

1982

# An Elementary Special Education Program, Community Unit District #3, Georgetown, Illinois

Nancy B. Thompson

*Eastern Illinois University*

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Administration](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

---

## Recommended Citation

Thompson, Nancy B., "An Elementary Special Education Program, Community Unit District #3, Georgetown, Illinois" (1982).  
*Masters Theses*. 2936.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2936>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

February 4, 1982

Date

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

AN ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM  
— COMMUNITY UNIT DISTRICT #3  
GEORGETOWN, ILLINOIS  
(TITLE)

BY

NANCY B. THOMPSON

FIELD STUDY  
~~THESIS~~

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

SPECIALIST OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION  
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1982  
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

2-15-82  
DATE

ADVISER

2-15-82  
DATE

COMMITTEE MEMBER

2-15-82  
DATE

COMMITTEE MEMBER

2-15-82  
DATE

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

ABSTRACT

AN ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

COMMUNITY UNIT DISTRICT #3

GEORGETOWN, ILLINOIS

A REPORT SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

SPECIALIST IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

BY

NANCY B. THOMPSON

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

413541

In February, 1977 Supportive Services (SS) was designed as a special education program for the elementary schools in Community Unit District #3, Georgetown, Illinois. Georgetown has 900 students in grades kindergarten through eight.

Three special education teachers developed the supportive services program with input from other district specialists who work with exceptional children. Following study sessions and writing the program, approval was sought from the director of the special education district, the school principal, and the school district superintendent. Upon request of the superintendent, the teachers presented the program to the school board for approval. After approval was received from the board of education, programs and workshops were planned by the special education teachers and the administrators to present the program to classroom teachers and parents to gain their cooperation in the implementation of the SS program.

The program is cross-categorical and includes students labeled educable mentally handicapped, learning disabled, and behavioral disordered. Special education students are based in a regular classroom and spend at least 51 percent of the school day in that classroom joining in activities

with their peers. The portion of the school day the child spends in the SS classroom is programmed to fit each child's educational plan. The child's work may be either instructional or supportive. Supportive Services utilizes an academic approach to work with the child's perceptual deficiencies.

Transitional kindergarten is a part of the SS program as well as a part of the kindergarten program. At the end of the kindergarten year, children, who have not accomplished the academic requirements for the first grade, are provisionally placed in special education for one year on the basis of minimal testing. This appraisal is based on pre and post testing of the kindergartners. These students attend school a full day, half of the day is spent in repeating kindergarten and half the day is spent in SS. Special education remediation techniques are utilized with perceptual and academic deficiencies. At the end of the year all transitional kindergarten children return to the first grade classroom. If serious special education problems are suspected, the child is referred for full psychological evaluation and a placement conference.

Opinion surveys of the regular classroom teachers were made in 1978 and 1981. The teachers had positive attitudes toward the social and academic progress that the special education students had made. They approved of the increased cooperation between special education teachers and classroom teachers. Some teachers noted that problems existed in grading and scheduling. In general, the teachers and administrators feel that the positive aspects of the SS program help to better serve the needs of the students.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Chapter

I	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE.....	2
II	DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING CURRICULUM CHANGE .....	4
III	THE PROGRAMS	
	Supportive Services.....	8
	Transitional Kindergarten.....	15
IV	OPINION SURVEYS	
	Survey 1978.....	23
	Survey 1981.....	23
	Comparison.....	26
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	34

### Appendix

A	OUTLINE OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES PROGRAM.....	41
B	LETTER FROM ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION CONTINUING PROGRAM.....	44
C	OUTLINE OF INSERVICE WORKSHOP ON SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.....	48
D	PRELIMINARY REPORT OF 1978 OPINION SURVEY.....	49
E	FINAL REPORT OF 1978 OPINION SURVEY.....	52
F	OPINION SURVEY 1981 WITH TABULATION OF RESULTS.....	53

LIST OF TABLES

1. MEETING TEACHER AND STUDENT NEEDS.....26

2. POSITIVE ASPECTS OF SS..... 28

3. NEEDED CHANGES IN SS..... 31



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

In February, 1977, the writer was one of three teachers who began designing a new program of special education for the elementary schools in Community Unit District #3, Georgetown, Illinois. This was a time of change in many special education programs. The federal government had just enacted Public Law 94-142, but the specific requirements had not been written, and the law had not been implemented. Public Law 94-142, popularly called the "bill of rights of the handicapped", did require the public schools to provide education for the handicapped in the least restrictive educational environments. This was enough direction for the teachers to write the general outlines of a program although minor corrections on specific requirements might have to be made.

Georgetown Community Unit District #3 has an elementary school enrollment of about 900 students in grades kindergarten through eight. For grades kindergarten through six, the district employed two teachers for the educable mentally handicapped and two teachers for the learning disabled. The two teachers for the educable mentally handicapped and one of the teachers of the learning disabled were at Pine Crest Elementary School. These three teachers instituted the special education program called Supportive Services, (SS).

Community Unit District #3 had one primary and one intermediate self-contained classroom for the educable mentally handicapped. In these two classrooms it was possible to serve twenty-seven students. It was not possible to combine the two classrooms because the age span of four years is set by law. Due to stricter rules governing the labeling of children educable mentally handicapped and to changes in the district population, by the fall of 1977 it would no longer be financially feasible to maintain the primary educable mentally handicapped classroom for the number of children it would serve. The central administrative office had offered the suggestion that severe learning disabled children be included in the self-contained room with the educable mentally handicapped.

The rules concerning learning disabled children in the present program allowed the learning disabilities teacher to work with twenty children for one half hour each. For some students this was sufficient time, but for those with more severe handicaps, it was not.

Therefore, Miss Gail West, intermediate educable mentally handicapped teacher, the writer, primary educable mentally handicapped teacher, and Miss Theresa Baumgartner, learning disabilities teacher, submitted an alternate proposal for special education in the district. The purpose of this program was to coordinate and correlate the special services of the district so that it might better serve the specific and individualistic needs of the child who has problems affecting his/her educational developments which cannot be met in the confines of a standard classroom program.

## CHAPTER II

### DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING CURRICULUM CHANGE

The three special education teachers at Pine Crest School met during a teachers' workshop. They decided that since the special education program would have to be changed in the immediate future, they would like to present to the administrators a complete program of special education for the elementary school. The plan would coordinate with the Title I reading program to provide more comprehensive programs to meet the students' educational and social needs. It would also make possible more cooperation and coordination with other personnel who work with special education students -- the school nurse, social worker, school psychologist, therapists, and clinicians.

The three teachers discussed their idea with the other personnel who would be involved in its implementation. It was necessary to include everyone who would have to work together with the special education students so that they felt a part of the plan, not that the plan was forced on them. The special education teachers approached the principal and asked for permission to write a proposal. It was granted.

Time was spent in discussing philosophy of education, various approaches to special education problems in education, the particular

needs of the Georgetown school district, and the available personnel.

The teachers visited the tutorial classroom of Mrs. Linda Jenkins in Champaign. They also studied carefully the "Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education". Where the rules and regulations needed clarification as to their application in specific situations the Vermilion Association of Special Education, a cooperative which includes the Georgetown district was consulted. Mr. Lynn Roberts, Director of the Vermilion Association of Special Education, (VASE) and Mr. Dallas Grant, VASE psychologist, answered any questions on procedures and testing.

The teachers wrote a program in outline form which was presented to Mr. Don Strohl, principal of Pine Crest and Frazier Elementary Schools in Community Unit District #3. Mr. Strohl approved the program and set up a meeting with Mr. Lynn Roberts, the special education teachers, and himself to make sure that the program would meet all the requirements set forth by the cooperative, the state, and federal regulations. After being assured by Mr. Roberts that the program would meet the legal requirements, Mr. Strohl decided to recommend the program to the school superintendent, Mr. Derry Behm.

A meeting was then held with Mr. Behm, Mr. Strohl, and the three special education teachers. The group discussed the district's special education needs and the way in which the SS program could meet these needs. Mr. Behm agreed to recommend the program to the board of education for implementation and requested the teachers to prepare and deliver

a fifteen minute presentation to the school board at their next meeting.

The teachers presented the program to the school board with the recommendation from both Mr. Strohl and Mr. Behm that the SS proposal be approved for implementation in the Pine Crest School. The board approved the implementation of the program in the fall of 1977.

The special education teachers discussed the effect of the program on the regular classroom teachers with Mr. Strohl, and planned and executed two teachers' meetings to explain the changes and the reasons for the changes. The advantages of the program were stressed as well as the fact that without the cooperation of the classroom teachers the program could not succeed.

The change in program was discussed with the parents of the present special education students at the annual review conferences in May. The special education teachers, the VASE psychologist, and Mr. Strohl formed a panel discussion about the program which was presented at a fall Parent Teacher Organization meeting.

It was decided that the two special education classrooms would be placed side by side and that the three teachers would cooperate in working in the two classrooms. The small former learning disabilities classroom would be used for testing and storage of materials. Materials from and for the three classrooms were inventoried and combined. Check lists were chosen or written for recording student progress. Class lists were prepared for each teacher and by the time the school year of 1977-78 began the program was ready for operation.

The special education personnel worked very closely with the classroom teachers. There were still many questions to be answered and some problems which arose that were worked out. At the end of the 1977-78 school year an opinion poll was conducted among the classroom teachers.

## CHAPTER III

### THE PROGRAMS

#### Supportive Services

Supportive services program is designed to serve as either an instructional or resource program for children who have been placed as educable mentally handicapped, learning disabled, or behavioral disordered.

For placement in a special education program, the child must be referred by the school or parents for a full psychological evaluation. This evaluation is conducted by a qualified psychologist. The psychologist's tests include an individual abilities test, a wide range achievement test, and may include tests in visual perception, auditory perception, gross motor, fine motor, or any other test the examiner deems appropriate. The school nurse completes a health history which includes a hearing and vision examination. The social worker makes a home visit and completes a social history. A report of the findings are given at a staffing. The persons present at the staffing must include the child's teacher, the child's parents, a school administrator, a VASE representative, a social worker, the psychologist, the nurse, and any specialized personnel who may be involved in the final placement of the child. Those could include a special

education teacher, a counselor, physical therapist, vocational therapist, speech clinician, and/or instructor in special areas.

The people at the staffing decide if the child is eligible for special education placement, what the placement should be, how much time the child will spend in the SS program, and how much time will be spent in the regular classroom environment. The child may be placed in SS for as little as 45 minutes a day or as much as 49 percent of the school day. The child may receive supportive work for the classroom program, or may receive an instructional program in reading, mathematics or spelling.

At the staffing, a long term individualized educational plan, usually for one year, is constructed for the student. The educational plan is concerned with academic progress and all other aspects of the child's development. It will state the minimum development the child is expected to make in academic areas as well as expected progress in definite deficiency areas like visual and/or auditory perception. It may include goals for development in attention span, acceptable behavior in the classroom, social growth, or personal hygiene. The educational plan will stipulate the amount of time to be spent in SS and the amount of time in the regular classroom. It may contain special stipulations for the classroom work, i.e., social studies and science material will be read to the child or the child will be expected to accomplish one-half the regular spelling list. It will also stipulate any therapists and/or clinicians who will work with the child. Once the individualized lesson plan is approved and signed by all those present at the staffing it cannot be changed unless another staffing is held.



The SS teacher uses the long range educational plan and writes more specific goals to be attained in a shorter amount of time. The time limit on these short term goals is not as specific, but may be for a few weeks, a quarter, or a semester. The teacher contacts the parents, explains the short term goals and how they lead to the accomplishment of the long range goals. The parents must approve the plans before they are implemented. This keeps the parents aware of the child's progress or lack of progress in the stipulated areas.

Near the close of each school year an annual review conference is held. Those participating in the conference are the parents, the school principal, a VASE representative, and all the teachers and therapists who have worked with the child during the school year. At this conference progress is reviewed, the child's continuing needs are discussed, and the long range educational plan for the following year is designed.

Supportive services is an academic program. If the student needs activities for visual perception, visual discrimination, auditory perception, auditory discrimination, fine motor, or other learning disability problems he gets these activities, but they are designed around the work which he is doing in the classroom. For example, if the child has visual discrimination problems, instead of doing exercises with designs, exercises are done with the actual words or letters with which the child has problems. Many of these activities are teacher designed and teacher made.

Supportive services does instructional programs in reading, mathematics, language arts, and spelling. These programs are structured to

each child's needs, but grouping is done where two or more children are working on the same level. These groupings are mobile. The groups are based on the child's specific needs, not on his/her special education label. Thus, a group of children working on subtraction skills may include educable mentally handicapped, learning disabled, and behavioral disordered. The group stays together only as long as it is meeting each child's needs. A child may be moved to another group or receive additional instruction for specific skills. Many different materials and approaches may be used by the teachers. A phonics approach is stressed in reading if the child can learn from this method. A lot of oral reading is done by each child. In mathematics a hands on approach is stressed so that the child may come to understand the mathematical theories. However, in some cases, the child must simply learn by rote.

The classroom teacher and the SS teachers must work together. Children react differently in the smaller, more sheltered atmosphere of the SS room than in the larger classroom situation, where more work must be done independently. It is not sufficient that the child can do the task in the SS room, but he must be taught the independence to be able to perform the task in the regular classroom where adult supervision is not constant.

Grading is one of the perennial problems of education. In a special education program it can become even more of a problem. In general, special education teachers like to grade according to the progress the child has made, taking into account his capabilities. Conversely, classroom teachers like to grade according to a standard expectation for the

child at his age and grade level. In order to alleviate part of the problem it was decided that if the child received an instructional program in SS, that grade would be given by the SS teacher. The grade would be recorded on the report card with an asterisk and a note that these grades were earned in the SS program. In all areas where the child received his instructional program in the regular classroom, the grade would be given by the classroom teacher. As in all grading systems, there have been some problems, but, as yet, no one has devised a better system for our use. The writers were fortunate that in an elementary system they did not have the problem of grade point average for honor roll.

Generally speaking, by the time the child reaches the SS classroom, motivational and self concept problems have arisen. Since children vary so greatly in what motivates them, the program has devised no specific motivational plan. The teacher tries many procedures from immediate reward with candy or seals to more complicated procedures where the child earns points toward a more distant and larger award. Progress charts are also used. Praise from the teacher may be a powerful factor in motivation and self concept building. In any program such as this, it is necessary to set standards for which awards can be earned. These standards and awards are individualized. Therefore, the teacher must be certain that the child understands what work and/or behavior will earn a reward and what will not. Above all, the teacher must be consistent. The teacher does not reward student for work poorly done. Self confidence grows with the child's knowing he/she is accepted, and the work the child is

able to accomplish is accepted. The teacher must be willing to experiment with various forms of motivation until the one that works with each child is found. The teacher gives criticism in such a way that the child understands that he/she is still accepted but that particular performance is not.

The SS program has had many positive aspects over the self contained special education classroom. First, since the children who attend SS are based in a regular homeroom they feel more a part of the total school. These students participate in the regular school program suited to their age groups. From the association with the students in the regular classroom, the special education students develop social skills appropriate to their age group. It is easier to control abnormal behavior and immature social behavior in the larger group where role models are closer to normal behavior than in an isolated special education setting that concentrates abnormal behavior without the normal role models.

Second, the special education children learn more about themselves and the world around them from the other children with whom they associate. While a fourth grade student may not be able to read, the child may be able to learn from class discussions in science and social studies. While the child may not learn the 70 percent of the material presented for a passing grade in science or social studies, if 50 percent of the material is mastered, more knowledge has been gained in that area than before.

Third, the special education children have gained by participating in the physical education and music programs with their regular classroom. Many are able to achieve as well in these areas as the students not in special education.

Fourth, special education students become a part of the total population in which they will live their lives. Only in the school setting are most of these children separated from the main stream of their contemporaries. By associating more closely with their contemporaries, they learn to live with them and how to deal with them socially.

Fifth, with proper handling by the teacher the children not in SS learn not to be afraid of handicapped children. They learn to be more considerate of the handicapped, more accepting of what the handicapped can do, and become more tolerant of children who are different.

There are some possible disadvantages to the program. The ones which are most obvious include the following. First, the teacher's attitude. The classroom teacher must accept the special education students as they are and where they are and deal with them accordingly. Since special education teachers have special training, some classroom teachers feel that they should not have to deal with special education problems in the large class setting. Some teachers do not work well with slower learning students, they either over or under compensate in the classroom. It is very essential that the classroom teacher and the SS teacher cooperate in the program for the child. For teachers who are accustomed to working with complete autonomy in their classroom, this can be a real problem.

Second, the school has had a couple of students for whom this was not the best educational atmosphere. The movement between rooms confused them, and they were able to participate very little in the regular classroom program. With these children, the SS staff made special arrangements in scheduling and helped the classroom teacher with

activities which the child could perform in the classroom. In some cases it has been necessary for the district to locate a self-contained classroom within the special education district and arrange placement and transportation for children in the self-contained environment.

Third, the SS teachers must be able to cooperate and work together. While a student may be on one teacher's case load he/she may work with any of the three supportive teachers in a specific need group.

The district feels, however, that in spite of any problems which have arisen, this SS program has worked well. With the assets the district has, this program has given them an opportunity to meet the needs of a group of handicapped children who have varying needs and abilities.

#### Transitional Kindergarten

Transitional kindergarten is a part of the SS special education program in the Community Unit District #3. It grows from a philosophy that the earlier educational problems are diagnosed and remediation begun, the more success the child will have in learning to compensate for his problem. However, the testing materials for schools are still not exact and it is very easy to make errors with children as young as kindergarten age. What may appear to be a learning problem might be a problem in immaturity and difficulty in adjusting to the school environment. Therefore, it was decided to make the transitional kindergarten a one year special education placement with a learning disabilities label. Transitional kindergarten is a portion of the total program of kindergarten education.

The program begins in June prior to the fall the child will enter kindergarten. The parents of each potential kindergarten student are strongly urged to bring their children to the Prevention of Failure in Early Childhood testing program. This program is conducted for one week. It requires one two-hour session for testing and a short follow up session for the parents to discuss the testing results. The program is explained to the parents, and general suggestions are made about home activities and attitudes that affect the child's school life. The social worker meets with each parent and does a social history. A trained tester gives each child the Slosson Intelligence Test, Visual Motor Inventory, Peabody Individual Achievement Test, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, a speech survey, a language development survey, a gross motor survey, and a hearing and vision screening. At the end of each half day of testing the testing staff holds a conference on each child and makes recommendations. Specific attention is paid to those areas of deficiencies that appear in the sub tests or in tester observation. The child may be recommended for early childhood class, summer school, or kindergarten. Specific activities may be suggested for the parents. Notes are made of the child who will need specific language development skills, visual or auditory perception and discrimination skills, and gross or fine motor skills. These are noted so that the kindergarten teacher can be aware of the needs of the students and prepare to meet them in the coming year. Some children are recommended for speech therapy or further testing. Then the director of the testing program meets with the parents to discuss the recommendations that have been made.

In the kindergarten year, the teacher plans activities for small group work with the children who have a specific need.

The kindergarten program is an academic program. By the end of the year the children are expected to know the sounds of the consonants, long and short vowels, and be able to read one syllable words. They are also expected to be able to count and write to 100 and recognize the numbers in and out of sequence, and to understand basic math concepts such as less and more. If the child has not been able to attain these goals, they are referred by the teacher for transitional kindergarten.

With the referral from the teacher, a placement procedure begins. Parents are asked for written permission for the psychologist to do minimal testing on each child. Some of the tests that were given the preceeding June are repeated. These include the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, the Slosson Intelligence Test, and the Visual Motor Inventory. The classroom teacher repeats the language abilities survey. A regular special education staffing is held with the parents, the psychologist, the school principal, the kindergarten teacher, and the transitional kindergarten teacher. On the basis of the discrepancy between achievement and expected achievement on the tests the child is recommended for placement in the transitional kindergarten for one year. The parents must give written permission for the child to be placed. If the parents do not give permission for the transitional kindergarten, the child simply repeats kindergarten. The child's individualized educational plan for the year is written and signed by the parents and teacher.



The transitional kindergarten is designed specifically for second year kindergarten students. Occasionally transfer students who have had kindergarten in another school district which does not have an academic orientation are staffed into the program. The transitional kindergarten children have a full day of school, as they would have had had they gone on to first grade with the rest of their age group. One half of the day is spent in the regular kindergarten class and the other half of the day is spent in the SS classroom.

In the one-half day that the children are in the kindergarten classroom they find that, where they were at the bottom of the class the preceding year, they now are generally in one of the top groups. They remember some of the material covered from the kindergarten year, and some has already been taught in the SS classroom. This situation has been very beneficial for the child's self concept. In the half day in SS the child is taught from the standpoint of remediation and meeting each child's individual educational problems.

Since the teachers have found that many of the traditional kindergarten children have problems with auditory discrimination and auditory perception, a special emphasis is placed on this area. The traditional kindergarten children use "Listening to the World", an auditory development kit prepared by the American Guidance Systems. It makes a good follow-through to the Peabody Language Development program that was used in kindergarten. The teachers also do a lot of oral phonetic work with listening for particular sounds or providing words with specified sounds. The children have trouble

differentiating between the sound of b, d, and p and confuse some of the short vowels. However, with lots of practice they can be taught to hear the difference. Hearing and following directions is stressed.

The educational program for each child begins where the child is in his/her educational program. For some, this will mean learning the alphabet and counting. For others, the beginning place will be in learning letter sounds. Grouping is used for teacher instruction time. The transitional kindergarten teachers try to keep these groups to no more than four students. In a group larger than that it becomes difficult for the children to be able to do individual oral response. They lose their concentration before their turn comes. Each child also has an opportunity to work individually with the teacher.

Teacher made charts in the shapes of animals, cars, trains, or holiday motifs are used for the child to visualize his/her own progress. This can be done by coloring in sections or attaching seals or stars.

The teacher introduces small amounts of material at one time. This material is repeated in several ways until it is mastered. Then another small amount of material is added, and the repetition continues until the material is mastered before more material is added. In this competency based approach some children progress faster than others, so it is necessary to keep the groups mobile and let children who progress faster move on to other groups. The groups may vary a little in student make-up for each subject taught.

The teacher must get to know each individual child so that the teacher can find the motivation to which each child will respond. It should be kept in mind, that at this age most children like to please adults. The teacher can do a lot in the area of motivation with praise when it is earned. However, even at this early age a child can differentiate between sincere praise which he/she has earned and insincere praise or praise given for work which is not the best the child can do. The child will often live up to the teacher's expectations, so the teacher must constantly be aware of his/her own estimation of the child's abilities and if this estimation needs revision.

Individualization is good for the child's progress and lets the child work at his/her own rate. However, the teacher must keep in mind that the child will be returning to the regular first grade classroom so that working in a group and working independently must also be taught. The teacher must also keep in mind that children learn to read teacher clues quickly. Therefore, when working in small groups and individually with children, the teacher must be aware of any clues the teacher may be giving and ascertain if the child can do the task independently without the teacher's clues.

Some of the children will complete the requirements for entering first grade before the year is over. For those children the curriculum continues in reading, in learning addition and subtraction, and in spelling. In mathematics the program uses a lot of hands on material so that the child can understand why that particular mathematics concept works. Some of

the first grade activities have proven to be difficult for some children to understand. Transitional kindergarten accents these and gives each child individual help in understanding the concept. For example, one area of difficulty in first grade is working with a number line to do addition and subtraction. In the program the teachers begin with a large floor number line and allow the child to walk the number problems. The number line like this is already familiar from learning to count to ten. Then the child progresses to the number line on the blackboard and the number line on paper.

The kindergarten teacher and the SS teacher work very closely. They confer informally on each child. If a child is having difficulty with a concept that is being taught in kindergarten, the SS teacher will take time to work with the child individually on the concept until he/she understands it.

The supportive services and kindergarten teachers meet with the parents in October to discuss the child's progress. This is at the time of the regular parent conferences. In April an Annual Review Conference is held. This conference is a regular special education conference at which the parents, a VASE representative, the teachers, and the school principal are present. It will also include all specialized personnel who work with the child. Most of the children will return to the regular classroom setting in the first grade. If a child is still having problems the school requests permission from the parents to do a full psychological examination. Special education placement is considered after the psychologist has had time to

do the testing and set up another conference. At the staffing conference the decision is made whether the child is eligible for a special education placement in the SS program. If the child is placed in SS an individualized education plan is written (see Supportive Service section). If the child is ineligible for special education placement he is returned to the regular classroom program.

CHAPTER IV  
OPINION SURVEYS

Survey of 1978

In the spring of 1978 a graduate student from the University of Illinois conducted an opinion survey among the classroom teachers for the purpose of evaluation of the SS program.

The researcher placed a card file with blank 3 x 5 cards in the teachers' lounge. Each teacher was urged to make any comments which he/she wished to make about the SS program. The cards were not to be signed. The researcher read the cards and prepared a summary. The summary was distributed to the teachers. If the teachers felt that any area needed more comment they were urged to write them out and place them in the file box. Then these cards were collected, and a final summary was written (see Appendices D & E). Since this was an open-ended type of survey, the responses covered a wide range of opinions. However, it was not possible to get all of the teachers' opinion on any one subject. It was not a familiar style of survey for the teachers. Opinions were not requested in any definite areas and the number of teachers who participated is unknown.

Survey of 1981

In the spring of 1981 the writer prepared an opinion survey to re-evaluate the teachers' opinion about the SS program. In the three years since the first opinion survey some of the personnel in the regular classroom and in the SS classrooms had changed.

The survey was set up as a short answer or check list form. It was kept short and simple to facilitate teacher response. The teachers were given opportunity to give additional comments if they wished to do so. Response was voluntary and anonymous. The writer received responses from all fourteen classroom teachers grades 1-5. The items of the survey were written to correspond to the concerns and comments which had arisen in the 1978 poll so it would be possible to compare the two.

The surveys were handed out at a teachers' meeting. The writer explained that the survey was to ascertain the teacher's opinion of the present SS program and that the results would be used in a paper about the program. It was also explained that their participation was voluntary and anonymous. The teachers were asked to return the surveys to the writer's mailbox at school within the next four days, if possible. Eleven of the responses were received within that time frame. A further request was made in the teachers' lounge for the surveys which had not been returned. Subsequently the other three responses were received.

Two questions were asked on the 1981 survey which were not a part of the 1978 survey. Question 1 asked for the number of SS students in each regular classroom. The number of students ranged from zero to eight (see Appendix F). The administration has tried to keep the SS student population balanced within the regular classrooms. This is not always possible. Some grades have more students in SS than others, Some teachers refer more students than other teachers do. The classrooms with the larger number of children

are probably fourth and fifth grade classes. From the SS class rolls, it becomes apparent that a larger than average number of students is referred to SS for reading remediation in the fourth and fifth grades. The writer feels that a portion of the high rate of referral is due to a change in the nature of reading that is required in the classroom. Through third grade, reading is a class. Reading fluently and with comprehension in a basal reading series is the goal. At fourth and fifth grade levels reading becomes more important as a tool for other subject areas. Some students cannot make the transition from reading as a goal to reading as a tool without more concentrated help than is received in the classroom.

Question 2 was asked to partially evaluate the teachers' assumptions about educable mentally handicapped and learning disabled placement. Seven teachers felt that they had a total of eleven students who would profit from a self-contained educable mentally handicapped class (see Appendix F). Only one child has been labeled educable mentally handicapped by a staffing conference. The school does have slow learners with learning disabilities, but these students would not be eligible for a self-contained educable mentally handicapped class. Despite the stress that has been placed on understanding and teaching the handicapped in local workshops and county workshops, the teachers still do not understand the special education laws and placements. The classroom teachers see a child who is not achieving in their classroom, but are not realistic about what the special education program placements are.



## Comparison

Since the 1978 and 1981 surveys were not of the same type it was necessary to do some correlation of data in order to compare the two surveys. In the 1978 survey there was no opportunity for a "no" response. It was decided to compare the positive answers from both surveys. (See Table I)

TABLE I

### MEETING TEACHER AND STUDENT NEEDS

	1978		1981	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
3. Meeting teacher needs	3	0	12	0
4. Meeting students' academic needs	8	0	10	0
5. Meeting students' social needs	7	0	10	0
6. Adequate help to teachers				
Materials	0	0	11	1
Scheduling	2	2	13	1
Consultation	2	0	12	2
Grading	1	2	13	0

Therefore the writer took categories D, E, and F from the 1978 survey and totaled the responses (see Appendix D). This total figure represents the answer to question three on the 1981 survey. The increase from three positive responses in 1978 to 12 positive responses in 1981 indicates that the SS teachers are meeting the needs of the classroom teachers. These needs include cooperation in academic fields and in giving the teacher support and insight in working with SS students. The writer feels that the support and help the SS teacher has been able to give the classroom teacher

is a primary reason for the success of the SS program. Because the classroom teacher feels help can be had from SS for any problems which arise from having a handicapped child in the regular classroom, the teacher has a more positive attitude toward the handicapped student.

For Question 4 categories A and B of the 1978 survey were totaled. This figure shows eight positive responses that SS is meeting the students academic needs. The 1981 survey shows a total of ten positive responses (see Table I). These figures would indicate that the SS program has done well at meeting students' academic needs since it began four years ago but is improving with experience and closer cooperation within the school staff. It is indicative of the success of the SS program that the classroom teachers are able to see gains in the students' academic progress.

The responses to categories C and G of the 1978 survey were totaled to compare with the response to question 5 of the 1981 survey. Over the three year period the positive responses increased from seven to ten. SS is meeting the social needs of the students. The SS students have gained in self-confidence in participating in the regular class. The handicapped students are gaining experience with interacting with non-handicapped students. Social behavior has improved in the classroom, on the playground, and at home. The teachers feel that this social interaction of the handicapped and non-handicapped is very important to the SS students. Only in the school setting are the educable mentally handicapped, learning disabled, and behavioral disordered separated from the rest of the population. Once school is completed, these handicapped students are expected

to live and work among the general population. Therefore, it is important that both the handicapped and non-handicapped are learning to deal socially with each other.

Question 6 deals more specifically with SS giving adequate help to the classroom teacher. Help with materials had no response in 1978 and eleven positive responses in 1981. The 1978 category H totals were used for comparison on scheduling. Category D totals were used for consultation, and category J totals for grading comparison (see Table I). In each of the four areas, materials, scheduling, consultation, and grading, there was a significant increase in positive responses from the 1978 to the 1981 survey. This increase in positive responses indicates a closer staff relationship between the regular teachers and the SS teachers. It also shows an acceptance of the SS program by the faculty and the desire of the teachers to make it productive for the students involved.

Question 7 was an open ended question. The responses to both the 1978 and the 1981 surveys were tabulated and categorized under four headings.

TABLE II  
POSITIVE ASPECTS OF SS

	1978	1981
Individual help for students	1	9
Cooperative staff	2	4
Gains in students' social skills and behavior	7	3
Students' academic gains	8	0

The one response to category D and nine responses on the 1981 survey were grouped together since they all expressed approval of the amount of individual

help that SS students received in the SS program. It is a major concern of the classroom teachers that the SS students do receive remedial work not only in areas of perceptual difficulties, but also tutorial help in understanding materials that are causing the student difficulty in the classroom. The large response in this area shows that the SS program is indeed giving support to the students in the classroom. It is interesting to note that in the 1978 survey in categories A and B eight teachers note the students' academic gains as a positive point of the program. In the 1981 survey no teacher mentioned the students' academic gains as such, but nine teachers mentioned the individual help that students receive from the SS staff. The writer feels that part of the difference in response is due to the dates of the surveys. In the first year of the SS program the amount of the academic advance had not been anticipated, so it was a startling result of the SS program. Therefore, it got more comment from the teachers. Academic progress is taking place in 1981 (see Table I, question 4). By 1981 the academic progress of the SS students was anticipated and so drew no comments. With a large number of students in the regular classrooms, the cooperation of the SS staff in working with the special education students becomes of great importance to the classroom teacher. Perhaps the classroom teachers are working more closely with the SS staff and this would account for the emphasis on individual help for students in the 1981 survey.

Categories D and E of the 1978 survey were totaled to compare with the responses denoting approval of a cooperative SS staff in the 1981 survey (see Table II). The number of responses increased from two to four in the

surveys. The writer finds it significant that besides mentioning the help that students receive, the teachers would also point out the cooperation of the SS staff as one of the good aspects of the SS program. The barriers that often exist between special education teachers and the rest of the school staff have been dissolved. The SS and other special education personnel have now become, in the mind of the classroom teacher, a part of the total school picture. Part of the development of this feeling has come from a decided effort on the part of the SS staff to be cooperative and understanding of the classroom teachers' situation in working with special education children.

The fourth heading under what teachers like about SS is the gains that students have made in social skills and social behavior. For comparison purposes the responses to the 1978 categories C and G were used (see Table II). More teachers responded in this area in 1978 than in 1981. However, in a previous question there were more positive responses to students' social gains in 1981 than in 1978 (see Table I, Question 5). In 1977-78 some students were entering the SS program from self-contained educable mentally handicapped classes. These students' maturity levels, social skills, and behavioral patterns improved greatly over the first year. Since the 1977-78 school year special education students have not been confined in a self-contained classroom so their gains in maturity levels, social skills, and behavioral patterns have not been as marked. However, with the SS program, students who did not get help in these areas before, have received help in these non-academic areas.

Question 8 on the 1981 survey was an open-ended question. The teachers were asked what they would like changed about the SS program, so this question points out what the teachers see as negative aspects of the program. There were three areas mentioned in the 1978 survey. These categories were J on grading, H on better scheduling, and I on annual reviews. In 1978 there were ten responses in these three areas. In 1981 there were eleven responses in five areas.

TABLE III  
NEEDED CHANGES IN SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

	1978	1981
Grading	2	0
Simplified referral procedure and faster placement	0	4
More teacher consultation	0	2
Program enlarged	0	1
Better scheduling	2	1
Annual reviews	6	0
No change	0	3

Grading which elicited two responses in 1978 was not mentioned in the 1981 survey. While no one has yet devised a perfect system for reporting student progress, the grading system is not considered a major problem in 1981.

In 1978 two teachers asked for better scheduling, and in 1981 one response was made. The SS staff in consultation with the classroom teacher does the scheduling of the exact times the student will spend in the SS room. Due to grouping in the classroom and in the SS room sometimes conflicts arise. However, it would appear that scheduling has been arranged so that it is not a major problem for the classroom teacher.

The area mentioned most often in the 1978 survey that needed improvement was category I, annual reviews. This question elicited six responses in 1978 and none in 1981. In 1978 the SS staff arranged the reviews and parents' time preferences were given consideration. In 1981 the VASE office selected the date for the annual reviews and most of the reviews were done in one day. Substitute teachers were available for the classrooms while the teacher attended the review conference.

Four areas of desired change were found in the 1981 survey which were not mentioned in the 1978 survey. Three responses stated that they desired no change in the SS program. Four responses asked for a simplified referral procedure and faster placement of students. This is an area where the local school has little influence. The referral forms are prepared and issued by the VASE office. It is difficult to meet the teachers' desire for simplification and yet supply the psychologists and social workers with the information they need to select tests.

Testing is done by VASE employed social workers and psychologists. The social workers and psychologists are assigned to districts for one year at a time by VASE. Pine Crest School is fortunate that the social worker and psychologist they have had for the past few years are as cooperative, understanding, and as efficient as any on the VASE staff. The only method that could be used to speed up the procedures would be for VASE to hire more social workers and psychologists or for the district to hire its own. Both of these suggestions are not financially feasible at this time. Placement procedures are governed by federal and state governments as well as

the local VASE office. Schools must conform to these procedures. In order to insure the rights of parents and students, the procedures become cumbersome and slow.

One response in 1981 suggested enlarging the SS program. It was not stated in what way the responder would like to see the program enlarged. The SS program provides for sixty special education students. This should be enough to provide the special education needs for this school. Maybe the responder had in mind a program which would provide help for slow learners and children with low motivation (see Table III).

Two of the responders wanted more time for teacher consultation (see Table III). One mentioned the possibility of released time for this consultation. At the present time most of the teacher consultation is done outside of the classroom hours. This response points to the growing cooperation between the classroom teachers and the SS staff. More consultation time would probably enhance the planning and programming for the students in the SS program.

The areas for change mentioned in 1978 dealt with administrative problems in scheduling, grading, and annual reviews. In 1981 most of the responses called for changes which deal more directly with the students' education. The teachers asked for students to be included in the SS program more quickly and for more consultation on the child's education.



## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS , AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### SUMMARY

In most respects the results of the opinion surveys are consistent throughout the two surveys. The items that the teachers liked about the program in 1978 are still positive in 1981. A few teachers who were dissatisfied with grading and scheduling in 1978 are still dissatisfied in 1981. The problems with the annual reviews which appeared in 1978 have either been solved or the teachers have accepted the situation. They did not resurface in 1981.

The teachers feel that the strong point of the program is the individual help that children in SS receive. The children make progress because the SS staff are able to diagnose and remediate specific learning problems. Supportive Services is able to motivate children to do the regular classroom work. Supportive Services also helps the children build a self-concept geared toward success. Besides academic progress SS helps the children through guidance and acceptance to learn social skills so they make friends with children their own ages in the regular classrooms. Since the regular classroom is their basic environment, SS students are more accepted by the school population than are children in a self-contained special education

class. The classroom teachers have contributed much in working with the classes to make this acceptance possible.

Another strong point of the program is the cooperation between regular teachers and the SS staff to see that each child receives help so that educational needs are met. Not only does this apply to special education students, but at times the SS staff is able to make suggestions for children who are having some problems, but are not eligible for special education. The classroom teachers and special education teachers are able to share materials and remedial techniques that have worked. This is accented by the fact that two teachers would like to see more released time given to more formal consultation between the regular classroom teachers and the SS teachers.

The special education students social and academic gains have been greater than was expected when the SS program began. These students have profited greatly by being included with the regular school population and using the regular classroom students as models.

Areas noted as needing improvement are grading and scheduling. These are essentially administrative problems. The problems are only mentioned a couple of times in the survey, but they are areas that could affect the cooperation of the two staffs and some attempt should be made to bring about better understanding. One possible way to attack the problems would be a committee of teachers from both staffs to study them. Such a committee might not solve the problem, but should bring about better understanding of the problems from both groups of teachers.

In general, the teachers feel that this is a "mainstreaming" special education program with which they can work and have success for both the teacher and the child. It is indicative of the success of the SS program that not one of the classroom teachers suggested returning to the more conventional special education program of self-contained educable mentally handicapped classes and learning disabled resource room.

## CONCLUSIONS

The SS and TK programs have benefitted the Pine Crest Elementary School in several ways. These ways include benefits for the administrators, the teachers, and the students.

Flexibility in the use of teachers and the placement of students is allowed in the programs. The special education class load is divided evenly among the special education teachers. Placement of students in SS allows for variations in the proportion of the school populations which is eligible for EMH, LD, or BD placement. The time that the student spends in SS is determined by the child's needs and offers more choices than a thirty minute session in LD or a self-contained classroom.

More efficient use of the building and supplies has resulted from implementation of the SS program. It has been possible to obtain a greater variety of teaching materials because it has not been necessary to duplicate materials for EMH and LD programs. The three teachers of the SS program share the two rooms that were used for EMH classrooms. These are much better facilities than those used by the LD program alone.

The special education teachers have profited by working in closer cooperation. It has been very helpful to combine the techniques of teachers in the fields of EMH, LD, and BD. The teachers have learned from each other and have developed a variety of methods for helping students deal with their handicaps.

Cooperation between the special education teacher and the classroom teacher has increased. The teachers work together to plan the class work for each child. These consultation sessions often become an informal in-service training program. In the regular classroom it is assumed that certain transitions in learning are made by the students. Special education teachers have become experts in breaking down these transitions into steps by which the students, who do not automatically make the transitions, can be taught. As the classroom teacher and the special education teacher discuss these steps for a particular student, they are learned by the classroom teacher. The special education teacher becomes more knowledgeable about the skills that are needed for achievement in a regular classroom. Techniques which were only used in one setting are now used by the classroom teacher and the special education teacher. Since the special education teachers and classroom teachers are cooperating more closely, they understand each other better, and much of the friction that existed between the two groups of teachers has disappeared.

Special education children have profited socially and emotionally by being in the SS program. They spend more time with their peers and pick up behaviors more appropriate to the age than when they were segregated in self contained classrooms. They feel more a part of the total school and participate more fully in the school program. They take part in the plays or other programs that the class prepares for the other classes in the school or for parent programs. They participate more fully in the music and athletic programs and are included in music programs and in the beginners' band.

They also go on class field trips. The SS program assists the special education students to participate in classes in the regular classroom.

The slow learners in the regular classroom have profited by some of the changes precipitated by the presence of the SS students in the classrooms. One program, which was developed in the third grade, was a math section for students who could not read the math book. The group was composed of children from the regular classroom and SS students. When the math book was read to the students they could do grade level math.

Parent response to the SS and TK programs has been good. Many are pleased with the academic progress that their children make without being totally removed from the regular classroom program.

The administration has been pleased with the SS and TK programs and feel that it offers a better school atmosphere and education for special education students than the self contained classroom.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The writer would suggest that more time be allowed for consultation between classroom teachers and the special education teachers. It would be profitable to have some meetings of a whole grade level to discuss more general considerations that each individual students program.

Class load may become a problem for the special education teacher. The Illinois Office of Education has set the class limit as twenty to twenty-five students per teacher. This class limit does not take into consideration how much of the school day the child spends in the SS room. Legally a teacher could have twenty-two children for half the school day. This large a class load does not allow time for the individual help and student-teacher

interaction that seems to work best in a special education program. The writer feels that some other form of measuring the class size could be adopted by the district without violating the state guide lines. The writer would suggest devising a limit based on total student hours in the SS program. The teacher might see twenty-two students if half of them were in SS for only one hour. However, if the teacher had twelve students who were in SS for a half day, the total pupils would not reach the twenty-two pupil limit.

The SS and TK programs have been working so well for the Georgetown Elementary Schools that the writer would not recommend many changes. However, if the program were to be tried in another school district it would have to be changed and adapted to that particular districts needs.

APPENDIX A

OUTLINE OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES PROGRAM



GEORGETOWN SPECIAL EDUCATION  
INSTRUCTIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

I. Purpose

Coordinate and correlate the special services of the district so that they might better serve the specific and individualistic needs of the child who has problems affecting his/her educational developments which cannot be met in the confines of standard classroom program.

II. Tentative Personnel Involved:

A. 1. Learning Disabilities  
2 elementary K-5  
1 Junior High (6-8)

2. E. M. H.  
1 primary  
1 intermediate  
1 junior high

3. Speech therapist

4. Social worker

5. Nurse

6. Psychologist

B. These specialists are required by Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education (4.03-1 P.5).

All of the above are presently employed by Georgetown Community Unit No. 3 except junior high L.D.

III. Legality

A. (Art. III 3.01 P. 3)

"Each local school district shall establish and maintain special education instructional programs and supportive services which meet the educational needs of children."

- B. This program has been approved as meeting the above requirements by:

#### IV. Population

##### A. Numbers

##### 1. Prevalence Rates (statistics from U.S. Dept. of Ed.)

E.M.H.	2%
L . D.	3%
B. D.	1%
E. H.	1%
IQ's between 80 and 90 ---	15%

##### 2. Georgetown school population: Total K-8 --- 934.

##### 3. Students eligible to receive services (as indicated by prevalence rates).

E.M.H.	19
L.D.	28
B.D.	9
E.H.	9
IQ's between 80 and 90 ---	140.

Total 205 possible K-8.

##### 4. Students presently served: 62 K-8 in all areas.

##### 5. With present staff (plus additional L.D. teacher) we can serve 25% more.

##### B. Criteria

#### V. Instructional

A. Each child's specific educational needs will be assessed by qualified specialists.

B. A staffing will occur. (refer to Rules and Reg. Art IX 9.15 #3 p.12)

C. Based upon staffing results an individualized program will be established by an interdisciplinary team of trained personnel.

1. Behavioral objectives
2. Check lists
3. File on instructional programs
4. Utilization of multidisciplinary staff
5. Utilization of multiprogram materials
6. Continual assessment of children in supportive services program and standard educational program.
7. If the major part of instruction for any given subject is provided by Supportive Services, they will be responsible for evaluation.
8. Follow-up of the implementation of the supportive services program in the standard educational program
9. Annual review of child's progress in the supportive services program.

#### VI. Advantages

1. More children will receive services
2. Non-categorical
3. Interaction in standard classroom
4. Better use of staff, materials, and facilities without increased cost.
5. Each child's specific needs will be met.
6. Equalization of class load
7. Continuous educational plan
8. Continuous assessment of each child
9. Updates present program.
10. Meets standards set by Rules and Regulations (1976)
11. Coordination of supportive services staff
12. Needs of the bulk are not now being met under the present program

APPENDIX B

LETTER FROM ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION CONTINUING PROGRAM



# STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

## ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION

APPENDIX B

Joseph M. Cronin  
State Superintendent of Education

Letter from Illinois State Board of  
Education Continuing Program

June 30, 1977

Ms. Gail West  
Rural Route #1  
Lakewood, Illinois 62438

Dear Gail:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your model. It looks good and I am sure it will be a great success.

I made a few notes which will correspond to your sections. Please consider these as helpful suggestions.

IVB.4. According to the Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education psychological testing must be done for all children if there is question about their mental impairment, placement in a special education instructional program, placement in a behavior disorders program, or question regarding the intellectual functioning and/or learning capacity (9.09-3i). In any event, and probably more importantly, a comprehensive case study evaluation (the structure of which would "plug in" very well to your evaluation section V2 or under the criteria section). As Public Law 94-142 is implemented, I think we will see more of a tightening of identification, evaluation, and IEP development. Under this same section, Jim Stowell and I have worked out a "M-Teaming" or Multidisciplinary Team Staffing concept that you might be interested in. Jim brought the idea with him from Wisconsin, and I adapted it to our state regulations. It is in the "Rough Draft" state now, but if you are interested, let me know and I will send you a copy of it.

V4. Why limit yourselves and the students to a locked-in time-frame? Why not think of the time placement on a continuum, which fits "that particular student's needs" at "that particular time" (e.g.: a student may need a very structured 45 minutes at the same time every day in September, but by November he may only need 30 minutes every other day or less). I realize this may seem haphazard to other teachers at first, but once they accept the idea of "individual planning", it will seem logical to them.

V5. I am enclosing a copy of the IEP information just received from the National Association of State Directors of Education (NASDE). It, too, may "plug into" your model for content, staffing, etc. I would strongly urge you to include the "regular" teachers in the planning when at all possible. They will be much more likely to "buy into it" if they have an investment (i.e., time, energy, thoughts) in the child's program development. The same is true of parent involvement. They will

be much more likely to follow-through at home if they have ownership in the plan (they can save hours of precious time by cluing you in on their child's favorite reward, etc.). You may want to consider the system of "peer tutoring" in your model. This can be done in many ways: from using "gifted students" with LD students to using LD students with "slow students". I am enclosing an ERIC search which was done on peer tutoring. It is a subject that must be approached cautiously. You may want to consult with your principal before incorporating it in the model.

V6. The evaluation is certainly needed and is needed on a continual basis - not just waiting until the end of the year to see if the child has succeeded or failed. You may want to borrow a system from the business world: that of a "tickler" system. Set aside twelve manila folders and label each for one month of the year (or if you want a daily check at first, use 31 folders numbered from 1 - 31 for the days of the month). If John Jones needs to be checked for reading comprehension in two months, drop a card with his name (or ID number), present comprehension level, and anticipated level in two months (e.g., the November folder). Have one teacher responsible for the follow-up each month, assess John for his comprehension, and revise the objective or alter the material/techniques to assure better success, if needed. Determine the next check point and drop the card in that month's file. This is only one simple method. There are many others. One word of caution: be sure to emphasize that you are measuring only the student's progress and not the teacher's competency. That can be a very touchy issue: we all have feelings of pride and professional ethics. Teachers are certainly not exempt from them! Also this may be a good time for a parent contact, either by phone or mail. The parent may have information to share with you regarding attitude, new reinforcements, problems encountered, etc.

V7. This is a minor point, but you may want to consider using the term "Initial Reintegration" instead of the more final term of "dismissal". Many learning disabled children need support for several months, or years, even if it is only a "check in" time on occasion.

VIB. The staffing procedures may need to be outlined more in detail (as per the "Regulations") in the IVB Criteria Section. You have referred to staffing several times, but do not have it down in a 1-2-3 order. This may need to be done in order to assure that your population served is within the guidelines of the "Regulations" and that you are not suddenly overloaded with extra students with "learning problems".

VIC. That statement is unclear to me. Do you mean the staffing which determines placement or the multidisciplinary team staffing which determines the IEP? Or is it a combination? You might want to delineate that for clarity.

VII. Needless to say, and apparent from the length of this letter, I am enthusiastic about your model. You may want to consider additional "advantages", such as:

- 1) the personal needs (i.e., educational, social, and emotional) of

- the child are considered and are planned for,
- 2) the attitude of the "regular" teacher toward handicapped children may be enhanced, and the relationship between "regular" and "special" teachers will surely be strengthened,
  - 3) the attitude of children in "regular" classes will hopefully become more empathetic and accepting of the handicapped, and the attitude (self-concept) of handicapped children will hopefully be enhanced,
  - 4) the attitude of parents of both handicapped and nonhandicapped children will be more accepting and cooperative,
  - 5) the attitude of school administrators (including school board members, superintendents, principals) will be more empathetic and understanding toward handicapped people,
  - 6) teachers, both "regular" and "special" may develop both a broader knowledge base and more technical teaching skills (as a biased side line the old adage that the special education teacher has a "magic wand" to wave over her students is no longer valid: many teachers need to upgrade their skills in methods and materials usage),
  - 7) although there is no question in my mind that there will be better use of staff, materials, and facilities without significant cost, I have been unable to find any hard research data to verify this concept. I sincerely hope you will keep the necessary data in order to verify this concept. People all over the country would greatly appreciate this kind of "proof".

I am sure there must be many more advantages; perhaps we will both encounter more as the next year ensues.

VIII. I have only one comment about the evaluation section: as I mentioned, this section is extremely important and needs to be delineated at the very beginning of the project. If we can get some hard data on cost/effectiveness, it will be extremely valuable, both intra and interstate. One additional component you may want to consider is that of the child's own self evaluation. This is one area we educators sometimes overlook, but it is surely important input that not only lets us know if we're "getting through", but it also lets us know how the child is feeling about himself/herself. This can be done just in the affective domain (through a written essay, pictorial portrayal, or tape recorder), or can extend into a self evaluation of the academic areas.

As I mentioned earlier, Gail, I am extremely enthusiastic about your project, and have full confidence that y'all will put Georgetown "on the map". It is wonderful to see such a supportive principal, and a staff that is at least willing to try.

I am sending a copy of this to Theresa, Nancy and Grace, so that they will have some "pondering" time as well. Be sure and consider the resource person (for behavior management) that Jeannie mentioned to you. You may want to have her for an inservice the very first day. Teachers tend to get discouraged easily and quickly if they have children with behavior problems, with whom they are unprepared to deal. Some key, effective management techniques can make all the difference in the program's success.

I wish you the very best of luck. If you have any questions or if I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to write or call. I will forward any information regarding this area as it comes across my desk. Please keep in touch.

I hope to visit you during the next school year, knowing full well that the program will be a "smashing success".

Sincerely,

Cindy Terry  
Special Education Specialist  
Programs for Exceptional Children

CT:jj

Enclosure

CC. Joe Fisher  
Jim Stowell



APPENDIX C

OUTLINE OF INSERVICE WORKSHOP ON SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

## INSERVICE

### Overview:

Discuss which of these needs cannot be met in the classroom. Research shows kids do as well in this situation as a closed classroom.

### Explain program:

What's this going to do for teachers (can serve as a resource room for materials and techniques). Present program putting a label on child

Don't explain need and importance of cooperation. Two rooms - teamwork. If we take the child for a subject we will give the grade--on report card we will put an asterisk (\*) and state grade level achieved.

We are the first program in Vermilion County -- will be model program to be looked to by others. Success of program will be based on cooperation between SS and teacher. Let's hear it for PRIDE!!!!

The administration and Special Education Director are very enthused in program -- but whole success depends on YOU!!! Let's hear it for COOPERATION!!!

## HOW CHILD IS PLACED

1. Referral form (go over)
2. Evaluation
3. Staffing
4. Placement in program
5. Educational plan
6. Evaluation
7. Dismissal

## COMPARISON CHARTS

Criteria for placement informal assessments.  
Questions, and questions, and questions...hopefully answers!!!

GO S.S. GO!!!!!!

APPENDIX D

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF 1978 OPINION SURVEY

### Preliminary Report of 1978 Opinion Survey

This will be our first summary of the issues you've generated as well as the evidence collected under each issue. Parenthesis will indicate how many separate pieces of evidence (in our case, cards) you submitted under each category. If you disagree with any particular summary, or if you feel your attitudes and opinions have not yet been expressed, then NOW is the time to submit these. If you have no additional comments or suggestions, then it is possible this could become our final evaluation summary.

Nancy, Mike, Gail, Janice

A. HOW MUCH, OR IN WHAT KINDS OF ACTIVITIES, ARE SUPPORTIVE SERVICE STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN REGULAR CLASSROOMS?

Students have given reports and participated in the Talents Unlimited Program. Their participation is comparable to that of other students, and their responses in class are accepted by the other children. (2)

B. WHAT ACADEMIC GAINS HAVE STUDENTS RECEIVING SUPPORTIVE SERVICES MADE?

Some students will be in regular classes full-time next year. Others have made gains in math, science, and reading. (6)

C. WHAT SOCIAL GAINS HAVE STUDENTS RECEIVING SUPPORTIVE SERVICES MADE?

Students seem to have gained self-confidence in class. Playground behavior has improved. Students have also gained new friends in their classroom and interact more frequently with individual children as well as groups. (5)

D. HOW HAVE CLASSROOM TEACHERS BEEN RESPONSIVE TO SUPPORTIVE SERVICE STUDENTS' NEEDS?

When a classroom teacher noticed a student having difficulty during the year and mentioned this to a supportive service teacher, help was provided immediately. (1)

E. HOW HAVE SUPPORTIVE SERVICE TEACHERS BEEN RESPONSIVE TO STUDENTS' NEEDS? - IN ACADEMIC AND/OR SOCIAL AREAS?

Supportive Service teachers have identified students' needs and work on increasing specific skills. (1)

F. HOW DO TEACHERS FEEL ABOUT HAVING CHILDREN RECEIVING SUPPORTIVE SERVICES IN THEIR CLASSROOMS? IS THERE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE WAY TEACHERS FEEL NOW AND THE WAY TEACHERS FELT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR?

The number of negative or apprehensive comments about supportive service students has decreased since the beginning of the year. (1)

G. HOW HAVE PARENTS RESPONDED TO SUPPORTIVE SERVICES? IS THERE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THIS YEAR AND LAST YEAR?

Parents have given only positive comments about their childrens' programs this year. Some have noticed positive changes in their child's social behavior at home. (2)

H. HOW WELL DOES CURRENT SCHEDULING WORK?

Some teachers have no problems with scheduling. (2) Others have students whose schedules mean missing regular classroom work and discussions in other academic areas, and it becomes difficult to get these students caught up with the rest of the class. (2)

I. HOW ARE ANNUAL REVIEWS MEETING STAFF, STUDENT, AND PARENT NEEDS?

Some teachers do not want to miss instructional or planning time to attend conferences. (3) Suggested solutions include the use of a substitute or aide to watch classes during staffings, possibly for 2 consecutive days during annual review time. (2)

During staffings, one concern has been that classroom teachers of 49% supportive service students seemed to give less input into their students' programs than other teachers. (1)

J. HOW DOES THE CURRENT GRADING SYSTEM MEET STATE AND STUDENTS' NEEDS?

Some teachers feel that grades of supportive service students should be differentiated from grades given to regular students, perhaps by a separate grade card or checklist, to avoid confusion.

Some teachers feel the teacher who works with a student should give the grade, and/or that supportive service grade should be averaged in with classroom grades. (2) Parents do not seem confused about grades - students work is discussed with them twice a year. (1)

APPENDIX E

FINAL REPORT OF 1978 OPINION SURVEY

## FROM SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Your feedback on our first summary indicates that we all seem to agree on the summaries of the evaluation issues. Overall, your responses have shown that Supportive Service students have made academic as well as social gains. Teachers have been responsive to students needs, and everyone seems to feel more comfortable with these children in their classrooms. Parents, also, have been pleased with their children's progress.

Scheduling may not always work out for all students with all teachers. (We will try to keep things as balanced as possible.) Because of your feedback on annual reviews, next year's might go much more smoothly with help from extra personnel. We have also become aware of the differences of opinion that exist about our grading system. We hope to keep this as simple and unconfused as possible.

Thank you all for your comments and suggestions. We feel that this evaluation has been extremely helpful to us, and hope you will continue to share your ideas and opinions with us next year.

Nancy, Mike, Gail, and Janice



APPENDIX F

OPINION SURVEY 1981 WITH TABULATION RESULTS

## OPINION SURVEY - 1981

1. How many Supportive Services students are in your class?

1 3 3 2 4 6 3 0 4 3 3 6 8 1

2. How many of these students do you feel would profit more from a self-contained Educable Mentally Handicapped Class?

0 2 0 0 1 - 2 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 0

3. Is the Supportive Services program meeting the teachers' needs?

12 yes                             no                        1   undecided

Comments:        Sometimes

4. Is Supportive Services meeting the student's academic needs?

 10  yes                             no                        2   undecided

Comments: Most of the time

5. Is Supportive Services meeting the student's social needs?

 10  yes                             no                        4   undecided

Comments:

6. Do you feel the Supportive Services staff gives adequate help to the classroom teacher?

	YES	NO	Yes & no 1
Materials	<u> 11 </u>	<u>  1 </u>	
Scheduling	<u> 13 </u>	<u>  1 </u>	
Consultation	<u> 12 </u>	<u>  2 </u>	
Grading	<u> 13 </u>	<u>     </u>	

Comments:

7. What do you like about the Supportive Services program:

9 - Individual help                      4 - Staff  
3 - Social skills and behavior

8. What about the Supportive Services program would you like to see changed or altered?

No answer - 3                      No change - 3  
Simplified referral procedure and faster placement - 4  
More teacher consultation - 2  
Program enlarged - 1  
Better scheduling - 1