preventing youth violence within and outside of school?" Fifty-six percent had not received training. In identifying the training faculty received, respondents noted training in conflict resolution, peer mediation, and crisis intervention. See table 11 for responses by category.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Individuals involved in the social studies do not perceive violence as being a significant problem in their perspective schools. This is similar to findings of a study of South Dakota middle and secondary school administrators by Wood, et al (1994).

However, in an examination of what students in rural, northern Michigan worry about, Cooledge, et al (1995) pointed out that "[r]ural areas have not remained as isolated from urban problems as we wanted to believe (p. 36)." They found that violence ranked as one of the top five worries for rural students. Moreover, a 1993 Harris & Associates report for Metropolitan Life pointed out "...teacher and student experiences and perceptions frequently differ, with students seeing and fearing violence more than do teachers."

The juvenile violence that was noted in the present study tends not to be life threatening, usually involving verbal abuse and fighting as opposed to guns. This is consistent with the study by the Texas Independent School District (1995) which found that most offenses were simple assaults, intimidation, or disorderly conduct and involved hands, fists, and feet rather than weapons such as guns or knives. They also found that these type offenses were higher in rural districts than urban and suburban districts.

Respondents' perception of the causes for increased violence (breakdown of family, increased use of drugs/alcohol, desensitized attitudes towards violence, and increase in media violence) are consistent with that of research nationwide (Elam, 1993) and South Dakota administrators (Wood, et al, 1994). Research points to the negative influence of media violence on children's behavior (Thoman, 1995). Garnett (1994) in a discussion of "violence disguised as entertainment"stated, "The strongest predictor of how aggressive a young man would be at age nineteen was a preference for violent television programs at the age of eight."

Although research supports that violence prevention programs for students and

teachers helps reduce violence (Curwin, 1995; Garnett, 1994; Steinhart, 1994; Walker, 1995), it was interesting to note that 56% of respondents had received no training in violence prevention strategies. This, coupled with perceptions of most respondents (92%) that violence remains at a constant or escalating level and that more than one half of respondents don't think schools spend adequate time addressing violence, suggests that violence prevention programs for both students and teachers should be addressed by school administration. Wood, et al's (1994) study of South Dakota administrators also confirmed lack of student and teacher violence prevention programs.

Those schools who have taken steps to reduce violence appear to be using techniques that have proven successful in other school districts across the nation (Enger, et al, 1995). Techniques such as counseling, disciplinary and dress codes, school meetings, and alternative conflict resolution methods have produced positive results in violence reduction and school performance (Elam, et al, 1993; Harris & Assoc. 1993; U.S. Dept. Of Justice, 1993).

While the present status tends to be positive, there does appear to be a consensus that violence is increasing. Drugs and the media are identified as affecting violence and contributing to its increase at a national level. This suggests that those influences are also present in South Dakota. While schools have taken a number of steps to curb and prevent violence in their schools, most indicate that more needs to be done.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A more comprehensive study of teachers' perception of violence in schools be conducted of South Dakota K-12 teachers.

A study of students' perception of violence in schools be conducted of South Dakota K-12 students.

Research be conducted to determine if the perceptions of students differ from that of administrators and teachers.

More student and teacher violence prevention programs be integrated into all K-12 schools in South Dakota.

References

Cooledge, N. J., Barrons, M.F., Cline, L., Geller, P., Keeney, V., Meier, R. D., and Paul, D. M. (1995) Rural adolescents: Are their worlds and worries different? Schools in the Middle, 4(4), 34-37.

Curwin, R. L. (1995). A humane approach to reducing violence in schools. Educational Leadership, 52(5), 72-75.

Elam, S.M., Rose, L.C. & Gallup, A.M. (1994). The 26th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. PHI DELTA KAPPAN, 41-56.

Enger, J.M. and Others (1995). Violence prevention in the middle level curriculum. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 384 987).

Garnett, D. M. (1994). Dimensions of youth violence. In L. McCart (Ed.). Kids and violence. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 365 921).

Harris, Louis & Associates (1993). The Metropolitan Life survey of the American teacher 1993, violence in America's public schools. New York: Metropolitan Life.

Harris, P. (Ed.) (1994). Violence and the schools. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 380 520).

McCart, L. (Ed.) (1994). Kids and violence. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 365 921).

Mulhern, Sean and others. Preventing youth violence and aggression and promoting safety in schools. Madison, WI: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1994. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 368 989).

N.Y. State Education Department (1994). Violence in the schools: A national state and local crisis. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 367 757).

Sautter, R. C. (1995). Standing up to violence. PHI DELTA KAPPAN, K1-K12.

Steinhart, D. (1994). Strategies and programs for prevention of youth violence. In L. McCart (Ed.). Kids and violence. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 365 921).

Texas Education Agency (1995). Texas Independent School District crime report. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 382 914).

Thoman, E. (1995). Media violence: The search for solutions. Momentum, 26(1), 47-49.

United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1993). A comprehensive strategy for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders. Washington, D. C.

Walker, D. (1995). School violence prevention. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 379 786).

Wood, R.W., Zalud, G. G., and Hoag, C.L. (1994). Opinions of principals towards violence in schools. (ERIC Reproductive Service Document No. ED 387 466).

Table 1

What is your professional position?

Category	N	Percentage
Teacher	19	76.0
Administrator	0	0
Other*	6	24.0
Total	25	100.0

Other positions listed:

- Student (3)
- Counselor
- Attorney
- Drug Free Scholars Coordinator & LRE Coordinator

Table 2

What is your grade level?

Category	N	Percentage
Elementary	4	16.0
Middle School/Jr. High	5	20.0
High School	11	44.0
Other*	5	20.0
Total	25	100.0

*Other grades listed:

- All grades (2)
- Both Middle and High School
- K-12 & Adjudicated LRE program
- N/A

Table 3

My school location is considered:

Category	N	Percentage
Urban	10	40.0
Suburban	1	4.0
Rural	13	52.0
No Answer	1	4.0
Total	25	100.0

Table 4

On a scale of 1 to 5, indicate your opinion about the problem of violence among your students

Response Scale*	N	Percentage
1	6	24.0
2	7	28.0
3	5	20.0
4	5	20.0
5	1	4.0
No Answer	1	4.0
Total	25	100.0

*rank = 1 (not a problem) to 5 (very serious problem)

Table 5

In your opinion, during the past year, has the level of violence at your school:

Category	N	Percentage
Increased	11	44.0
Decreased	0	0
Stayed the Same	12	48.0
No Answer	2	8.0
Total	25	100.0

Table 6

What types of violence have you had in your school during the past five years?

Category	N	Percentage*
Fighting	18	72.0
Guns in School	2	8.0
Knives in school	7	28.0
Gang Activities	2	8.0
Racially Motivated	1	4.0
Verbal Insults	23	92.0

*Percentages will not equal 100% due to participants' ability to select more than one response.

Table 7

Where do you believe most acts of violence in your school occur?

Category	N	Percentage
In the School Building	11	44.0
In the School Neighborhood	4	16.0
On the School Grounds	7	28.0
On the School Bus	1	4.0
Other*	2	8.0
Total	25	100.0

*Other locations:

- In and around the building
- Throughout the school and neighborhood

Table 8

Do you think that the amount of effort spent on addressing violence in your school is:

Category	N	Percentage
More than Adequate	3	12.0
Adequate	7	28.0
Less than Adequate	13	52.0
No Answer	2	8.0
Total	25	100.0

Table 9

In your opinion, what are the causes for the increased violence in our nation's schools?

Category	N	Percentage*
Increase use of drugs/alcohol	20	80.0
Growth of youth gangs	11	44.0
Schools don't have authority to discipline	10	40.0
School curriculum is out of touch with needs of today's students	1	4.0
Cutbacks in school support programs	6	24.0
Racial or ethnic diversity	6	24.0
Boredom or lack of motivation to learn	13	52.0
Increase in media violence	18	72.0
Breakdown of family	21	84.0
Easy availability of weapons	9	36.0
Inability of school staff to resolve conflicts between students	6	24.0
Shortages in school personnel	2	8.0
Desensitized attitudes towards violence	19	76.0
Various achievement levels among students	4	16.0
Poverty	6	24.0
Other**	2	8.0

*Percentages will not equal 100% due to participants' ability to select more than one response.

**Other comments included:

- Change in parent support
- Combination of everything

Table 10

What kinds of steps has your school taken to stop or reduce violence in or around your school?

Category	N	Percentage*
Held meetings for class or entire school	8	32.0
Had visitors talk to class about crime and violence	8	32.0
Provided a hotline for students to call	2	8.0
Provided counseling for students and/or families	11	44.0
Conducted programs on alternative problem-solving methods	8	32.0
Started safety or antiviolence programs	1	4.0
Started a disciplinary code	11	44.0
Passed out brochures or pamphlets about violence prevention	4	16.0
Instituted or modified a dress code or banned certain types of clothing	9	36.0
Placed monitors in the hallways	3	12.0
Hired security guards or police in or around the school	2	8.0
Used metal detectors	0	0.0
Made random checks of book bags, backpacks, and/or lockers	8	32.0

Suspended or expelled students when they were violent	17	68.0
Conflict resolution program	5	20.0
School Court	3	12.0
Other**	2	8.0

*Percentages will not equal 100% due to participant's ability to select more than one response.

**Other comments:

- Students participate in Teen Court Program
- Support Group

Table 11

Has your faculty received training in preventing youth violence within and outside of school?

Category	N	Percentage
Yes	6	24.0
No	14	56.0
No Answer	5	20.0
Total	25	100.0

Comments:

- Nonviolence prevention training-Conflict resolution, peer mediation, bias prevention
- Don't know, new to system
- Crisis intervention by Dr. Fellner
- Dr. Fellner presented an Inservice on Crisis Intervention techniques. Al Rasmussen, Western Prevention Resource Center, presents frequently on violence prevention & conflict resolution
- Conflict resolution/Peer mediation
- Just started. District rec'd "Violence Funds", formed a committee and held one inservice

COMPETENCY PORTFOLIOS AND THEIR APPLICATION IN A PROFESSIONAL SETTING

Marilyn K. Urquhart
Assistant Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Lana M. Danielson
Assistant Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

INTRODUCTION

Alternative assessment has gained attention in recent years as a means by which to collect information about students' acquisition and application of knowledge in a systematic way, using the components of reflection, self-direction, and personal engagement in meaningful tasks as part of the evaluation of students' educational progress. The portfolio is one vehicle for implementing alternative assessment. It allows the teacher and student to share control over what learning is to be evaluated and how it will be documented thus the student assumes responsibility as evaluator, documenter, and planner of his or her learning (Jones, 1994; Urquhart & Danielson, 1994; Valencia, Hiebert, & Afflerbach, 1994; Sugarman, Allen, & Keller-Cogan, 1993; Wagner, Agnew, & Brock, 1993; Berry, Kisch, Ryan, and Uphoff, 1991; Tierney, Carter, and Desai, 1991).

The portfolio method focuses on production and demonstration of competency rather than on mere recall of isolated facts, facilitates projects that allow for depth and breadth rather than superficial coverage of content, provides a means of offering informed judgment of growth rather than mechanical scoring (Calfee, 1992), and represents different stages of growth in which a range of experiences and achievements can be documented to provide a cumulative record of performances (Lamme & Hysmith, 1991; Paulson, Paulson, and Meyer, 1991; Ohlhausen, 1990). In addition, the portfolio allows for personal reflection and self-assessment as a means of analyzing one's own growth (Valencia, Hiebert, & Afflerbach, 1994; Green and Smyser, 1993; Hutchings, 1993).

INITIAL RESEARCH PROJECT

The portfolio process was implemented in several Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) graduate classes at the University of South Dakota. The purpose of the USD Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) project was to incorporate the portfolio process into ECSE classes in order to provide students a foundation for working with young children with special needs and with their families. Because many states are in the process of developing certification standards for professionals who will be working in the field of early childhood special education, it is important that the preparatory programs provide procedures that will assist students in meeting the certification requirements.

The portfolio was selected as an ideal vehicle for planning, acquiring, and demonstrating the acquisition of requisite competencies. In addition, portfolios offer a model for collaboration with peers and faculty which can foster long-term professional behavior in using multiple resources to pose and solve problems related to serving this special population.

The project was initiated in January 1993 and was systematically studied over eight semesters (Urquhart & Danielson, 1994). The first three phases of the study are outlined in Table 1 and describe the development of individual portfolio projects and student responses during the semester in which the students were enrolled, and the fourth phase provides the description of the follow-up procedure which is the focus of this study. Appendix A provides a partial list of course/portfolio requirements.

From the first three phases of the study we identified several outcomes. First, students were able to meet the CEC/DEC competencies identified with specific course content through self-selected projects which define the way in which expertise will be demonstrated.

Second, collaboration among students and among faculty and students increased. Third, the quality and diversity of the projects exceeded our expectations, reflecting a high degree of investment on the part of the students.

From this data we also recognized that issues of validity and reliability needed to be addressed more fully. By its nature, a portfolio cannot be standardized in the way that more traditional models of assessment can. Nonetheless, criteria that guide fair and equitable evaluation of projects are important. Rubrics for delineating levels of success were developed based on previous work done by Ohlhausen (1990) and we explored how the student committees could be expanded into evaluation teams that work towards consensus about what constitutes minimal, excellent, and exemplary evidence of successful completion of the competencies.

FOLLOW-UP STUDY: PORTFOLIOS IN THE FIELD

The fourth phase was a follow-up study to collect data on how the portfolio projects were actually used in authentic settings. In order to determine if the learning that students exhibited during the class continued after completing the requirements of the course, we videotaped scripted interviews (See Appendix B) with former students about their use of their portfolio projects in their school settings. These taped interviews were edited to provide short vignettes to document the portfolio process as a vehicle for learning ECSE content and as a resource in actual practice in the field.

Responses to the interviews indicated that the projects selected by students were beneficial to their professional development and had provided a basis for on-going or expanded professional development in the field of Early Childhood Special Education. One student developed a multicultural unit for kindergarten children which focused on individual differences among children and how to better include children with special needs in the classroom. This teacher offered the following validation for her porfolio project:

> Last year I had one [student] with ADD, one with cerebral palsy, one with cancer, and two with language disorders---all in the same class. I was able to pull a lot of resources from the special education-multicultural project. In fact, because of the little child with cancer, I wrote a handout for parents to explain what to expect and how to talk to their child. All of the information I had gathered [previously] for my portfolio....The children became much more understanding, much more concerned about each other. [They] learned that differences are all right and make us special. It was a really good experience having those children [with special needs] in the classroom.

Another project was developed by two professionals, one from Head Start and the other an elementary principal, who collaborted on writing a grant which resulted in establishing two inclusive preschool programs for children with special needs and their typical peers. These teachers summarized their experience in this way:

> The portfolio process allowed us to brainstorm ideas in class and set the stage implementation of this project. [It] allowed us to combine resources and to implement the program into our school.
> We followed up with another grant for more expansion monies as well as funding from our school district. This is our third year. In our initial grant we served ten children; now we serve
> twenty-five.

A third project focused on a transition process that included families in initial stages of planning for their children's IEPs. The student told us:

> The reason I enjoyed [the portfolio] so much is that it was left open-ended for us. You said to choose something that we needed in our job or in our profession within the framework of Early Childhood Special Education. I got to choose something that was a need for me. The fact that it was open-ended allowed me to get information in any way possible.

This final phase of the study is ongoing as we continue to document how the portfolio projects are being applied to authentic settings. Our initial findings are encouraging. Students have reported practical applications of the information gained from their portfolios as well as full implementation of some projects. We believe that the use of portfolios to facilitate both the acquisition of knowledge and the application of acquired competencies has strengthed the Early Childhood Special Education program at USD and has contributed to meaningful professional growth of our students.

References

Berry, D., Kisch, J., Ryan, C., and Uphoff, J. (1991). The process and product of portfolio construction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Calfee, R. (1992). Authentic assessment of reading and writing in the elementary classroom. In M. J. Dreher & W. H. Slater (Eds.), Research for improving reading language arts eduction in the 1990s (pp. 211-266). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Green, J. and Smyser, S. (1993). Changing conceptions about teaching: A semantic differential study of teaching porfolios with pre-service teachers. Paper presented at the meeting of Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hutchings, P. (1993). Introduction. In E. Anderson (Ed.), Campus use of the teaching portfolio: Twenty-five profiles (pp. 1-6). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Lamme, L. and Hysmith, C. (1991). One school's adventure into portfolio assessment. Language Arts, 68, 629-640.

Ohlhausen, M. and Ford, M. (1990). Portfolio assessment in teacher education: A tale of two cities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 329 917)

Ohlhausen, M. (1990). Literary portfolios: The process. A presentation for the Iowa Council of Teachers of English Annual Conference, Des Moines IA.

Paulson, F., Paulson, P., and Meyer, C. (1991). What makes a portfolio a portfolio? Educational Leadership, 48 (5), 60-63.

Urquhart, M. and Danielson, L. (1994). Faculty collaboration in developing competency in preservice training through portfolio assessment. Paper presented at the Second Annual Curriculum and Instruction Research Symposium, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD. (ERIC ED 374 094)

Valencia, S., Hiebert, E. & Afflerbach, P. (Eds.) (1994). Authentic reading assessment: Practices and possibilities. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Table 1

Student Reactions to Portfolio Process

	Portfolio Process	Student Response
Phase 1	Orientation to portfolio process for students and faculty during first class	Anxiety about ambiguity of task, lack of confidence in the knowledge base
Phase 2	Committee meetings to discuss proposed projects and offer suggestions for meeting competencies	Increased understanding of purpose of the portfolio, personal control over progress, and a belief in the potential for success
Phase 3	Submission of formal projects transferred to classroom practice	A sense of efficacy, empowerment and pride as demonstrated by quantity and quality of work.
Phase 4	Videotaped interviews with students from previous ECSE classes	Implementation of projects in authentic settings

Appendix A

Partial List of Course/Portfolio Requirements Appended to Syllabus

Students will present portfolio projects at the end of the semester to demonstrate competencies in the areas listed. (These competencies have been established by the Division of Early Childhood/Council for Exceptional Children and meet minimum requirements for South Dakota Standards.

One project may be used to more than one competency area. Also, more than one project may be submitted under a competency area.

Criteria for evaluating portfolio projects will be developed by the student with consultation fromt he instructor. Each student's portfolio will be different with the portfolio items developed in conjunctionw ith the instructor. The steps in developing portfolio projects will be as follows:

1. Students will submit project proposals which will be reviewed by the instructor.

2. The instructor will review the proposals and make suggestions to the students.

3. Students may consult with the instructor about the projects at any point during the semester. Times for telephone consultation will be arranged individually as needed.

4. During the semester the instructor will set aside one day for portfolio reviews. Students will have the opportunity at that time to submit portfolio items they have developed to that point for review. At the four and eight week point in the semester, students will be especially encouraged to have their portfolios reviewed.

5. The instructor will evaluate the portfolio items and either check them off as completed or return them to the student with suggestions for improvement.

6. At the end of the course work, the students will submit the completed portfolios for final review. At this point, the student either passes or is given a grade of incomplete with one more semester to complete the work based on the established criteria.

7. On the last day of class final projects will be presented. These presentations will be in a poster-session format. An outline or handout for classmates should

be prepared. Remember, your projects are contributing to the field of Early Childhood Special Education. Quality and appearance are important.

Appendix B

Scripted Interview Questions for Follow-up Study on Portfolio Projects

1. Would you describe your portfolio project(s)?

2. How have you used the project in your current professional position?

3. How has the portfolio project affected:

   - Curriclum
   - Instruction
   - Student Learning
   - Teacher growth (leadership, empowerment, inservice, etc.)

4. Do you have future plans for using the portfolio project?

5. Do you have any comments you would like to make about the portfolio project?

THE EFFECTS OF MENTORING ON VETERAN TEACHERS IN A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Dr. Rosanne Yost
Curriculum Director
Beresford Public Schools

Dr. Sharon Lee
Associate Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Interest in teacher career development has become an important focus of education in the 21st century. Two district parts of career development have emerged: induction and mentoring. Mentoring is one way of delivering an effective induction program. As of this time, 24 states have implemented some form of induction program. Research has clearly established the benefits of a mentoring program for new teachers. It should seem likely that a mentoring experience can provide rewards and growth for the mentor as well as the beginning teachers. As apparent as this may seem, the actual research available on the degree to which mentors perceive they have benefitted from such a program is relatively limited.

Although the focus of the PDC at the University of South Dakota was the induction and support for first year teachers, it has been discovered just how important it is that the positive effects are there for the experienced teacher also. With the thousands of teachers now in the classrooms, the focus of professional development must also be on them. It is with this in mind that a study was conducted to explore whether this PDC provided a positive system for professional development through the mentoring program. This program contained many of the identified components of other programs such as released time and some monetary reward.

Since mentoring is a method of professional development for teachers, there are some identified essentials for professional growth that need to be recognized in order to better examine the mentoring process. This chart is a compilation of several research studies by Duke (1990), Guskey & Sparks (1991), and Wildman & Niles (1987).

ESSENTIALS OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Autonomy

1. Teachers need the freedom to direct their own growth.
2. System of responsibility must replace a system of accountability.
3. Teachers must be allowed to use and develop their professional judgment.
4. A culture of learning in which experimentation and problem solving is used instead of a formal personnel development.

Collaboration

1. Participation in cooperative, collegial groups can expand experience, create a forum to test new ideas, and provide emotional support and encouragement.
2. Supports autonomy in that groups must be flexible based on needs.
3. Teachers must decide on the specifics of their collaboration.

Time

1. Time is the critical resource needed for complex learning and the maintenance of autonomy and collaboration.

Teacher specialties can be the key to changing the profession to better meet the educational needs of all and this is usually the focus of curriculum reviews. However, the possibility of developing different roles for teacher builds a new way for them to grow and develop professionally. Mentor teachers become staff development specialists and are actively involved in collegial activities as professional development. Mentoring has been described as a natural beginning step on the road to improving the teaching career.

Mentoring programs are able to address the needs and concerns of both new and experienced teachers. In this way, mentorships offer a three-way success story: a new teacher becomes better equipped to handle the teaching job sooner; an experienced teacher improves leadership skills and has the opportunity for professional development; and the school district benefits from the increased expertise of each in their respective professional roles.

This study reports the findings of a naturalistic inquiry to determine if the PDC was beneficial to the mentor teachers and to identify the specific areas of professional development.

METHODOLOGY

Four elementary teachers who served as PDC Mentors were interviewed about their perceptions of the PDC. All were mentors in the first year of the pilot of the PDC and mentored one or two interns (first-year teachers). The first interview was to establish general information about each of the mentors and to review the overall reflection of the mentoring experience. The second interview covered the area of teacher self-efficacy. The third interview focussed on collaborative practices of mentoring and teaching. The final interview dealt with the mentors' conceptualizations of teaching.

FINDINGS

Data from this study is reported in the form of charts of identified elements in each of three areas: self-efficacy, collaborative practice, and conceptualizations of teaching.

Self-Efficacy: Evidence was found that the four mentors included in the study had derived increased feelings of self-efficacy from their experiences during their year spent as a mentor in the PDC. Self-efficacy is defined as that feeling help by teachers that they have the ability and the skills that can positively affect student learning and success (Thompson & Handley, 1990; Tracz & Gibson, 1986). The following elements of self-efficacy emerged from the data as contributing to the

mentors' feelings of having the abilities and skills needed in the teaching profession:

- Professional identity as a good teacher
- Awareness of and ability to show talents
- Honor and recognition for good teaching
- Feeling of being needed by someone
- Pride and satisfaction in a job well done
- Responsibility and opportunity to do things for their district
- Rejuvenation as a teacher
- Feelings of importance
- Generative Needs

Collegial Relationships: Collegiality is the desire to share ideas and expertise with others. Working collaboratively hold both problems and promise in the public schools. Finding the time to build the quality working relationships is a most difficult assignment. The possibilities that these relationships can bring to schools, however, makes the effort worthwhile (Short, 1992). The following list contains the identified elements that were reported by the four mentors regarding collegiality.

- Mentors can work effectively with others
- Mentors can help the school
- Mentors are role models
- Mentors can help improve staff relations
- Mentors are positively linked to the university

Conceptualizations of Teaching: The four mentors who participated in this study reported positive attitudes toward their profession and a desire to continue to grow and learn in that profession. Mentoring can provide the avenue for teachers to achieve these goals (Walker, 1992). Mentoring can invite teachers to examine their own procedures, techniques, and assumptions of teaching and learning. By giving teachers the opportunity to study current innovations and ideas they re-evaluate their old methods and practices (McKenna, 1990). A mentoring program also leads to more interest and understanding of professional development for teachers which includes defining new roles and responsibilities (Stevens, 1995). It is in this category that the four mentors identified some fundamental changes.

- Analysis and reflection
- Responsibility of another person
- Leadership skills were realized
- Better understanding of professional development

CONCLUSION

The data has shown that the mentoring experience of four veteran elementary

classroom teachers who participated in the PDC program had a positive influence on the feelings of self-efficacy, the establishment of collegial relationships, and on the teachers' conceptualizations of teaching. Participation in the Professional Development Center mentoring program was a valuable experience for the mentor teachers. Mentoring is one of the best ways to add to professional development for the experienced teacher. The evidence from this study demonstrates the worth of such a program and how mentors can positively influence teachers and what they do. Much of what the mentors now think and know was discovered and refined during their year in the program. There is no better example of the lifelong learning process than the mentor/intern pair working together in a school to improve teaching and learning for students and teachers alike. It must also be understood that the changes experienced by these veteran teachers were also influenced by their graduate programs and the responsibilities given to them by their districts.

Developing teacher leaders is possibly the most important dimension of the PDC. As has been suggested in much of the literature, it is this aspect that may be the key to educational improvement. To professionalize the teaching career is to add an element that has been missing. With the PDC program came recognition and respect for abilities and the opportunity to use those abilities to affect the education of both teachers and students. The program gave time and responsibility to teachers in such a way that their roles were enhanced and their positions upheld as being important. This is not common in most public schools and teachers are all too used to working in an environment that does not promote, nor encourage professionalism or true leadership development. It is time to change the status quo and let teachers lead the way.

TABLE 1

Summary of Identified Benefits of Mentoring

Krupp (1987)	McKenna (1990)	Stevens (1995)
1. Collaborative work environment	1. Relationship Dimension Pride in trusting, sharing relationship	1. Enhanced classroom performance
2. New and various job responsibilities	2. Professional Dimension Reinforced professional identify	2. Growth in self-confidence and professionalism
3. Improvement of staff relationships	3. Skill Dimension Enhanced skills and new ideas	3. Increased collegial relationships
4. Forum for reflective practice	4. Personal Esteem Dimension Reaffirmation of belief in ability to teach	4. Fulfilled generative needs

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Duke, D. L. (1990). Setting goals for professional development. Contemporary Education, 64, 230-233.

Guskey, T. R. & Sparks, D. (1991). What to consider when evaluating staff development. Educational Leadership, 43 (3), 73-76.

Krupp, (1987). Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reformd. New York: Teachers College Press.

McKenna, G. (1990). What's in it for the mentor? Lessons from teacher induction. Mentoring International, 4, 2-10.

Short, P. (1992). Restructuring schools through empowerment: Facilitating the process. Journal of School Leadership, 1, 127-139.

Stevens, N. H. (1995). R and R for mentors: Renewal and reaffirmation for mentors as benefits from the mentoring experience. Educational Horizons, 73 (3), 130-137.

Thompson, J. R. & Handley, H. M. (1990). Relationship between teacher self concept and teacher efficacy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association.

Tracz, S. M. & Gibson, S. (1986). Effects of efficacy on academic achievement. Paper presented at the California Educational Reseach Asociation annual meeting.

Walker, L. (1992). Mentoring: A review of the literature. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Assocation.

Wildman, T. M. & Niles, J. A. (1987). Essentials of professional growth. Educational Leadership, 44 (5), 4-10.

AN OVERVIEW OF VARIABLES RELATED TO STUDENTS WHO ARE ACADEMICALLY AT-RISK FOR FAILURE AND SUBSEQUENTLY DROPPING OUT OF SCHOOL

William J. Sweeney
Assistant Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Marilyn K. Urquhart
Assistant Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Mary Milleret Ring
Instructor and Graduate Student
School of Education
University of South Dakota

For a number of years educators' have been concerned with frequency of academic failure that correlated with students "dropping out" prior to completing high school (Ekstrom, Goertz, Pollack, & Rock, 1986; Hall & Keogh, 1978; Lloyd, 1978). Sainato (1987) described the enormous price that society pays for the failure of students in our schools. The ultimate price of educational failure is often relegates these students to a life on the fringe of our society. The population of economically deprived minority children have become a breeding ground for a recurring cycle of poverty, low socio-economic status, and subsequent increased risk of school failure (Rumberger, 1987; Fine, 1986). It is in this environment of deprivation and poverty that the propensity for school failure and antisocial behavior tends to be the most prevalent in our society (Reed & Sautter, 1990). The United States Census (1990) estimates that as many as thirty percent of our school aged children live in conditions that are under the poverty line. Therefore, many scholars and educators have looked to the educational system as a means of combating many of our current societal problems (Ryan, 1976).

Parents, teachers, administrators, and educational policy makers have recently voiced an increased concern dealing with the role the school plays in the destructive cycle of poverty that affects many student in the schools (A Nation at Risk, 1983). For many years educators have understood the strong correlation between student academic failure in school and the increased prevalence of these students dropping out of school. Wehlage and Rutter (1986) have pointed out that in comparison to other students, dropouts generally score lower on school tests, have poorer grades, and are more likely to have disciplinary problems in school. Therefore, it should not be surprising that students that have had repeated failures in an educational environment are at greater risk for dropping out of school.

The "at-risk" student is a new term coined to identify those children that are doing so poorly on school related tasks and are in danger of failing academically. Problems with academic performance of students in the inner cities have often been attributed to the forms of environmental deprivation (Carta & Greenwood, 1988). Further, "at-risk" children are those who are showing a pattern of behavior associated with individuals who tend to dropout of school. In addition, many "at-risk" students are those referred for special education or other support services. In many instances, these "at-risk" students may not qualify for any specific type of special classes or support services. Many educators call these students, the students that fall between the cracks. They are failing academically and need help; unfortunately, many times the educational system, for what ever reason, does not have the resources to provide adequate assistance to the student to succeed. Several characteristics have been associated with students who are "at-risk" in the schools. Many students come from low socio-economic backgrounds, have parents who dropped out of school or had negative school experiences, and have a general dislike for school

(Good & Brophy, 1987). Many "at-risk" students tend to have higher rates of absenteeism, poorer.social skills, and performing one to two years below grade level (Schaeffer, Staresinic, Reider, & Cummings, 1989). Problems with punctual attendance and being prepared for class, turning in work on time, reading and following directions, and appropriately talking with peers and teachers have also been associated with "at-risk" students (Schaeffer, Zigmond, Kerr, & Farra, 1991). Students exhibiting higher rates of behavior problems, more distractible during tasks, less social acceptance by their peers, and poorer self-esteem have also been related to academic and social failure in school Kauffman, 1993). Other related variables to academic failure are families where English is not the spoken language in the home (Baca & Cervantes, 1984), little reading material is available in the home and parents have little or no formal education (Heron & Harris, 1992), possibility of negative peer pressure, and teenage pregnancy (Kerr, Nelson, & Lambert, 1987). The Kaplan Report (1990) identifies several other related characteristics with "at-risk" students: a higher percentage of black, Hispanic, or Native American's; children from single parent homes headed predominantly by females; males are more likely to dropout than females; and family size is a contributing issue for white children.

The issues related to students who are academically at-risk for failure in our schools are not going away in the near future. This makes it even more important that teachers, parents, administrators, and other service providers address those issues directly and with and open mind. Additionally, this emplores these service providers in proactively planning with the intent of addressing the individual needs of each child in the classroom, home, and community to increase the probability of success in school.

References

Baca, L. M. & Cervantes, H. T. (1984). The bilingual special education interface. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Carta, J. J. & Greenwood, C. R. (1988). Reducing academic risks in inner-city classrooms. Youth Policy, 10(7), 16-18.

Ekstrom, R. B., Goetz, M. E., Pollack, J. M., & Rock, D. A. (1986). Who drops out of high school and why? Finding from a national study. Teacher College Record, 87(3), 356-372.

Fine, M. (1986). Why urban adolescents drop into and out of public high school. Teachers College Record, 87(3), 393-409.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1987). Looking in the classroom. New York: Harper and Row.

Hall, R. J., & Keogh, B. K. (1978). Qualitative characteristics of educationally high-risk children. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 1, 62-68.

Heron, T.E. & Harris, K. C. (1992). The educational consultant. (2nd. ed.). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Kauffman, J. M. (1985). Characteristics of emotional and behavioral disorders in children and youth (5th ed.). New York: Merrill/Macmillan Publishing Company.

Kerr, M. M., Nelson, C. M., Lambert, D. L. (1987). Helping adolescents with learning and behavior problems. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Lloyd, D. N. (1978). Prediction of school failure from third grade data. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 71(3), 370-374.

Reed, S. & Sautter, R. C. (1990). Children of poverty, the status of 12 million young Americans. Phi Delta Kappan. Kappan special report. (pp. 1-12).

Rumberger, R. W. (1987). High school dropouts: A review of issues and evidence. Review of Educational Research, 57(2), 101-121.

Ryan, W. (1977). Blaming the victim. New York: Random House.

Sainato, D. M. (1987). A self-evaluation program for developmentally - delayed minority preschoolers. University of Pittsburg, Office of Research.

Schaeffer, A. L., Staresinic, G. L., Reider, C., Cummings, L. D. (1989). CHAMPS progress report. University of Pittsburgh, Mellon Evaluation Center for Children and Adolescents.

Schaeffer, A. L., Zigmond, N., Kerr, M. M., & Farra, H. E. (1991). School survival skills for secondary students with mild disabilities. University of Pittsburgh, Mellon Evaluation Center for Children and Adolescents.

The National Commision on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation "At-Risk". Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

The United States Census Bureau. (1991). The 1990 U.S. census. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wehlage, G. G. & Rutter, R. A. (1986). Dropping out: How much do schools contribute to the problem? Teachers College Record, 87(3), 374-392.

AN IN-DEPTH STUDY OF THE CALDECOTT AND NEWBERY WINNING BOOKS

Maurine V. Richardson
Associate Professor
School of Education
University of South Dakota

Margaret B. Miller
Associate Professor
I. D. Weeks Library
University of South Dakota

The Caldecott and Newbery Awards are the most prestigious given for children's books. For that reason the Caldecott and Newbery Award winning books are used extensively in classrooms kindergarten through high school. Each year the Caldecott and Newbery Medals are awarded by the American Library Association for the most distinguished American children's books published the previous year.

In 1937, the Caldecott Award was instituted when it was noted that the illustrators creating picture books for children should also receive recognition (ALA, 1995). The award is named for Randolph J. Caldecott, a noted nineteenth century illustrator for children's books. The award is restricted to an illustrator who is a citizen or resident of the United States. In the case of this award "picture book for children" is defined as a book that provides the child with a visual experience, and has a collective unity of storyline, theme or concept, developed through the pictures in the book. Excellence of execution in the artistic technique and excellence of pictorial interpretation of the story, theme or concept are to be of prime consideration in the award.

The Newbery Award was the first children's award in the world, it was instituted in 1922 (Peterson, 1982). It was named by the eighteenth-century English bookseller John Newbery, who was one of the first publishers to publish books expressly for children. The award is restricted to authors who are citizens or residents of the United States. The literature may be in any form of writing including fiction, nonfiction, and poetry. In identifying distinguished writing for the Newbery Award, the committee considers the criteria for all good literature: interpretation of the theme or concept, presentation of information including accuracy, clarity, and organization, development of plot, delineation of characters, delineation of setting, and appropriateness of style.

This research was developed as a result of questions asked by students in the undergraduate children's literature class taught at the University of South Dakota. The research looks at the number of genres represented by these books, multiple winners, and the trend in the various artistic mediums used to illustrate the Caldecotts award winning books.

The Newbery and Caldecott Awards: A guide to the medal and honor books (1995) published by the American Library Association (ALA) was used as source for the analysis of the trends. The data was analyzed to answer the following questions.

WHAT GENRES ARE REPRESENTED IN THE CALDECOTT WINNERS?

The genres represented in the Caldecott Award Winners are:

Autobiographies/Biographies (2), Contemporary Realistic Fiction (8), Fantasy (7), Historical Fiction (5), Informational (3), Multicultural (8), Poetry (2), Science Fiction (2), and Traditional (23). Of the genres Traditional Literature has the highest representation among the Caldecott Award Winners. Traditional Literature consists of folktales, fairy tales, myths, legends, epics and work songs.

The genres represented among the Caldecott Honor Books are: Autobiographies/Biographies (2), Contemporary Realistic Fiction (27), Fantasy (17), Historical Fiction (6), Informational (26), Multicultural (29), Poetry (10), Science Fiction (0), and Traditional (68). Just like the representation of the genres among the Caldecott Award Winners, Traditional Literature has the highest representation in the Caldecott Honor Books.

The genres represented by the combined totals of the Caldecott Award and Caldecott Honor Winners are Autobiographies/Biographies (4), Contemporary Realistic Fiction (35), Fantasy (24), Historical Fiction (11), Informational (29), Multicultural (37), Poetry (12), Science Fiction (2), and Traditional (91). Traditional Literature is the most widely represented genre among the Caldecott Award and Caldecott Honor winners.

WHAT GENRES ARE REPRESENTED IN THE NEWBERY WINNERS?

The genres represented in the Newbery Awards are Autobiographies/ Biographies (4), Contemporary Realistic Fiction (20), Fantasy (6), Historical Fiction (28), Informational (1), Multicultural (7), Poetry (2), Science Fiction (2), and Traditional (5). Historical Fiction (28) and Contemporary Realistic Fiction (20) are the most widely represented genres in the Newbery Awards.

The genres represented in the Newbery Honors are Autobiographies/ Biographies (28), Contemporary Realistic Fiction (44), Fantasy (14), Historical Fiction (83), Informational (17), Multicultural (20), Poetry (0), Science Fiction (2), and Traditional (33). The two most widely represented genres are Historical Fiction (83) and Contemporary Realistic Fiction (44).

The genres represented by the combined totals of the Newbery Award and the Newbery Honor Winners are Autobiographies/Biographies (32), Contemporary Realistic Fiction (64), Fantasy (20), Historical Fiction (111), Informational (18), Multicultural (27), Poetry (2), Science Fiction (4), and Traditional (38). The most widely represented genre is Historical Fiction (111).

HOW MANY AUTHOR/ILLUSTRATORS HAVE WON THE CALDECOTT

AWARDS MORE THAN ONCE? HONORS?

Three author/illustrators have won the Caldecott Award more than once. While thirty-four have won the Caldecott Honor Award more than once.

HOW MANY AUTHORS HAVE WON THE NEWBERY AWARD MORE THAN ONCE? HONORS?

Four authors have won the Newbery Award more than once. Forty-two have won the Newbery Honor Award more than once.

HOW MANY AUTHOR/ILLUSTRATORS HAVE WON THE CALDECOTT AWARD AND CALDECOTT HONOR AWARD?

Twenty-three Caldecott Award winners have also won the Caldecott Honor Award.

HOW MANY AUTHORS HAVE WON THE NEWBERY AWARD AND THE NEWBERY HONOR AWARDS?

The Newbery Award and the Newbery Honor Award have been won by twenty-seven authors.

HOW MANY AUTHOR/ILLUSTRATORS HAVE WON BOTH THE CALDECOTT AWARD AND NEWBERY AWARD?

Two author/illustrators have won both the Caldecott Award and the Newbery Award.

HOW MANY HAVE WON THE CALDECOTT AWARD AND THE NEWBERY HONOR AWARDS?

The Caldecott Award and the Newbery Honor Award has been won by four people.

HOW MANY HAVE WON THE CALDECOTT HONOR AND THE NEWBERY AWARDS?

The Caldecott Honor Award and the Newbery Award has been won by eight people.

HOW MANY HAVE THE CALDECOTT HONOR AND THE NEWBERY HONOR AWARDS?

Fifteen people have won the Caldecott Honor and the Newbery Honor Awards.

WHAT ARE THE MOST FREQUENTLY USED ARTISTIC MEDIUMS IN CHILDREN'S LITERATURE?

In the Artistic Medium category according to Behrmann (1988), the most frequently used are watercolors (19), pen, ink and water (10), pen and ink (8), black and white lithograph (6), and pencil and water (5). The remaining 126 types of artistic mediums were used less than four times in illustrating children's books.

This research project has lead the researchers to believe this study should open the door for continued research in the area of Caldecott and Newbery Winners.

References

Association for Library Service for Children. (1995). The Newbery and Caldecott Awards: A guide for the Medal and Honor Books. Chicago: American Library Association.

Behrmann, C. (1988). The media used in Caldecott picture books: Notes toward a definitve list. Journal of Youth Services, 2, 198-212.

Peterson, L. K. & Solt, M. L. (1982). Newbery and Caldecott Medal and Honor Books. Boston, MA: G. K. Hall and Company.

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

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Research, Issues, and Practices Fourth Annual Research Symposium Proceedings	
Author(s): Robert W. Wood, Constance L. Hoag, and Garreth G. Zalud -- Editors	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: April 26, 1996

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.

[X] ← Sample sticker to be affixed to document	Sample sticker to be affixed to document →	[X]
Check here Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction	"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Robert W. Wood Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."	"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Robert W. Wood Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."
	Level 1	Level 2

or here

Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

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: Robert W. Wood	Position: Professor
Printed Name: Robert W. Wood	Organization: School of Education
Address: School of Education Univ. of So. Dakota 414 East Clark Vermillion, SD 57069	Telephone Number: (605) 677-5837
	Date: Nov. 20, 1996