



CHANGING CANADIAN SCHOOLS

Perspectives on Disability and Inclusion

Contributors

Charlotte Campbell

Jean Collicott

David Jory

Brian
Kelly

Marcia Marcaccio

S. Dulcie McCallum

Margaret Murray

Jeff den Otter

Melanie
Darlene E. Panitch
Perner

Marcia H. Rioux

Alene Steinbach

Julie Stone

Editors

Gordon L. Porter
Diane Richler

Mary
Wilson

Changing Canadian Schools

Perspectives on Disability and Inclusion.

Version bab4b8f2, 2017-05-18

Changes in this Version can be viewed by following this link:
[bab4b8f2](#)

Authors

Campbell, Charlotte

Collicott, Jean

den Otter, Jeff

Jory, David

Kelly, Brian

Marcaccio, Marcia

McCallum, S. Dulcie

Murray, Margaret

Panitch, Melanie

Perner, Darlene E.

Porter, Gordon L., Ed.

Richler, Diane, Ed.

Rioux, Marcia H.

Steinbach, Alene

Stone, Julie

Wilson, Mary

Changing Canadian Schools

Perspectives on Disability and Inclusion

edited by

Gordon L. Porter and Diane Richler

with a preface by

Dr. G. Michael Fullan

Dean, Faculty of Education

University of Toronto

The Roeher Institute

Copyright © 1991, The Roeher Institute

All rights reserved. The use of any part of this publication reproduced, transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in a retrieval system, without the prior consent of the publisher is an infringement of the copyright law.

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Changing Canadian schools: perspectives on disability and inclusion

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-895070-00-7

Issued also in French under the title:

Réformer les écoles canadiennes: Perspectives sur le handicap et l'intégration.

1. Mainstreaming in education - Canada.
2. Mentally handicapped children - Education - Canada

I. Porter, Gordon L.

II. Richler, Diane.

III. G. Allan Roeher Institute

LC4634.C53 1991 371.92'806'0971 C91-094767-8

The Roeher Institute

Kinsmen Building, York University,

4700 Keele Street, North York, Ontario, Canada

M3J 1P3

(416) 661-9611

Institute Director:	Marcia H. Rioux
Editors:	Gordon L. Porter and Diane Richler
Publications Editor:	Laura Code
Desktop Publishing:	Victor Salus

This publication was prepared with financial support from the Department of National Health and Welfare, Social Service Programs Branch.

The Roeher Institute

Canada's National Institute for the Study of Public Policy Affecting Persons with an Intellectual Impairment.

The Roeher Institute has two major goals:

- to identify and anticipate future trends that will support the presence, participation, self-determination and contribution of persons with an intellectual impairment in their communities;
- to foster the exchange of ideas leading to new ways of thinking about persons with an intellectual impairment.

The Institute conducts, sponsors and publishes research in a wide range of areas, with a maior focus on public policy and funding, on studies of innovative social programs and on the development of policy alternatives. It offers training programs and workshops across Canada on topics such as integrated education, post secondary education, leisure, employment, and alternatives to intrusive methods of behaviour modification. Through its Information Services, which include a library, a book and film distribution service, and a computer accessible information system. The Instiute provides up-to-date information to the public, professionals and community groups. The Institute also publishes the quarterly magazine **entourage**.

The Roeher Institute is sponsored by the Canadian Association for Community Living, a voluntary organization bringing together over 400 local and twelve provincial and territorial associations working on behalf of persons with an intellectual impairment.

For more information about The Roeher Institute, please contact us at:

Kinsmen Building, York University, 4700 Keele Street, North York, Ontario, Canada M3J 1P3 (416) 661-9611

Dedication

To the families (parents, siblings and students themselves) who have struggled for access to and equity in school and community and from whom we have learned so much; and to the teachers and educators who have accepted the challenge and turned vision into reality.

Preface

As someone interested in issues of social reform and strategies for change, I feel it is a special privilege to write this preface for *Changing Canadian Schools*. This is a very well balanced, thorough, and practical book. Its chapters contain clear analysis of all the roles involved in changing special education practices. It provides perspectives and insights from the points of view of parents, administrators, regular classroom teachers, special education resource teachers, consultants and school board staff, and more. Personal stories and case studies make the reading interesting, poignant and rich. Larger scale analysis and synthesis are also provided on the law, policy making and policy content.

The book contains many ideas for strategies and practical suggestions for success. It combines advocacy with insight, and demonstrates that both will (persists) and skill (good strategies) are needed for success. There is no other book of its kind in Canada that provides such a timely and comprehensive account of the state-of-the-art of special education reform.

Special education reform represents just about all the issues involved in bringing about educational reform. The existence of significant social needs even when combined with legislation is not sufficient to achieve reform.

We know from a lot of research that knowledge of the change process is also crucial (Fullan, 1991).

Some of the key obstacles to reform include the problems of *complexity*, *compatibility*, *capability*, and lack of coordinated *leadership*. Special education reform reflects all of these problems. The solutions to inclusion are not easily achieved. It is complex both in the nature and degree of change required to identify and implement solutions that work. Philosophical and pedagogical ideas in the debate about inclusion are often in conflict and perceived to be incompatible so that we are dealing with changes in belief systems. Capability or the degree of skill and know-how is a perennial central problem of change. This is why continuous in-service education or professional development is a critical strategy. Given what change requires — persistence, coordination, follow-up, conflict resolution, and the like — leadership at all levels is required including teacher leaders, school administrators, school board consultants, parent leaders and provincial ministries.

The ideas in *Changing Canadian Schools* provide ample insight for addressing the above obstacles to reform. Above all, the book demonstrates that we should not wait for someone else to take the first step. It takes *each individual* pushing for needed change. When many individuals begin pushing in the same direction they begin to intersect, and influence others along the way. We have in this book a compilation of the struggles and success stories of such individuals whose efforts have begun to add up

and to make a substantial difference and improvement in educational practice.

Dr. G. Michael Fullan

Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Toronto.

Fullan, M. (1991) *The New Meaning of Educational Change*.

Toronto: OISE Press; New York: Teachers College Press.

Introduction

An idea which was dismissed by all but a few educators just a decade ago is now becoming reality in an increasing number of schools across Canada. Students who have a disability are being educated alongside their non-disabled peers.

This book is designed to fill a gap in the resources available to parents, educators and those people interested in educational policy and change. Canada is currently at a crossroad in special education practice. The traditional model of educating students who have a disability in their own classrooms and schools is giving way to systems which include all students in the same classrooms. This approach, which is mandated by law in the province of New Brunswick, is replicated in school districts, schools and individual classrooms all across the country.

The cumulative Canadian experience of inclusionary education is now substantial. There is ample evidence that integration can and does work for all children regardless of their disability or handicapping condition. However, much remains to be done in order to move from present circumstances to the point where inclusion in regular classes in the neighbourhood school is taken for granted. This book is meant to assist those who want to contribute to this effort.

In Chapter 1, we have identified three factors connected to achieving school integration:

- law — a legal and legislative base
- Advocacy — a vision clearly articulated and effectively advanced
- Innovation — creative educational practice that captures the vision and turns it into reality in classrooms and schools.

Each chapter in *Changing Canadian Schools* addresses one or more of these factors. Taken together they offer a broad perspective on the issue in question. The book's three sections — Philosophical, Legal and Historical Overview; Parent and Self-Advocacy; and Innovations and Practical Applications — parallel the evolution of an inclusionary approach to schooling.

The first section describes the ideals and attitudes that led to a desire for inclusive education. Various contributors explain the social theory and legal action that arose as people began to work towards their ideals.

The philosophical underpinnings of education integration are part of the overall vision of rights for people who have a mental handicap. Chapter 2 explains the vision as articulated by the Canadian Association for Community Living. It explains that education which includes all students is a critical foundation for building communities in which all individuals can participate, regardless of disability. Peter Park, a founding

member of People First of Canada, an advocacy organization of individuals who have been labelled mentally handicapped, sums up the situation:

I have to thank my father and mother for not putting me in a segregated school back in the '50s when they were just starting. They said. "No, you have to go to a regular school", and I have benefitted from it. I had regular friends, got into regular trouble, and all the things a person does when they are growing up. When you are in a segregated setting nobody else wants to talk to you, nobody wants to have anything to do with you except the people that you have daily contact with. So you don't make friends there. You don't know how to conduct yourself appropriately.

The second section, Parent and Self-Advocacy is a glimpse into the personal drama that lies behind years of legal action and lobbying driven by parents who persistently challenged established systems. As with other aspects of the community living movement, parents were major players in the efforts to open schools to children traditionally excluded from regular classrooms.

In the 1970s and '80s, parents of children with a mental handicap began to develop higher expectations for the lives of their children than had traditionally been dictated by the medical profession. These parents wanted alternatives to segregated education and they became involved in "early intervention", new methods of stimulating their children and discovering and building on their children's capacity to learn. In following through on their expectations and seeking opportunities for their sons and daughters, parents were thrust into leadership roles. They organized parents' groups, chaired lobbying committees and confronted school boards and education ministries.

The personal perspectives of the contributors demonstrate not only their courage and conviction in these challenging roles. They also reveal the extent of their involvement in the politics and complexities of the education systems as they met with resistance and worked to understand and untangle a mass of bureaucracy. It was often the case that they were lobbying for concepts which people in the education system had not yet begun to consider.

The third section, Innovations and Practical Applications describes the fruits of these parents' efforts — inclusion in action. As the education system has begun to adapt to demands for inclusion, new approaches have evolved at all levels. The chapters in this section are written by people with first-hand experience in implementing inclusive programs through the development and pursuit of important strategies for teachers, school administrators and special education professionals.

These strategies cover the many facets of preparation for and planning of inclusion, such as curriculum development and problem-solving tactics.

Readers will notice that authors of the various chapters have used many different

terms to refer to the students targeted in an inclusionary model, from “student with a mental handicap” to “student with special needs” to “exceptional student”. These different terms actually reflect the ongoing struggle with language. In a country as diverse as Canada, people have conflicting views; what may be acceptable terminology in one area is seen as backwards and regressive in other areas. Therefore, because the book reflects the experiences of many people in integration, it also reflects the state of the evolution of language and that diversity of opinion.

In addition, many of the contributors to the book mention that they look forward to a time when the word “integration” will not be necessary because the concept will simply be a fact of life. This view is shared by people advocating for inclusion who look forward to a day when the various “labels” used to identify people through their differences are no longer necessary. David Jory, the parent of a young man labelled mentally handicapped (see Chapter 5) writes:

After all these years, I do not like to use the word “integration” any more. The use of the word, however, is necessary because, for far too long, our school systems have practised systematic discrimination against pupils with a mental handicap. “Integration” is simply the process of righting that wrong. I prefer to think of an integrated schoolsystem in which the educational needs of all pupils are met appropriately, and I hope that soon the word “integrated” will be unnecessary. But we are not at that stage yet.

This book has taken several years to prepare and in the course of that time we have been anxious to finish it. At the same time we have been pleased that our contributors have had more time to update their material based on their continuing involvement in integrated education initiatives. Most of the contributors are from New Brunswick and the reasons for this must be noted. First, since one of the editors is from New Brunswick, personal knowledge of the people working in this field was a factor. Second, experience with integrated education as a result of legislative and policy initiatives is unique in the province, giving educators and parents substantial experience which they have shared in this book.

A special word of thanks is due to Dr. G. Michael Fullan, Dean of the Faculty of Education, University of Toronto, for his generosity in writing the preface to this book. His words of support for the approaches put forward are encouraging reinforcement for people engaged in the struggle towards inclusion. His words are all the more powerful because he is recognized internationally as a leader in understanding educational change.

A heartfelt thank you goes to Laura Code, Publications Editor at The Roeher Institute for her cheerful but persistent prompting and motivation, without which the book would have never have been completed. All the contributors deserve recognition both for their valuable additions to the book as well as for their willingness to rework their

material in order to produce a balance between the chapters.

We hope the strategies and practical suggestions presented in *Changing Canadian Schools* will be useful to families and educators alike. Their efforts will promote the inclusion of people with disabilities in all aspects of community life, and improve the education system for all students.

Gordon L. Porter and Diane Richler
August, 1991

Section One

**Philosophical,
Legal and
Historical
Overview**

Chapter 1

Changing Special Education Practice: Law, Advocacy and Innovation

by Gordon L. Porter and Diane Richler

It is somewhat ironic that the very organizations that first legitimized the education of children who have mental handicaps are now the ones fighting to dismantle the systems that are the product of their success. Yet, when the Canadian Association for Community Living (CACL) established a task force to identify issues facing the advocacy movement for people with mental handicaps, integrated education was rated a top priority (CACL, 1987). The goal of the Association is to promote the participation of people with mental handicaps in their communities by focusing on their citizenship (the power to exercise their rights), their inclusion (as full members of their communities), and their self-determination (the power to make their own decisions).

Rioux (1988) documents how specialized and separate services result from a paradigm that labels individuals with intellectual handicaps as socially inferior. Therefore, the kind of care and treatment available to them, as well as laws, policies, and programs, have been developed solely on the basis of this label. Criteria for generic programs systematically keep out people with mental handicaps and there is a rationalization of the need for parallel and separate systems.

During the 1980s, the process of gradual, evolutionary change in special education practice in Canada was subject to increasing challenge. In this chapter we discuss three factors [law, advocacy, and educational innovation] which, taken together, have created in Canada a unique environment supportive of fundamental change in how students with disabilities are educated. These developments have resulted in the kind of ambiguity and inconsistency in special education practice that has been identified as being necessary for a paradigm shift (Skrtic, 1987). Whether or not this shift will be toward full integration of students with disabilities will only become clear over the next several years. We conclude our review of these three factors with a brief discussion of the crucial role an integrated educational program plays in preparing a student with disabilities for life as an adult in the community.

LAW

The Special Committee on Social Policy Development of the New Brunswick Legislature issued its Report on the Review of School Integration on October 31, 1989. The report was issued following five weeks of public hearings into school integration, during which the twelve-member committee visited sixtythree schools and heard more than 250 briefs presented by parents, members, administrators, school boards, and other

citizens. The report's recommendations in summary include the following:

- The province should confirm its commitment to Bill 85, which mandated the integration of special needs children into the regular school system.
- The education minister should clear up differences over interpretation and implementation of the act and issue "clear directives to all school boards."
- The education minister should immediately give school boards the funds they need to meet the requirements of the bill.
- More training on teaching exceptional children should be provided to teachers and ... should provide more such training in their education programs.
- The education minister should provide leadership by accenting the successes and positive points of integration (Committee reports, 1989).

Continuing controversy over integration and intensive pressure from the province's teachers' union had prompted the minister of education in May 1989, to mandate this committee with the task of reviewing the integration process that has been under way in New Brunswick since the passage of Bill 85 in 1986. Union leaders had maintained that integration was putting New Brunswick's already strained education system at risk of collapse. The president of the New Brunswick Teachers' Association claimed that "integration is turning classrooms into zoos" and creating conditions in which "teachers can't teach and students can't learn" (Benteau, 1989). The union insisted that the "horror stories" of integration be made public and that the issue be included in their negotiation of a new collective agreement (Richardson, 1989). As a result, the committee's strong support for the integration process came as a surprise to many and as a relief to advocates for students with disabilities.

While provincial legislation in Canada requires school boards to provide educational services to students with disabilities, how the service is delivered is generally left to the discretion of local school authorities. In Ontario, the passage of Bill 82 in 1980 raised parents' hopes that integrated programs would be easier to achieve, but that has not been the result. Both British Columbia and Alberta have recently revised their legislation governing schools, but the right of a student with disabilities to placement in a regular class with his or her nondisabled peers is not assured.

With few exceptions, Canadian school boards have generally offered options that have become the standard both in this country (Csapo and Goguen, 1980) and in the United States under public Law 94-142 (Gartner and Lipsky, 1987):

- "pull-out" resource room programs for students with mild disabilities;
- segregated schools or segregated classes in regular schools for students with moderate or severe disabilities;
- individual cases of integration for students with moderate disabilities.

However, while education is an area of provincial jurisdiction, the context in which provincial education legislation operates underwent a dramatic shift when the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* was entrenched in the Canadian constitution 1982. Several sections of the *Charter* have implications for policy and practice relevant to the education of students with mental and/or physical disabilities (McKay, 1984; Vickers and Endicott, 1985). It has been suggested that the aspects of education legislation which are most subject to challenge under *the Charter* are procedures for: student assessment and categorisation; placement; the discretion to exclude students from regular classrooms; and the very concept of segregated education (Robertson, 1987).

The *Charter* created a new environment in which the overriding principles of liberty, freedom from discrimination, and freedom of association set broad parameters within which education systems must operate. Since the equality rights in the *Charter* did not come into force until 1985, the assurance of equality rights in many areas is still in the process of being established. However, it is the opinion of some that segregated educational programs are a natural target for litigation based on the *Charter* (Donahue, 1988; MacKay, 1987a). In any event, there has been an increased awareness of and sensitivity to the question of school integration for students with disabilities.

In 1986, a Nova Scotia couple, Rick and Maureen Elwood, obtained a court injunction to keep their son Luke, who had been labelled mentally handicapped since birth, in a regular class in their neighbourhood school. They concluded that their only chance of prevailing in their dispute over his placement with the Halifax County School Board was to go to trial. School officials firmly maintained Luke would be better served in a segregated program. Their position that a range of placement options was necessary depending on the student's level of disability was consistent with the concept of least restrictive environment and the [\(Cascade model\)](#), both typical of traditional special education practice (Little, 1985). The department of education did not intervene on their behalf.

The Elwoods did not take this action lightly. They knew they would face the tension and unease of challenging one of the most established vested authorities in their community, the educational system. As Jack Batten (1988) explains, they also knew that inactivity on their part would mean a life of isolation for their son:

Luke took gym and music classes with normal kids, but, effectively, he was shut away in a ghetto of disabled children. And as far as Maureen could make out, he might pass the rest of his life in different corners of the same ghetto. He'd never escape. He'd never grow. If Luke was disabled, then the system seemed constructed to keep him disabled.

The dispute went on throughout the 1986-87 school year as the school board refused to accept the principle of integration. However, just hours before the case was to open

before the Queen's Bench division of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court, the board initiated discussions that led to a settlement of the dispute (Batten, 1988). The school board agreed to the parents' demand and the result was a court-approved agreement that assured Luke Elwood an integrated school program with appropriate support (MacKay, 1987b).

The case has received considerable national attention from both parents and school officials (MacKay, 1987b; McCallum, 1987).

In addition to the impetus of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (1982), a number of parents, parent groups, and educators throughout Canada have been calling for more integrated and inclusive school programs for students with disabilities. In the province of New Brunswick, this led to political action, and, as indicated above, subsequent legislative reform. Bill 85, which addresses the equality and procedural issues for educational practice that flow from the Charter, was unanimously passed by the New Brunswick legislature in 1986. Section 45(2)1 of Bill 85 (1986) deals with placement considerations and is particularly significant:

A school board shall place exceptional pupils such that they receive special education programs and services in circumstances where exceptional pupils can participate with pupils who are not exceptional pupils within regular classroom settings to the extent that is considered practicable by the board having due regard for the education needs of all pupils.

This section provides clear direction that integrated school programs are assumed to be appropriate for exceptional students in New Brunswick schools. Alternatives are to be used only after every attempt has been made to make an integrated program work. A school board may decide that an integrated program is not practicable for a given student, for a given period of time, for specific reasons; however, withdrawal is to occur only for compelling reasons that are considered necessary to meet the child's needs and on the condition that a plan to return the child to the regular class is made at the time of the withdrawal (Department of Education, Province of New Brunswick, 1988a).

While the law and policy just described for New Brunswick is clearly the most supportive of integration in Canada, it has not eliminated legal disputes over placement decisions. At the same time that teachers in New Brunswick were expressing grave concern about the effects of integration, one family was fighting the same battle for their daughter's access to a regular class that the Elwoods had fought two years before in Nova Scotia. In this case, a legal challenge was made to seek compliance with a law the parents believed was consistent with the *Charter*. Joe and Anne Robichaud had been unhappy for some time with their daughter Nathalie's placement in a special class. As they saw integration initiated in more and more schools in New Brunswick, they were increasingly anxious that things should change

for her as well. In the fall of 1987, they arranged for her to attend a regular class but, when things did not go well, they concluded that school officials were not willing to do what was necessary to improve the situation, and they withdrew her from school. Nathalie spent very little time in school during the 1987-88 school year but the Robichauds declined repeated suggestions from school administrators that she return to a segregated class. As the 1988 fall term moved on with Nathalie still out of school, the Robichauds reluctantly pursued a legal remedy to their situation.

Developments in the Robichaud case followed closely the pattern of the Elwood case. In December 1988, Joe and Anne Robichaud filed suit against the school board. An injunction was obtained in January 1989 ordering that Nathalie be immediately placed in a regular class until the case could go to full trial. As a result, Nathalie Robichaud, like Luke Elwood, attended a regular class while the legal manoeuvring went on in the background. In June 1989, several weeks after the Special Committee of Legislators received its mandate to review progress toward integration, the Robichauds were scheduled to take their case to court.

However, counsel for the school board approached the Robichauds about agreement on a settlement, and, like the Elwoods, the Robichauds were able to reach agreement only days before their case was to be heard in court. The settlement provided that Nathalie Robichaud, like Luke Elwood, receive instruction in a regular classroom in a neighbourhood school with non-disabled peers. Unfortunately, the Robichauds, like the Elwoods, were left responsible for their legal expenses while taxpayers covered the costs incurred by the school board and their administrators.

The Robichauds were forced to turn to the courts because New Brunswick's francophone school boards and the francophone division of the department of education have been perceived as taking a more traditional approach to integration. The *Enoncé de principe sur l'intégration scolaire*, developed by department officials and issued to school boards, provides for a "continuum of service" based on the Cascade model mentioned above. It is most often interpreted to mean that a student may be integrated only when it is clear the student can "benefit" from the class. In other words, the burden of proof rests with the student who must show "readiness" for integration (Department of Education, 1988b).

Both the Robichauds and the Elwoods began their legal appeals after the equality rights provisions of the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* came into effect in 1985. The *Charter* provided them with a legal basis for their demands that had not existed previously (Bales vs. Board of School Trustees, 1984). Since both cases were settled out of court, their resolutions do not have the weight of court decisions. However, the fact that two different school boards in two provinces capitulated completely to parent demand at the eleventh hour seems to indicate their expectation that, faced with the *Charter*, they would lose in the courtroom. Additional litigation by parents in the coming decade will be necessary to establish clear jurisprudence in this

contentious area.

ADVOCACY

Although many of the segregated schools that existed across Canada in the early 1980s had been started by local chapters of the Canadian Association for Community Living (the national advocacy association for persons with mental handicaps) segregated schools and segregated classes no longer satisfy the aspirations of many families. Parent advocacy for integrated schooling has increased substantially in the years following adoption of the *Charter*, particularly by parents of children labelled mentally handicapped. CACL has advocated and promoted the right of every student to attend a regular class in a neighbourhood school. This policy has been formally supported by all off CACL's provincial and territorial affiliates (CACL, 1987) .

While integration was not a matter of priority to most local or provincial associations in the early 1980s, at the national level, The Roeher Institute, sponsored by CACL, began to support parents as they struggled to articulate their concerns about their children's education. At the community, provincial and national levels, parents found solidarity and strength by banding together. As parent demand grew, the (Roeher) Institute and CACL identified and promoted positive examples of integration and facilitated training for educators to work in integrated settings. These courses led to the establishment of university affiliated programs that are currently providing teachers and school administrators with the attitudes and skills they need to meet increasing parent demand for integration. Since the early 1980s, the (Roeher) Institute and CACL have actively promoted integration through conferences and seminars, publications, video productions, and financial and consulting support for selected litigation.

CACL actively supported the development of an autonomous parent organization, the Integration Action Group, which now has a substantial membership in southern Ontario and a number of chapters in other provinces.

By the mid 1980s, the Integration Action Group was providing sophisticated support to individual families struggling to achieve integration. Since 1987, the Centre for Integrated Education (now called the Centre for Integrated Education and Community) has been another source of training, consultation, and resource development for both parents and professionals. Such initiatives are unique to Canada and have helped give parents the courage and determination to seek integrated educational fittings for their children. Parents have insisted with considerable success that the traditional special education system change. The increasing demand from parents has been evident in every province and territory and the concerns that have created the demand have been consistent. Parents' demand for integrated education stems from a vision for their children's future which they only see realized in a regular class with non-disabled peers.

At a meeting for parents of special needs children, we were asked, “What is your dream for your child?” I never [thought] I had a dream for my son Daniel who has special needs... After thinking about it, [however, I realized] I do have a dream for Daniel — a very simple dream. I dream of Daniel taking an apple to his teacher, of packing his lunch for school, of seeing him in a school play, and of him bringing home his report card. These are very ordinary things for most parents, but to the family of a [mentally handicapped] child, these are dreams that bring unexplained joy.

And I have another very special dream for Daniel that is coming true right now. While at play group Daniels friend Evan sits with him ... I hope when my son is in high school, his friends will say, Daniel doesn’t need an attendant all day — we’ll help him with his lunch — we’ll make sure he gets to classes — we’ll help him to get on and off the bus. We’ll take him to the school dances and basketball games, simply because he is our friend and we care about him.

— *Carson, 1987*

Parents have invariably had a deep feeling of malaise both about the prospect and the reality of special education. This has been true even when parents have had no clear conception of why this is so and how it might be changed. [Goffman \(1963\)](#) has provided a thorough description of the underlying factors that affect people’s perception of difference. As one parent explains,

Our experience with special education goes back to 1976. We have seen at first hand the damage the segregated school system has done to some students, particularly those with severe handicaps. The system was based on the negative, stressing the students’ differences and inabilities. Special education teachers have told us repeatedly that our daughter Yvonne “does not understand”, “is not able to ...”, “will never be able to ...”, and so on. The turning point came about five years ago with the recognition that although our daughter will probably always need assistance in daily living, the most important element in her life will be friends and the ability to communicate with them. It has taken a number of years for educators to understand the importance of this.

— *Penner, 1989*

The only time in my son's life that he was segregated was in our school system. It is not the only time he has learned; he has learned much as a member of the YMCA, at various jobs, and in groups ... What this tells me is that the segregation that was part of his educational upbringing, unfortunately, was a learned response, it is not natural. It seems to me that in an environment where we believe that [all] people should be treated equally ... there is no place in our school system [for the] kind of segregation ... being promoted through the Cascade model.

— *Jory, 1989*

(see Chapter 5)

The proliferation of early intervention programs in the last decade has raised the expectations of parents about the potential of their children to learn and develop. Participation in integrated day care, nurseries and kindergartens has created parental expectations that their children would continue to be educated in the regular stream.

Early intervention provides [excellent] support and information for families with children who show a delay. Matthew [who was born with Down Syndrome] was enrolled when he was a day old. We all worked to see that Matthew achieved all his milestones as soon as he could. We pushed him to be the very best he could be ... Matthew did everything my other children did; maybe not as fast, but he succeeded. When Matthew was three he went to preschool ... two mornings a week. Matthew, at four years, was enrolled in a kindergarten four mornings a week ... In his fifth year, Matthew attended French immersion kindergarten and [he] is now in [a] Grade 1 regular class ... Matthew is in school to learn to be the best he can be. He is not [there to be] dumped or babysat.

— *Crealock, 1989*

Furthermore, parents who see their children with disabilities participating fully in other aspects of community life cannot accept that they should have to travel out of their neighbourhoods, often at great distance, to attend school. Maureen Elwood acknowledged that this separation from peers was one of the major concerns that led to the family's militancy:

What's happened is that Luke's been alienated from everyone around him ... It starts first thing in the morning. Luke doesn't go to school a couple of miles down the road from us, the school where all the other kids in the neighbourhood go. Oh no, he gets collected in a taxi and goes miles off in the other direction.

— *Batten, 1988*

Parents have increasingly united and worked together to turn their visions from dreams into reality. “We have become a united voice, a resource to other parents and [the] community, and strength to one another. It is because we have stood together that we have seen many significant and exciting changes in our schools and our community,” says Alene Steinbach, a parent (see Chapter 6). However, while advocacy by both associations and parent groups is important, it is individual parents who must carry on the real struggle. Each parent must decide whether or not to engage in the struggle for integration. The number of people making that choice is growing as parents tell their success stories:

For years I watched Mandy stand alone on the front lawn as all of the neighbourhood children rushed by her. I remember thinking, “Please, just one person stop and talk to her, just one of you ask her to play too ... !” [O]ne of the most important benefits of being included [in a regular class is] that Mandy now has friends. [Her] original group of [three] friends has now more than quadrupled in number. They are her classmates, the people who speak up and support her, her advocates at school and in the playgrounds at home ... It is her classmates who come to our home to call on her to come out to play, her friends who invite her to parties and dances, and the kids who are anxious to see her at Brownies, the Mall, gymnastics, figure skating, the ball diamonds, and the hockey rinks. These are the kids who can’t wait to introduce me to their parents as “Mandy’s mom. Mandy, she’s in our class.”

— *Steinbach, 1991*

(see Chapter 6)

INNOVATION

In many parts of North America, the expansion of special education has resulted in the creation of parallel systems for regular and special education. Many jurisdictions with the most mature and comprehensive special education services have evolved to the point where the regular and special education systems exist separately and relate to each other only in the most theoretical way.

Many who promote special education have developed a mentality of compartmentalizing: rather than restructure a system that is inadequate, “gaps in service” are filled with new special education programs (Porter, 1990).

The goal, indeed the mission, of an effective school is to assure success in learning for all students. The development of a parallel special education system has been harmful, not only because it has excluded exceptional students and prevented their contact with non-disabled peers, but also because of the effect it has had on the regular education program (Gartner and Lipsky, 1987; Reynolds, Wang and Walburg, 1987; Stainback and

Stainback, 1984; Will, 1986). A School that passes over all the students with learning problems to a separate special education system undermines its capacity to be a holistic unit that serves all students well. The Director of education of a Roman Catholic school board in western Canada describes his rationale for dismantling such a separate structure:

In 1982 ... I took the Student Services Department out of the organizational chart and said we will be one department, and it will be Instructional Services. Until then there were two heads of two departments. I said if Student Services is part of Instruction then it has to be part of that department, right at the board level too. We didn't wipe out the staff, but we [incorporated] Student Services [into] Instructional Services... People [often] want to keep the functions separate. My contention is that organizationally we've got to have them together. If there's a sense of education being integral and being for everybody, then those services have to be in the one department.

— *Porter, 1990*

It is now recognized that learning problems are contextual. They exist within the context of the classroom where the curriculum design and the instructional strategies employed by the teacher influence the degree to which exceptional students can be effectively served. A commitment to integrated or inclusive education means teachers, schools, and the community commit themselves to resolving problems that arise in a way that respects the integrity of the school as an organization (Porter, 1986).

The traditional approach to special education encouraged the classroom teacher to refer any difficulties to experts who would diagnose, prescribe, and invariably provide alternate instruction for the student (Little, 1985). The message inherent was that regular class teachers were not qualified or competent to provide education to a student with a significant learning problem.

The past decade has seen an increasing number of school districts make a commitment to full integration for all students (Forest, 1984a; Forest, 1987). These range from several Catholic school districts in southern Ontario (Little, 1985), to French-language districts in Quebec (Frigon, 1988), to several public districts in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia (Porter, 1990). Many other school districts across Canada are moving toward more integrated approaches to special education.

One of the compelling features of the school districts that have moved toward an integrated approach on a systemic basis is what Sage (1989) has described as the relatively “primitive” level of development of their special services when they began to incorporate integration policy and practice. The term “primitive” is not used in a negative sense, but rather to draw attention to the districts’ relatively late development of special education programs.

This is true of many small and rural school districts in Canada as well as many of the separate or Roman Catholic school systems, where the neighbourhood school may be the only school available. Developing support for integration in such circumstances can be based on the natural sensitivity of a local school to the families that live in the community.

Administrators from a small school district in New Brunswick illustrated this point well in their presentation to the province's legislative committee. District 21 is made up of several small towns and islands along the southwest coast of New Brunswick. It has 1,550 students in eight community schools. The superintendent describes his school board's close relationship with the public:

We are not at arm's length, but shoulder to shoulder with the public, [who] are involved in their community school. [T]hey were involved with the integration process before and after 1987, and they feel reasonably comfortable with it.

— *Hayes, 1989*

The separate or Roman Catholic school boards in several provinces also have features that have made them more receptive to integration. First, the traditional segregated special education programs have been linked to the public school system. Therefore, the segregated schools and segregated classes so characteristic of the last several decades passed them by (Forest, 1983; Forest, 1984a). A second and equally important factor is the stress Roman Catholic school systems have placed on the importance of values and the nurturing of family, church, and community through the school (Flynn and Kowalczyk-McPhee, 1989; Hanson, 1987):

What is critical and essential in the Catholic School System [is] the sense of community that reaches out and accepts everybody; not just the football or basketball player, but [also] this youngster who had to be pushed in a wheelchair; who had to be taken to the toilet; [a sense of community that sees] his sense of humour [despite] his disability [and] pain ... He was the one giving support to the others at times ... I can talk about [integration] from an educational, philosophical point of view. I can [also] talk about it from a religious point of view and the two move hand in hand.

— *Porter, 1990*

A similar view is expressed by Dr. Albert Murray, district superintendent of school districts 28 and 29 in New Brunswick, which have been using an integration approach for students with disabilities since 1985 (Porter, 1986):

Children with special needs must not be viewed just from the perspective of their disability. They must not be simply assessed, assigned a category, and given the most specialized treatment possible. Rather, they must be viewed holistically as belonging to a valued and supportive community, which, for young people, is the peer group found in the classroom. The need is to adjust the classroom organization, instructional strategies, and curriculum to meet the challenges of the wide range of learners. This is good educational practice [that] assists all students in realizing their highest potential as individuals and as members of society. Such an approach permits schools to do what they were intended to do, [enabling] students to learn and belong, and ... teachers to facilitate the process.

— *Murray, 1989*

Other examples of innovation grew out of situations in which the traditional system was firmly entrenched and the only avenue leading to integration was to start an alternative program or school. The Saturday-Get-Together, Summer-Get-Together and Thousand Cranes School are among alternative examples of how integration could produce positive results for children (Bracewell and Milligan, 1984; Forest, 1981; Forest, 1982).

While such innovation has been difficult in large school systems, isolated examples have flourished in virtually every province and territory, and networking among like-minded educators has helped to promote and refine the models.

School districts that have been willing to take alternative challenge and develop innovative and supportive alternatives to the old models of segregated special education have been critical to the progress made in Canada. We believe this movement will continue to grow as more and more jurisdictions break through traditional barriers and forge an even stronger basis not only for integration, but for the education of all students. As one teacher involved in integrated school programs explains it:

I think the biggest thing we've done, other than Integration is to make teachers aware of the fact that all children are not learning at the grade level. They have to teach them at the level they're at and have them meet with success at that level. I think [this is] happening a lot more than it ever happened before ... A lot of children are having their needs met [today, whereas] before [they] would have just been pushed along or ignored.

— *Porter, 1991*

(see Chapter 8)

CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have described the movement toward schools that accept and include all students in regular classrooms. We have identified factors related to law, advocacy, an educational innovation as being critical to this development. Yet it is also true that despite the positive changes made in Canada in the last decade most children with serious disabilities still spend most of their time in segregated classes with little opportunity to interact with their non-disabled peers.

Biklen (1985) has identified quality education as respectful of the individual needs of all students, creative, exciting, and welcoming of children regardless of their differences. Not only does integrated education prepare children with handicapping conditions to become part of their communities, it also prepares the children without any identifiable handicap to do the same.

A parent who was impressed with the way the children in her daughter's integrated Grade 1 class welcomed, cared for, and felt responsible for a student with Down Syndrome gives us a view of a very different future. She describes what her non-handicapped child has learned from being educated in an integrated setting:

Our Erin now has a good understanding of what Down Syndrome means and understands also that this child can progress. She is comfortable with [handicapped people] and realistic and positive about them. It is a joy to us, as parents, in this highly competitive world, to see that these values can and do exist, and can be lived within an often less-than-perfect school system.

— *Secord, 1989*

In a sense the jury is still out, not on whether integration is a good idea, but on how the movement toward inclusionary education will proceed in Canada. The challenge to school systems is a major one as the experience in New Brunswick illustrates. This creates a situation where those involved in education need to decide whether the prevailing approach to special education should be defended and enhanced, or whether fundamental and innovative changes should be implemented.

In both the Elwood and Robichaud cases the school authorities and the professionals involved resisted the parents' demands and hardened their positions. In both cases this was harmful to the parents and the child, as well as the school system.

In our view, a more positive and constructive approach is in the interest of concerned. The essential elements of this approach are the following:

1. The support the *Charter* offers for integrated education should be acknowledged and school authorities should initiate programs to develop and implement such programs.
2. School authorities and professionals must work to develop real partnership with parents, drawing on their visions for their children's future, as well as including them in meaningful way in actual program planning.
3. Professionals engaged directly or indirectly in public education, such as teachers, psychologists, social workers, and therapists need to develop strategies for more effective collaboration to support a more inclusionary educational program.

The opportunity to enhance the natural capacity of our communities to support individuals with disabilities through integrated school programs is clear. We conclude with the words of a parent who articulated her support for a new approach to schooling to the New Brunswick legislative committee:

I went to a school ... that was not integrated. I was an adult when I had my first encounter with an integrated person, and it happened to be my own child. I think my idea of society was incorrect because I was not allowed to have that experience ... I cannot see how there is a negative aspect to learning something new, getting rid of a prejudice, learning how to get along with someone who is different, whether mentally, physically, or racially. I think that it is only positive.

— *Thompson, 1989*

This chapter is a modified version of the original article “Changing Special Education Practice: Law, Advocacy and Innovation,” which appeared in the Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, Fall 1990, Vol. 9, No. 2.

REFERENCES

- Bales v. Board of School Trustees, School District 23* (Central Okanagan). (1984). (Supreme Court of British Columbia, unreported).
- Batten, J. (1988). *On Trial*. Toronto: Macmillan.
- Benteau, S. (1989, April 28). MacLeod: Wages not only issue. *Saint John Telegraph Journal*, p. 1.
- Biklen, D. (1985). *Achieving the Complete School: Strategies for Effective Mainstreaming*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bill 82: *Education Amendment Act*. (1980, December). Toronto: Legislature of Ontario.
- Bill 85: *An Act to Amend the Schools Act*. (1986, June). 4th session, 50th legislature, Province of New Brunswick.
- Bracewell, D. and Milligan, K. (1983). Thousand Cranes School: Building a dream. *Mental Retardation*, 33(4), pp. 26-30.
- Canadian Association for Community Living. (1987). *Community Living 2000: A Time of Change, a Time of Challenge*. Toronto: Author.
- Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Part I of the Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B of the Canada Act, 1982 (U.K.).
- Carson, L. (1987). My dream. In *Integration Means All Our Children Belong*. Fredericton, NB: Student Services Branch, Department of Education. p. 13.
- Committee reports. (1989, November 1). *New Brunswick Telegraph Journal*, p. 3.
- Crealock, P. (1989, September 27). Remarks. *Transcript of the Ninth Meeting of the Special Committee on Social Policy Development*. Fredericton, NB: Queen's Printer. pp.

Csapo, M. and L. Goguen. (Eds). (1980). *Special Education Across Canada: Issues and concerns for the '80s*. Vancouver, BC: Centre for Human Development and Research.

Department of Education, Province of New Brunswick. (1988a). *Working Guidelines on Integration*. Fredericton, NB: Department of Education.

Department of Education, Province of New Brunswick. (1988b). *L'Enoncé de principe sur l'intégration scolaire*. Fredericton, NB: Department of Education.

Donahue, T. (1988). Armed with the Charter. *entourage*, 3(1), pp. 42-47.

Flynn, G. and B. Kowalczyk-McPhee. (1989). A school system in transition. In S. Steinbeck, W. Stainbeck, & M. Forest (Eds), *Educating All Students in the Mainstream of Regular Education*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., pp. 29-41.

Forest, M. (1981). Reflections on a new kind of school: *Mental Retardation*, 31 (4), pp. 35-43.

Forest, M. (1982). Reflections on a new kind of school: Update. *Mental Retardation*, 32 (4). pp. 30-31.

Forest, M. (1983). Right in our own backyard. *Mental Retardation*, 33(1), pp. 24-27.

Forest, M. (Ed.). (1984a). *Education Integration: A collection of readings on the integration of children with mental handicaps into regular school systems*. Downsview, Ont.: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

Forest, M. (1984b). Education update: Wellington County Separate School Board at work. *Mental Retardation*, 34(3). pp. 35-39.

Forest, M. (Ed.). (1987). *More Education Integration*. Downsview, Ont.: The G. Allan Roeher Institute.

Frigon, O. (1988). Stopping segregation. *entourage*. 3(1), pp. 35-39.

Gartner, A. and D. Lipsky. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(4). pp. 367-395.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hanson, J. (1987). Each belongs. In M. Forest (Ed.). *More Education Integration*. Downsview, Ont.: The G. Allan Roeher Institute. pp. 95-100.

Hayes, F. (1989, September 26). Remarks. *Transcript of the Eighth Meeting of the Special Committee on Social Policy Development*. Fredericton, NB: Queen's Printer, p. 49.

- Jory, D. (1989, September 26). Remarks. *Transcript of the Eighth Meeting of the Special Committee on Social Policy Development*. Fredericton, NB: Queen's Printer, pp. 62-63.
- Little, D.M.(1985). A crime against childhood -uniform curriculum at a uniform rate: Mainstreaming re-examined and redefined. *Canadian Journal of Special Education*, 2(1).pp. 91-107.
- MacKay, A.W. (1984). *Education Law in Canada*. Toronto: Emond-Montgomery.
- MacKay, A.W. (1987a). The Charter of Rights and special education: Blessing or curse? *Canadian Journal for Exceptional Children*, 3 (4). pp. 118-127.
- MacKay, A.W. (1987b). The Elwood Case: Vindicating the educational rights of the disabled. *Canadian Journal of Special Education*, 3 (2), pp. 103-116.
- McCallum, S.D. (1987). A giant step for all kids. *entourage*, 2 (3), pp. 38-39.
- Murray, A. (1989, October 11). Remarks. *Transcript of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Special Committee on Social Policy Development*. Fredericton, NB: Queen's Printer, p. 132.
- Penner, P. (1989, September 14). Remarks. *Transcript of the Third Meeting of the Special Committee on Social Policy Development*. Fredericton, NB: Queen's: Printer, p. 15.
- Porter, G.L. (1986, November). School Integration: Districts 28 & 29. In *Education New Brunswick*. Fredericton, NB. New Brunswick Department of Education, pp. 6-7.
- Porter, G.L. (1990). *Integrated Education as a Paradigm Question: Policy Perspectives of Canadian School Superintendents*. Unpublished doctoral research, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY.
- Reynolds, M.C., M.C. Wang and H.J. Walberg. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children*, 53 (5). pp. 391-398.
- Richardson, D. (1989, May 27). Integration truth must be told — MacKinnon. *Saint John Telegraph Journal*, p. 1.
- Rioux, M.H. (1989). *Last in the Queue*. Downsview, Ont.: The G. Allan Roeher Institute.
- Robertson, G.B. (1987). *Mental Disability and the Law in Canada*. Toronto: Carswen.
- Sage, D. (1989, April). *Obstacles to Implementing School Integration*. Paper presented at the conference of the Council for Exceptional Children, San Francisco.
- Secord, J. (1989, October). *Letter to Peter Gzowski*. Morningside, CBC Radio. Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- Skrtic, T.M. (1987). An organizational analysis of special education reform.

Counterpoint, 8(2), pp. 15-19.

Stainback, W. and S. Stainback. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children*, 51(2). pp. 102-111.

Thompson, S. (1989, October 11). Remarks. *Transcript of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Special Committee on Special Policy Development*. Fredericton, NB: Queen's Printer. p. 88.

Vickers, D. and O. Endicott. (1985). Mental disability and equality rights. In Anne F. Bayefsky and Mary Eberts (Eds.). *Equality Rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Toronto: Carswell, pp. 381-409.

Will, M.C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. *Exceptional Children*, 52(5). pp. 411-415.

Chapter 2

Inclusive Education as Social Policy

by Diane Richler

The pressure to provide education for children with mental handicaps began a half century ago when concerned parents banded together because they wanted their children with mental handicaps to remain at home, to be educated in the community and to be kept out of institutions. From the creation of special educational classes for a few children grew a vision of inclusion for all individuals who have been called mentally handicapped, in all aspects of community life. This vision included full participation in regular classes in neighbourhood schools. That effort has converged, both in its goals and in its vision of the rights of all people, with two broader societal trends. One is the movement towards the equality of all citizens, which is creating awareness of a new Canadian society — one that embraces diversity in all aspects of life. The other is the trend for educational reform which is causing both the public-at-large and educators to reformulate the educational system.

SELECTIVE DIVERSITY

Canada is by definition a nation of diversity. The aboriginal people of this vast country represent but a fraction of the mosaic of races, cultures, religions, languages and lifestyles that is increasingly evident in Canadian cities, towns and villages. Outdated views of Canadians as descendants of white Europeans who speak either English or French have been challenged. There is formal recognition that members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police need not be tall white men in the traditional wide-rimmed hat. They might also be men of colour in turbans, or even women. The legal protection of this new reality has been accompanied (often painfully slowly!) by a shift in attitude and public perception.

Yet, while Canada evolves into a country where diversity of cultural background is welcomed and celebrated, other distinctions, particularly disability, still set some people apart. These people continue to be met by insurmountable barriers, caused by other's attitudes, and by legislation, and societal policies and programs. They ultimately face systematic discrimination and exclusion.

Of all disabilities, intellectual disability is the most negatively perceived, leaving persons who have a mental handicap to live with comprehensive discrimination and exclusion. **Last in the Queue** (Rioux, 1989) documents the layers of this exclusion. These layers must be systematically peeled back in order for persons who have an intellectual disability to take their place as citizens and participants in the full sense of community life.

For persons who have a mental handicap and their families, the barriers to the community are often extremely destructive. They deprive people of self-actualisation, economic independence, intimacy in relationship, mental and physical health, and the ability to chart the course of their own lives.

Recent studies indicate that there are at least 15,000 persons in Canada living in institutions because they have been identified as having a mental handicap (Richler, 1991).

The Canadian Association for Community Living estimates that there are at least an equal number of people living in nursing homes, chronic care hospitals and private institutions. In addition, a 1991 study conducted by CACL reports that there are over 114,000 children and youths in segregated education programs, the vast majority of whom have a mental handicap. Furthermore, tens of thousands of working-age adults who have a mental handicap are excluded from competitive employment. Instead, they attend sheltered workshops or job-readiness programs or are excluded from any activity day after day (CACL, 1991).

THE STRUGGLE FOR INCLUSION

Just as other minority groups in Canada have struggled for inclusion in the mainstream of society, so people who have a mental handicap, their families and their friends have engaged in a long campaign for inclusion.

The first organized activities began simultaneously around the world immediately after the Second World War. Learning from the rehabilitation services which assisted disabled veterans, parents of sons and daughters who had a mental handicap came together to develop rehabilitation services in the community. These services were their alternative to placing their children in large, custodial institutions. The parent groups evolved into associations which took the lead in creating opportunities for their sons and daughters with mental handicaps.

Because their children were denied entry to public schools, the first priority of the associations was usually to begin a class, and then eventually a school in which to teach them. The teachers were often volunteers, or, if paid, were not professional educators because the teaching profession had not yet accepted that children who had been labelled “retarded” could learn.

Eventually, these classes and schools became a part of the public education system and a new profession of “special educators” emerged to operate them.

After the development of education programs in the 1950s and 1960s, most community service associations moved on to establish group homes and sheltered workshops. In the 1970s and 1980s, services proliferated at the local level across Canada. In addition to the establishment of education, residential and vocational programs, there were

explosions in the areas of recreation, family support, and early intervention.

The goal of most services was to support individuals with a mental handicap to live in the community rather than in institutions. However, while the new services were physically “in” the community, they operated as independent entities with no links to the parallel generic services for the community at large.

Although the parents’ movement can be credited with the birth of special education for students with an intellectual disability, by the 1980s it appeared their vision had outgrown their initial achievements. It had been necessary to institute an intermediate system of programs to overcome total exclusion; however, programmed childhood was leading to programmed adulthood. The special education system, which had been developed to prepare children to be part of their communities and to eliminate the need for institutionalization, was in fact preparing people for lives of isolation. They were moving into group homes, working in sheltered workshops and still being marginalized from the rest of the community. By the mid 1980s, there was a pervasive dissatisfaction with the segregated service system in the community. It was time to move onward and upward.

The national voluntary organization, begun by parents at the local level in the late 1940s, had been incorporated at the national level in 1958. It had expanded to include not only parents and other family members, but professionals working in the field, other interested citizens and, most recently, persons who themselves had been considered mentally handicapped.

In fact, because of the inclusion of self-advocates the association changed its name in 1985 from the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded to the Canadian Association for Community Living.

Immediately after the change of name, the association embarked on an eighteen-month review of its goals and objectives. After consulting with its membership in ten provincial, two territorial and over four hundred local associations, the organization developed a plan entitled **Community Living 2000** which described a vision for the year 2000. The vision is of individuals supported by a network of family and friends; they have opportunities to attend regular neighbourhood schools and be included in regular classrooms; they have meaningful work and control over the tax dollars being spent on their behalf; they have opportunities to develop a personal lifestyle and receive reliable support when they need it. This vision is shared by self-advocates, families, and members of the association-at-large. The vision is anchored in several principles which the association identified as critical in order to achieve true and full participation in their communities by all individuals, regardless of handicap. They are citizenship, membership and self-determination. Citizenship is the actualization of rights without discrimination. It encompasses voting, having equal opportunities for employment, and being entitled to due process of law whether as a victim, a witness or an accused. Membership is a sense of belonging: having friends and families through

good times and bad. Self-determination is the ability to chart the course of one's life: to choose with whom and where to live; to have a choice of career; and to choose the individuals who are providing support for activities in daily life.

A NEW SOCIAL AGENDA

Education in the regular school system is one of the fundamental elements upon which participation in the community is built. Advocates for individuals with a mental handicap first began to promote the idea of integrated education in the early 1970s, and the first attempts at "planned integration" began at that time. However, the people calling for inclusion of all students in the regular school system were few and far between. Examples of successes were even more scarce, and little effort was made within established forums to seriously address the issue.

As bleak as the prospects were twenty years ago, the early 1990s have seen visitors from around the world look to Canada for models of inclusion. In Canada, integration in education is now a priority of the national advocacy organization; independent advocacy organizations have begun to promote integration primarily and it has become a preoccupation of school boards, departments and faculties of education and a regular subject in the media. What happened in the years since 1970 to push integrated education onto the social policy agenda?

It appears that several factors have converged to create a climate in which support for inclusive education has flourished. These factors include developments in the advocacy movement of and for persons who have a mental handicap, the broadening human rights perspective in Canada, and educational reform.

Within the advocacy movement of and for persons who have a mental handicap, the adoption of the **Community Living 2000** plan has helped mobilized efforts to include all students with mental handicaps in regular education. The analysis which produced that plan was greatly influenced by the principle of normalization, which gained recognition in the 1970s and 1980s. Originally conceptualized by Bank-Mikelson and Nirje in Scandinavia in the late 1960s and expanded by Wolfensberger in North America in the 1970s, the principle challenged the traditional segregation of persons with a mental handicap.

Wolf Wolfensberger spent two years at The Roeher Institute (then known as the National Institute on Mental Retardation) as a visiting scholar, and the Canadian Association for Community Living (then the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded) invested heavily in promoting the concept of normalization through training and publications. As the concept gained acceptance, advocates and service providers alike began to look at emerging community programs and to question how services might be organized differently to include previously devalued individuals in the mainstream of their communities. While the principle of normalization prompted a healthy re-evaluation of community services, as the 1980s progressed it became clear

that simply improving segregated services would not provide the tools for eliminating the barriers to inclusion in the mainstream.

Concurrent with the emerging experiences rooted in normalization, activists promoting changes for persons with a mental handicap were influenced by an increased awareness in Canada of human rights. In 1981, Canada repatriated its constitution and included in it a **Charter of Rights and freedoms**. The original **Charter** prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex or age. A 1985 amendment also prohibited discrimination on the basis of mental or physical disability.

Protection by the **Charter** provided individuals, families and advocacy organizations with a weapon to use in gaining access to generic services. It also helped people to recognize citizenship rights, which enabled them to be more demanding of services. People no longer had to depend on charity or voluntary goodwill, but could make certain demands on the basis of their citizenship. The **Charter** influenced both how individuals who had been labelled mentally handicapped saw themselves and how they were perceived by others.

For many people the overriding image of individuals with intellectual disabilities had been as consumers of services. Their recognition in the **Charter** changed the image to one of citizenship.

While people within the advocacy movement were expanding their vision of possibilities, influenced by human rights advances and normalization concepts, the field of education was also undergoing major changes. There was a recognition of experiential learning - that children learn by doing, not by sitting in straight rows listening to a teacher. There was a growing appreciation of different learning styles, of individualized approaches to teaching. Experiments in creating open spaces and regrouping children were carried out. These changes made classrooms more easily adaptable to children who were previously outside the narrow definition of "average".

In fact, early demonstrations of integration occurred in settings which were designed to meet the individual needs of a wide range of students using alternative educational models (Forest, 1984 and 1987). These early programs exceeded the expectations of the advocates for children with intellectual disabilities. Their success demonstrated not only that disabled students could be educated beside their non-disabled peers, but that in the process all the children benefitted and the overall quality of the education improved!

NEW COALITIONS

The convergence of the normalization and human rights experiences with the fresh approach to teaching methods created a new environment and new alliances. Previously, many advocates for persons who had been labelled mentally handicapped

had identified allies only within their existing networks. Parents and other volunteers had collaborated with progressive service providers to improve services and increase the participation of people with a mental handicap in the mainstream of society.

In the field of education, those progressive service providers were special education teachers and administrators who worked outside of the regular education system. In the 1980s, for the first time, educators within the regular system who had been exposed to advocacy could make the connection between integration and their own objectives to improve the quality of education overall. The focus of the advocacy movement slowly shifted from a partnership with special educators to a partnership with general educators.

Similarly, the human rights movement was quick to ally itself with those seeking equality for persons with a mental handicap. The growing movement for human rights drew its early leadership from the women's movement and from vigorous advocacy for persons with a physical disability. Its members saw the relationship between these groups' experiences of discrimination and those of people who had been called mentally handicapped. These linkages were represented by the growing number of self-advocates who increasingly assumed leadership roles in both the human rights and mental handicap movements. Therefore, the struggle in the 1940s, '50s and '60s undertaken by a small single-interest group to secure education for labelled children became the cause of a new, loosely organized coalition. It now included people who had long been advocating for individuals with a mental handicap, and leaders from the human rights movement and from the field of education.

THE KEYSTONE TO COMMUNITY LIVING

The social policy agenda developed by the Canadian Association for Community Living and promoted under the name **Community Living 2000**, seeks to achieve citizenship, membership and self-determination for all people who have a mental handicap.

Inclusion in regular education is a keystone of that social policy agenda, particularly in order to achieve the goals of citizenship and membership.

For many individuals, the label "mental handicap" was applied when they enter the school system. Once in a segregated school system, most students were guaranteed a future of continued segregation. Graduation from the segregated school meant entering a sheltered workshop and often moving into a group home. Few would ever have the opportunity to move on from a sheltered workshop into a job in the workforce, and people living in group homes see them as another institution (Park, 1991).

Participation in the regular classroom gives students who have a disability the opportunity to escape the cycle of segregation. They break the cycle in three ways: they acquire skills which make their participation more meaningful; they develop relationships which foster true membership in the community; and their presence

teaches other people how to accommodate the surrounding environment to their differences.

Perhaps the most important aspect of participation in an integrated setting is that learning takes place in an environment which provides its own rewards and measures of success. Parents and teachers from across Canada consistently report that students who move from segregated to integrated systems demonstrate improvements in communications skills, concentration skills and demeanour.

Teachers report that non-disabled students are often the most creative in helping to accommodate the needs of a peer who has a disability. Children are able to communicate without words, see wheelchairs as toys, perceive challenges as games.

The citizenship of students who have a mental handicap is already being enhanced through the elimination of segregation. As a part of their education, students with disabilities are learning about their rights and responsibilities as citizens, and their non-disabled classmates are learning not to discriminate on the basis of disability.

Furthermore, the relationships formed between the student who has a disability and his or her peers can last a lifetime and the benefits will touch both lives. In the past, most non-disabled students never had opportunities to meet an individual with a mental handicap. Therefore, many adults are unsure about how to react to individuals with a disability they meet as neighbours, clients, patients, customers, colleagues or co-participants in leisure activities. When the generation of students now in integrated classes grows up, our communities should be transformed. The children who are helping to solve the challenges of accommodation in the classroom will be the adults who will make accommodation possible in the workplace and who will expect their communities to include their former classmates. Non-disabled adults often turn to relationships formed during their school years to assist in finding a job or a place to live or simply for friendship. And so students who have a mental handicap and who have experienced integrated education will also have a network of relationships, and a community of peers who understand how to accommodate their needs.

Already there are many stories about individuals who have a disability who have grown up as part of their communities and are benefitting from the friendships they formed. One story involves a young doctor who was able to respond to the needs of a patient at the scene of an emergency because he had grown up on the same street as her and knew how to respond to her. Other doctors and nurses had reacted nervously to the woman (Schaefer, 1982). Another story involves a person who has been labelled mentally handicapped and who is the business partner of two former classmates, one a doctor and the other an accountant.

THE IMPACT OF INTEGRATION

When the concept of integration in education was gaining momentum in the early 1980s it had few supporters. Now, however, there is a critical mass of people representing different interests working to make integration a reality for all students, regardless of disability.

As many of the chapters in this book indicate, integration works when there is a careful analysis of the needs of the student with the disability. It usually requires close collaboration among professionals, involvement of parents, activity-based learning, a child-centred focus, and an emphasis on pluralism and cooperation rather than competition. These factors improve the system for all students.

In the broader vision of a more inclusive society, integration in education makes **Community Living 2000** a possibility. If all school-aged children are taught by example that people who have a disability are equal members of our communities, there will be less risk of exclusion later in life. Parents will be better prepared to deal with the challenges of having a child who has a disability. Adults who have a disability will be better prepared for the workforce and coworkers will be better prepared to accommodate them.

Opportunities will increase for people who have a disability to be supported to live in their own homes rather than group homes. The number of segregated programs such as sheltered workshops and group living arrangements should dramatically decrease. While some of these changes are beginning as the transition to inclusive education continues, the rate of change is hampered by existing systemic discrimination as well as by inexperience on the part of community opinion-leaders. These leaders need direction as to the role they can play in promoting community living for all.

Experience in the classroom with students who have a disability will assist the opinion-leaders of tomorrow in defining their role in the movement to bring about social changes and achieve full inclusion.

REFERENCES

Bank-Mikelson, Dr. N.E. (1967). *Danish System of Services for the Mentally Retarded*. Minda Lecture, Australia. Services for the Retarded in Denmark.

Forest, M. (Ed.). (1984). *Education Integration: A collection of readings on the integration of children with mental handicaps into regular school systems*. Downsview, Ont.: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

Forest, M. (Ed.). (1987). *More Education Integration*. Downsview, Ont.: The G. Allan Roeher Institute.

Nirje, Bengt. *The Developmental Needs of Profoundly and Severely Handicapped*

Children.

Park, Peter. (1991). A Real Home. *entourage*, 6 (1), p.19.

Rioux, M. H. (1989). *Last in the Queue*. Downsview, Ont.: The G. Allan Roeher Institute.

Schaefer, N. (1982). *Does She Know She's There?* Toronto: Fitzhenry & Whiteside.

Wolfensberger, W. (1972). *Normalization*. Downsview, Ont.: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

Chapter 3

Education: A System of Social Disempowerment

by Marcia H. Rioux

ASUMPTIONS ABOUT EDUCATION: DEBUNKING THE MYTHS

When myths masquerade as reality, fact and fiction become inseparable. It becomes difficult for most people to know what to believe and what not to believe. In addition, any serious analysis of problems becomes confusing, at best. This is the position we find ourselves in when we look at the issue of integrated education for children with mental handicaps. We have been led to believe in certain so called “truths” about education in Canada. Because these have been presented as facts, they are often used to obscure or discredit any serious discussion or argument for integration in our public school system. In making a clear and convincing case for education integration, the fallacy of these “facts” must be addressed.

Popular debate over integrating children with mental handicaps into the school system has been frequently couched in terms of four myths. The first is that education is universal, that it is available to every child in Canada without restriction. The second is that the available education is equitable and equal for each child in the school system.

The third presumption is that the education system is structured and run in a way that is necessary for the continuation of the current economic and social systems. The final myth is that the structure of the education system results in a social and economic system that ensures equality based on ability.

These four assumptions tend to be framed both as prescriptive and descriptive — in other words they both ought to be the case and they are the case.

Many people who work in and influence the education system act upon the assumptions as though they are fact. They will argue that integration is either unnecessary or damaging to the education system’s accomplishments. Any person who challenges the educational system by attempting to integrate children with mental handicaps will encounter the resistance of these teachers and administrators. It is important to understand their position based on these assumptions and to decide the soundness of this position.

The Myth of Universality in Education

The first assumption is that education in Canada is universal; in other words, that everyone has access to it. Universal and free education has been held as both a right and a necessity in a democratic society. It is a right because, in Canada, we believe that people should be able to read and write and to have equal opportunity in life. It is

considered necessary that education be universal because it is assumed that people learn a basic set of social values in school. Education is considered so important that it has been made compulsory.

What realities challenge the universal education myth? The reality is that there has never been a truly universal education system in Canada. Historically, many people have been excluded from the mainstream education system. While most of those people are now provided with some form of education, the quality is inconsistent. And there still exists an entire class of people who have no access to the regular school system: mainly children who have been labelled mentally handicapped, disabled or emotionally or behaviourally disturbed.

Children are screened out of the education system by being divided into two categories: those who can be educated and those who cannot be educated. Those who are labelled uneducable are no longer considered the responsibility of the neighbourhood school. The classifications — educable and uneducable — are accepted because they are said to be based on objective and value-free criteria.

The problem is these classifications are founded on a knowledge base which presumes that the criteria determining whether a person is “educable” are inherent in the potential student. With this presumption, other conditions — such as the way the education system is structured or the way it operates — are not taken into consideration. There is no investigation into how structural or operational conditions affect a child’s ability to benefit from universal education.

Most people have been convinced that scientific criteria ensure objectivity and, therefore, it is acceptable to create legislation based on such criteria. The political and social consequences of deciding that someone is uneducable are seldom taken into account or questioned.

The Myth of Equitable Education

The second myth is that education is equitable. Not only is it presumed that all children have access to the public education system but it is presumed that they all receive a similar or equal education.

Universal access to education is thought to include the notion of an equivalent and impartial quality of learning. This means it doesn’t matter who the child is or where the child goes to school, what the child learns will be up to an accepted standard.

Once a person has access to education, which is said to be available for all, it then follows that the student’s personal ability is reflected in how well the student does at school. If the student does well it is assumed that he or she should be rewarded both in school and in the opportunities he or she has based on his or her performance at school.

What realities challenge the myth that education is equitable? It has been shown over and over again that the quality of education varies significantly from one school to another, and even within each school. In most cases the quality depends on how closely a child approximates the ideal student on which the school curriculum and pedagogical methods are structured.

Curriculum is usually based on the presumption that the child's intellectual "raw matter", outlined in popular taxonomies, is more or less the same for all students and, therefore, equally shared by all students. This presumption forms, to a large extent, the distinguishing features of the "ideal" student who is targeted by the education system through the curriculum content and pedagogical methods.

In cultivating these intellectual properties, the purpose of the education system is to bring the "ideal" student, latent in every child, from the potential to the actual state. This is like assuming that every kernel of corn starts off with the same potential to be a perfect piece of popcorn. Of course, this is a circular argument based on the false presumption that nature distributes intellectual raw matter in an equitable manner in the first place. But, as we know, not every kernel of corn has the same potential to pop, for many reasons. Even if all kernels are subjected to the same conditions of heat, oil and distribution in the pot, they will not necessarily pop in an identical manner.

The self-fulfilling prophesy inherent in this process should not be overlooked. When it is argued that a supposedly fair spectrum of qualities will be targeted in education, and when students rise to those expectations, there is an illusion that people are being educated properly and that people who fail are legitimate failures. The structure of the process makes it difficult to ask whether the narrow spectrum of intellectual properties targeted are the entire range of properties on which education ought to focus.

Adapting to the school system is another key part of the educational experience. Even if a student closely fits the model for whom the system has been designed, there is no guarantee that she or he will succeed by traditional standards, such as grades. This is because the skills of teachers as educators vary to a large degree. The more homogeneous the students and the more the teacher is like the students, in class and culture, the more likely a student is to achieve high grades within the public education system.

The Myth of Meritocracy

The third general assumption about the school system is that the rationale behind the operation of public education is necessary for the social and economic system to continue. The argument is that the school system in its present form prepares people for a social structure that is dependent on a certain form of social order. The public school system is important as an objective, dispassionate, impartial, rational mechanism for 1) ensuring that children learn, and 2) differentiating the abilities of students to determine who will have some to higher education, credentials, and jobs.

The school system is set up as the basis of the meritocracy.

The assumption of meritocracy is that people are not equal in their talents and abilities nor are their strengths of equal importance. Meritocracy has been justified because it has been presumed that social and economic efficiency and progress are necessary. These are dependent on identifying and rewarding people whose natural gifts sustain the welfare, culture and progress of society. Education is the medium for meritocracy. Inequality is, according to these assumptions, not only justifiable, but necessary.

These are dangerous assumptions. There is no necessity for the education system to operate as it now does.

In fact, figures show that enormous numbers of Canadians are illiterate despite having been to school; this suggests that the system is not even capable of reaching goals much more limited than those it promises to reach. Since the system, as it functions at present, does not ensure social progress and efficiency, there is little argument for its continuation in its present form. Neither the exclusion of people with mental handicaps from neighbourhood schools, nor the assumption that individual capacity determines how well a student performs lead to the promised efficiency and social order.

Ability Equals Equality

The fourth myth follows from the acceptance of the third. In this case, people have been convinced that the existing education system ensures equality because it is based on the objective criteria of ability. A notion of equality founded on a belief in meritocracy is based not on some set of human characteristics or human attributes but on a certain narrowly defined and measurable set of abilities that contribute to the present social and economic order. In this way it is argued that the economic and social distributions in society are a reflection of biological capacity. In other words, it is fair that some people have more and some people have less in society because it simply reflects what they contribute to society. Therefore, political inequality can be attributed to biological characteristics that are reflected in intellectual ability which is determined during the education process. A person is equal to others to the extent that she or he has the ability to compete in spheres deemed to be important to social and economic progress.

The reality, as opposed to the myth, is that the education system is not structured, as it claims, to provide people with an education, or even to equalize their opportunities and strengthen their abilities. Instead, it is structured to provide a justifiable, formal means of filtering out people who will then be denied all social benefits.

If, on the other hand, there was a will to create a school system in which children truly had equal opportunities, the new system would have to look very different from the one now in place.

THE REAL MESSAGE OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

What then is the real message of an education system which is designed to value things that persons with mental handicaps cannot do, and which then claim them uneducable.

Inherent in its attitude is a presumption about the incapacities of persons with mental handicaps. In addition, there is an implied expectation that persons with a mental handicap will not be in regular public schools or participants in the community in general. It is not surprising that the person with a mental handicap has problems functioning in an environment based on these assumptions — an environment created with no consideration of their abilities or participation.

In the heyday of social darwinism and the eugenics movement, education became the basis of qualification for entrance into elites, and the school system became the certifying agency. Science thought it had found a way to quantify and measure people's intelligence. Science seemed to provide objective criteria which justified selective participation, entitlement and rights — which, in fact, legitimized a system of discrimination. A rationale was created for particular distinctions and labels, which could have a medical and professional basis rather than a social basis.

We now know that science is unable to completely quantify intelligence. However, standardized testing and narrow curriculum persist in disempowering some people and restricting their opportunities to participate. Gould, in his classic work **The Mismeasure of Man** (1981), claims that we continue to assign to intelligence a whole set of complex human capabilities that support "... the [recognition of] the importance of mentality in our lives and wish to characterize it, in part so that we can make the divisions and distinctions among people that our cultural and political systems dictate."

The original IQ tests, developed by Binet in 1904, had the express and limited purpose "... of identifying children whose poor performance indicated a need for special education ... And the aim of his scale was to identify in order to help and improve, not to label in order to limit" (Gould, 1981). Binet presumed that intelligence could be augmented by education designed to cater to the specific needs of the child. His three principles for using his tests were:

1. The scores are a practical device; they do not buttress any theory of intellect. They do not define anything innate or permanent. We may not designate what they measure as "intelligence" or any other reified entity.
2. The scale is a rough, empirical guide for identifying mildly retarded and learning-disabled children who need special help. It is not a device for ranking normal children.
3. Whatever the cause of difficulty in children identified for help, emphasis shall be

placed upon improvement through special training. Low scores shall not be used to mark children as innately incapable. (Gould, 1981)

These principles were disregarded as the use of IQ and other standardized testing became popular over the next eighty years. Since Binet's time, IQ and other standardized testing has been used to exclude children from regular classes, to place them in restricted environments, to deny them jobs, to sterilize them, to prevent their immigration, and to place many other restrictions on their social and economic participation.

Legitimizing the value of intelligence (and education — an achieved rather than an ascribed characteristic) has made it possible to attach notions of merit to social order. Meritocracy is simply a process by which society gives out its rewards to those who have merit.

The critical question is: who or what is worthy of merit?

Merit eliminates the need for measures that enable or ensure equality because it is based on an acknowledgment and acceptance of the “aristocracy of merit”. That means there are a few people who, because of their superior intellectual qualities and their efforts, are born to be leaders. It is assumed that there is a natural order where the welfare, culture and progress of society depend on an aristocracy of these intellectually skilled. The argument continues that social efficiency and progress depend on rule by the elite of merit. Further, meritocratic rule must be implemented with supremacy over all other social values:

The meritocratic assumption that efficiency (and civilization) depends on inequality means that it is more important that human affairs be in the hands of an energetic, capable, skilled elite than that every person has an equal chance to rise in its ranks.

— *Livingston, 1979*

The school system has become the vehicle for sorting people this way. It is less and less a place for educating people in the most important sense. Because most people with mental handicaps are judged to have few natural (innate) cognitive skills, they are simply denied, by definition, any access to the meritocracy, to the rewards of society. The characteristics they possess are not relevant or valued according to the standards of the meritocracy. Effort without intelligence does not provide access to the rewards of society.

Over-valuation of certain forms of intelligence and experience has become entrenched and reinforced through the public education system. This can be seen in how the school system awards excellence in certain disciplines and ignores competence in others. At its simplest level, the sciences are much more relevant than the arts within

the formal school system. At a more complex level, the individual achievement of a person with a mental handicap in accomplishing certain skills is often viewed as irrelevant.

This is because of a persisting utilitarian philosophy which assumes the greatest good for the greatest number of people is achieved when educators target students with the maximum potential for contributing to the maintenance of the social and economic order.

Equality is sacrificed in the face of expediency and efficiency. Fundamental values and the contributions from people with different intellectual abilities are of no value within that framework. Therefore education, like other institutions in late twentieth century society, has become a political activity.

THE NEED FOR RESTRUCTURING

Educators, students, administrators are caught up in this predicament. It is still impossible to make square blocks fit into round holes. Education integration is now little more than a process of putting students with disabilities in classrooms where the structure ensures failure for the majority of them, creating the dilemma that both participating and not participating are disadvantageous. There is an entire body of literature concerned with theories of education and special education; all these works begin with premises that are counterproductive to achieving real equality in the education system.

The education system has, ultimately, helped “educate” society into a form of blindness about how people with mental handicaps enrich and enhance society. Much more creativity is needed if we hope to achieve real learning and real understanding within the antiquated structure of the education system. The system must do more than simply open its doors; it must be restructured to value the contributions from persons with disabilities, from women, and from people with different cultural experiences. Governments will have to commit themselves to that process through the provision of funds. And educators will have to be open minded and innovative in teaching and addressing students. The contribution that people with a mental handicap make to the education system will have to be part of the reconstruction of the education system.

It is time to get rid of the myths and start fresh on creating an inclusive education that provides all children with a real learning environment.

REFERENCES

Gould, S.J. (1981). *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Livingston, John F. (1979). *Fair Game? Inequality and Affirmative Action*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Chapter 4

Access to Equality in Education: The Power of Parents

by S. Dulcie McCallum

Equality is new, not old. Until recently, there was no law or constitution in Canada that ensured equality. Only when the federal and provincial/territorial governments enacted human rights legislation and when, in 1985, the equality rights provision, section 15, was proclaimed in the **Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms** was there any legal authority for a claim to equality.

Mental disability was not included in section 15 until the final draft of the **Charter** was drawn up. Then the proclamation of the equality rights provision was delayed three years after patriation of the constitution. This delay was to give governments at all levels the opportunity to amend existing legislation to meet the constitutional equality imperative. All jurisdictions now include protection in human rights legislation for people with mental handicaps but it was not until 1990 that the last province made the necessary amendment.

SEGREGATION BY LAW AND IN FACT

Throughout history, people who have mental handicaps have been disfranchised and subjected to segregation on two fronts:

1) **de jure** (as a matter of law) segregation: which means segregation sanctioned by actual laws (i.e., the law that prohibited people with mental handicaps from voting); 2) **de facto** (as a matter of fact) segregation: which refers to the various customs and practices that separate and exclude people labelled mentally handicapped which are taken as facts of life but have no specific legal sanction (i.e., the practice of confining people with mental handicaps in institutions). It was **de jure** segregation - legally sanctioned discrimination - which governments, for the most part, were supposed to rectify in their legislative review under section 15 of the **Charter**. The drafters of the **Charter** acknowledged, by imposing a time delay, that there were numerous examples of **de jure** discrimination that needed to be rectified. However, both **de jure** and **de facto** forms of discrimination are open to challenge in court under the terms of the **Charter**.

Examples of laws which create **de jure** segregation are: laws that prohibit people with mental handicap from making decisions for themselves; from voting; from receiving minimum wage; from marrying; and from being jurors. They also include laws that authorize use of aversive techniques, forced sterilization and unreviewable incarceration. These laws specifically and explicitly sanction differential treatment. **De**

jure segregation has institutionalized prejudice and has had an obvious and destructive effect. The courts, in interpreting and upholding these laws, prior to the **Charter**, were allowing this prejudice to exist and were sanctioning the legal devaluation of people with mental handicaps.

Examples of **de facto** segregation include the practice of warehousing people in institutions, of training or rehabilitating them in sheltered workshops, and of providing housing in group homes. These are practices that exclude and implicitly promote inferior status, worth and position.

De facto segregation appeared natural and proper because of the numerous examples of legally sanctioned state-approved discrimination.

SEGREGATION AND THE EDUCATION ACT

Education for children with mental handicap has been, and continues to be, a disturbing combination of both forms of segregation. In some provinces, school acts made specific provisions for children with mental handicaps to be educated in “special” schools and classrooms (*de jure*). In other places the practice and policies of school boards has been to treat children with disabilities as “special” and in need of a separate educational program outside the regular classroom (*de facto*). However, the *Charter* and human rights legislation have provided parents with powerful new weapons in the fight they wage daily on behalf of their children to gain access to an equal education.

The First Legal Challenges

In the first case to challenge segregated education, Mr. and Mrs. Balm of British Columbia, on behalf of their son Arron, claimed that their school board had failed to fulfil their educational duty of care when it exercised its statutory power to decide to place the child in a segregated, self-contained, special school on the basis that the child had a mental handicap. The *Bales v. Central Okanagan Board of School Trustees* case was framed in negligence because it took place before the equality rights provision of *Charter* came into force.

The trial judge held that the *School Act* did impose a duty on the school board to provide sufficient school accommodation and tuition, free of charge, to all children of school age. However, while the judge was sympathetic to the evidence that integration was becoming the norm, he followed the judicial tradition of legally sanctioning segregation. It is notable that this decision came prior to the existence of any constitutional protections in Canada.

The first **Charter** challenge was the **Elwood v. Halifax County-Bedford District School Board** case in Nova Scotia. The case was initiated by the child’s parents, who began by obtaining an injunction against the school board. The injunction prohibited

school board officials from transferring their child, Luke, from his neighbourhood school where he had been registered and placed in a regular classroom with the help of the principal. The school board had told the parents it intended to return him to the segregated class for children with disabilities located in another school.

The parents claimed that their child had the constitutional right to the equal benefit both before and under the education law and the right not to be discriminated against on the basis of a mental disability under s. 15 of the **Charter**. The school board countered on the basis that the education act gave the board the power to make all placement decisions. School board officials strongly resisted acknowledging that the practice of placing all children with disabilities together in a self-contained classroom could constitute unlawful discrimination.

During the year after the injunction the parties exchanged evidence in preparation for the trial. Shortly before the trial was to begin, a settlement agreement was proposed on behalf of Luke. The agreement detailed a model situation for Luke in his neighbourhood school in a regular classroom. The case was settled on the basis of this proposed agreement in favour of the child. Because all cases involving an infant claimant which are settled prior to trial must be approved by the court, the **Elwood v. Halifax County-Bedford District School Board** agreement is incorporated into the final court order.

Amendments Pave the Way to Integration

More recently, education statutes have been amended to specifically exclude reference to differential treatment but they do not provide any explicit obligation to fully include all children in regular classrooms.

In other words, education statutes refer to a general right for children to receive an education, but the power is vested in the school board to decide where to place children.

There is one notable exception to this general rule. Arguably the most progressive education legislative provisions to advance the interests of children with a disability are found in the *Schools Act* in New Brunswick. After defining exemptionalities in terms of behavioural, communication, intellectual, physical, perceptual, or multiple, the *Act* directs that a school board:

shall place exceptional pupils such that they receive special education programs in circumstances where exceptional pupils can participate with pupils who are not exceptional pupils within regular classroom settings to the extent that is considered practicable by the school board having due regard for the educational needs of all Pupils.

Despite these amendments, children continued to be segregated in New Brunswick,

particularly in francophone school districts. The Robichaud family of New Brunswick objected to the segregation of their teenage daughter in a special class to children with disabilities. The parents removed Nathalie from the segregated setting and were keeping her at home. They began proceedings by applying for a mandatory injunction which would require the school board to place Nathalie in a regular high school classroom. The court which heard their application interpreted the education legislation as specifically providing each child, regardless of disability, with the right to be educated in a regular classroom alongside his or her non-disabled peers. The court accepted the argument of the parents that the *Schools Act* was consistent with the equality requirement in the *Charter*.

The family argued and the court held that the Act was constitutional and enforceable in Nathalie's favour because it required a school board to provide the equal educational benefit to all children including those who have a disability.

The case was appealed to the Court of Appeal which held that the lower court judge had misapplied the test for granting an injunction. While the Court Appeal overturned the lower court ruling in **relation to the relief sought**, it ordered that the injunction was to remain in place until the end of the school year. Prior to the beginning of the next school term, the matter was settled in favour of the child. A settlement agreement which required that Nathalie be integrated was approved by court order.

Provincial/Territorial Responsibility

The Supreme Court of Canada has not had the opportunity to rule on the question of whether there is a constitutional right for all children to attend school in their neighbourhood in a regular class. The court has, however, stressed the importance of the State providing an education to its citizens. The constitution has continually made education the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. It can be argued that, where the provincial/territorial government has undertaken through legislation to provide an education, that education must be provided without discrimination to meet the constitutional standard imposed on provinces and territories by s.15.

Legislation typically enables the education minister to delegate responsibility for the day-to-day education and administration to school board officials. In addition to holding school boards accountable for the practice of segregating children with mental disabilities, some parents have made simultaneous claims against ministers of education who have the ultimate statutory duty.

The recent settlement of the *Charter* challenge in Ontario, *Hysert v. Carleton Board of Education et al.*, demonstrates the importance of asserting a shared responsibility with the provincial or territorial government. The case was settled just prior to trial when the attorney general advised counsel for the school board that the government intended to amend its statement of defence.

It changed its position to support the child's claim that she had a right to be integrated. This is thought to be the first time in the country when an attorney general clearly came out in favour of the disadvantaged person in a *Charter* challenge.

CLAIMS UNDER HUMAN RIGHTS LEGISLATION

In addition to claims to equality under the *Charter* and provincial or territorial education legislation, some people have made complaints under human rights. Two factors bring education under the domain of human rights:

1. despite conflicting legal judgements, schools have been held to be a public service or facility under human rights legislation;
2. in all provinces and territories, mental and physical disability are prohibited grounds for discrimination. Anti-discrimination laws can address policy and practice of people and organizations within both the public and private sectors.

The basis of a complaint is that it is discriminatory to segregate children because they have a mental disability in self-contained, "special" schools or classrooms, as this denies them access to a public facility or service (the school) that is customarily available to the public it serves (children).

The first human rights complaint involving a child with a mental handicap that went to a hearing, was initiated on the basis of religious discrimination. The Catholic school board in the county of Lanark, Leeds and Grenville in Ontario required all children with mental handicaps to attend one class operated by a secular school board. This meant that Catholic children with a mental handicap could not receive instruction in a separate school in the religion of their choice. The arrangement made between the boards dictating that all "special needs" children would be educated at one site was done for administrative convenience.

Human Rights Complaint Mechanism Fail to Respond

The number of complaints to human rights commissions has grown in recent years with little increase in their funding. The resulting backlog means there are many unresolved complaints of educational discrimination. The tragedy of the situation is that human rights complaint mechanisms have not produced the swift, accessible justice they were meant to provide. The result is that some children continue to be retained in segregated settings, taught at home or placed by their parents in alternative schools as interim measures while a complaint is being processed.

It is impossible to calculate the long-term damages to children who have been denied the academic and social benefits of regular classes and who have been ostracized in front of their communities. Two glaring examples of this unacceptable situation are the *Becky Till v. North York School Board* case, a complaint to the Ontario Human Rights Commission, and the *Zebrowski v. School Trustees* case, a complaint to the Manitoba

Human Rights Commission.

Even where a complaint is investigated, idiosyncrasies of the different human rights commission offices sometimes impede justice. In a recent decision following an investigation, the P.E.I. Human Rights Commission alluded to discrimination but did not appoint a board of inquiry. While the commission directed integration to take place, they did not specify how or when the school board was to carry out the integration, and failed to indicate how they intended to monitor the action of the board in light of the decision. The letter to the complainant advising her of the result indicated that if no steps were taken by the school board, she could advise the commission accordingly and it would intervene.

On the other hand, there are numerous examples in various provinces and territories where the human rights commission has assumed a role in arbitrating a settlement and the matter has been resolved in favour of the child.

EDUCATION APPEAL MECHANISMS

In some jurisdictions, parents can use special statutory appeal mechanisms to question decisions to place their children in segregated settings. These mechanisms have been established specifically for children labelled as having “special needs”. However, this appeal process has been rejected by many parents and advocates because they claim it is biased. If the statutory appeal mechanism allows the decision maker to discuss the question of whether a child should be included or not, it is inherently discriminatory. If parents were convinced that the appeal process would deal with education content and not with the actual validity of integration, people might not perceive the appeal process as biased.

In some jurisdictions, the appeal mechanism under education legislation provides for a final appeal to the minister of education. A recent decision by the minister under the *equivalent section* in Alberta came out after a lengthy, organized appeal by the family and supporters of the child, Margaret Eggert. The decision came out strongly in favour of the child entering Grade 1 in her neighbourhood school.

PARENTS CARRY THE STRUGGLE

The element that permeates all of the legal challenges by parents on behalf of their children is one of struggle. There is no universal acceptance of children labelled disabled within the education system. At every turn, parents must spend time, effort, money and emotion on justifying their child’s right to be included. Resources are continually being poured into “special” education while there is little effort to find ways of making inclusion happen. There is little exploration of the social and academic benefits to all children and the economic benefits to the whole of society.

Strategies developed by parents have been creative and intense, and strengthened by

the involvement of family members, friends and advocates.

In the Elwood case, Luke was in his neighbourhood school during the year before his trial, and his fellow students and classroom teacher became his greatest allies. The evidence given by people closest to the child ran contrary to the position taken by the school board, which no doubt inspired the school board to settle.

In cases where the minister of education was implicated, the politics of the situation became critical. In the Margaret Eggert case, wide-spread positive media coverage exerted sufficient political pressure to influence the decision in favour of the child. In the Alexandra Hysert case, the attorney general saw that the government policy on integration ran counter to the position adopted in its defense to the child's claim. The embarrassment of the inconsistency compelled the government to change sides, leaving the school board disempowered.

In order for segregation, both *de jure* and *de facto*, to be dismantled, it must be challenged on all fronts. While segregation persists, the non-disabled community will never have the opportunity to relate to people with disabilities as full and participating citizens. One has only to visit a truly integrated school, speak to one of the educators responsible for the implementation of an equality setting, or meet with any of the students benefitting from a situation where all children are included, to truly appreciate the result. There are some Canadian jurisdictions that provide outstanding models.

As long as people must struggle in courts for inclusion, others will continue to see disability as something negative and treat people with disabilities differently. The stereotypical impression of people with disabilities, that they must qualify to be anything but excluded and devalued, will continue to be the norm.

School board administrators and ministers of education must realize that legally sanctioned segregation has rendered people with mental handicaps powerless and disadvantaged.

The equality requirement in the *Charter* is intended to, and will mandate, the inclusion of all children. It will be interpreted by the courts as requiring the dismantling of segregation. The power of parents to act on behalf of their children is based on the child's constitutional and legal guarantees. Where the goal is inclusion, the power of parents is inexhaustible. It will continue to whittle away at the barriers that persist in practice and in law. Those who resist the inevitable transition to integration should recognize that because the power of parents is exercised in the name of equality, it will prevail.

Section Two

Parent and Self- Advocacy

Chapter 5

Principles of Change: A Parent's Perspective on the Education System

by David Jory

In his last year at school, Grade 12, our son, John, who has Down Syndrome, was fully integrated for the first time into regular classrooms. He spent only two hours a week outside the regular class when he practised reading and speaking with a teacher. He also attended job sites under a work-study program. Parents should note that it is important to have a definition of integration which permits and encourages things like work-study programs; some definitions I have heard would prevent them if taken literally. In fact, John had a better time in Grade 12 than did his older sister or younger brother. This was not an accident; it came about in part because of a great deal of learning on our — his parents' — part and on the part of some teachers and administrators, to whom we pay tribute. What we learned made us seriously question much of the ideology and many of the theories upon which the special education system is based.

When we began to think about the kind of education our child with Down Syndrome needed, it was 1978, when the jargon we now use was unknown in New Brunswick. As we felt that what was going on wasn't appropriate, we had to learn to explain what we wanted in ways the people in the system would understand and respect.

We also learned that, rather than trying to do it all alone, parents are much better off combining our efforts with a group of people with similar ideas. Our parents' group was helped by staff at the national office of what are now the Canadian Association for Community Living and The Roeher Institute. They explained concepts, provided information and helped us organize our ideas.

Rosi, my wife, and I realized that five simple principles would lead to the kind of education system we wanted:

1. adapt the system and the curriculum to the pupil;
2. educate all pupils together in the same class;
3. make the school system accountable to the pupils;
4. recognize that the real expert on a pupil is usually his or her parent(s);
5. for the pupil with a mental handicap, make the transition to the real world of work gradual, beginning years before the pupil leaves school.

FROM SYSTEM-CENTRED TO PUPIL-CENTRED EDUCATION

Rosi and I were disappointed to find that these simple principles were not generally accepted in the education system, and even when they were accepted in theory they were not put wholeheartedly into practice. In fact, we found our principles to be threatening to some people in the education system. This was because most school systems are “system-centred”; the needs and convenience of teachers and administrators generally take precedence over the needs of pupils. The reasons are sometimes beyond the control of the teachers and administrators, such as a lack of money and resources resulting in oversized classes. Teachers and administrators will say that their systems are pupil-centred, but if parents look closely they will see that they are mainly system-centred with some superficial concessions to pupil-centred practice.

In a system-centred school, the evaluation schemes, such as tests, marks and grades, are mainly “norm-reverenced”. This means they are based on the abilities and achievements of “average” or “normal” pupils at each grade level. Teachers must teach for these “normal” pupils whether they want to or not, and many good teachers would rather not. Very good pupils become bored and pupils with a mental handicap are bound to fail. In other words, pupils must adapt to fit the system; if they do not, or cannot, they suffer the consequences.

As we discovered, for a school system to follow our first principle and adapt structure and curriculum to the pupil, it must change its whole way of operating and become “criterion-referenced”. In a criterion-referenced school, the evaluation scheme is based on the abilities of individual pupils. Brilliant pupils are expected to do more than the “average” pupil and are evaluated according to whether their work matches their abilities. The majority of pupils work at roughly the same level and are evaluated accordingly. The pupil with a mental handicap is given work at his or her level and is evaluated according to whether or not he or she does the work well. In this way the pupil with a mental handicap can succeed as well as any other pupil because he or she is required to do only what he or she actually can do. This system allows for *all* pupils who require an adapted curriculum to receive it, not just the pupils with a mental handicap, removing some of the stigma associated with an adapted curriculum.

During our efforts, Rosi and I also discovered that we weren’t alone; many progressive thinkers and educators shared our ideas. Teachers, administrators, school board trustees and researchers are coming to understand that future national prosperity and social justice depend on maximizing the potential of each pupil. This means ensuring that each pupil gets the best education he or she is capable of acquiring, which is achieved by making our school systems more pupil-centred and less system-centred.

It is also achieved by applying good integration techniques to all pupils. In our struggle for appropriate education for “exceptional students” (the term used in our province for all pupils who require an adapted program) parents can seek out these potential allies,

make them aware that we are allies and work with them. They can work to change the system from inside, while we work for change from the outside. Experience has shown that determined leadership and clear goals make a pupil-centred school system a possibility.

In a pupil-centred school the arguments for keeping pupils with a mental handicap out of the regular classroom have no validity. So our second principle, to educate all pupils together in the same class, is a natural outcome of the first.

Our third principle, to make the school system accountable to the pupil, is also an extension of the first principle and is stated separately as a reminder that the school system serves parents and their children — we do not serve it. Too frequently the school system blame the pupil or the parents for whatever goes wrong with the pupil's education. When the school system fails any pupil it must be held accountable for its failure. This accountability encourages acceptance that the education of all pupils is the joint responsibility of the school system, the parents and their children.

Our fourth principle, to recognize that the real expert on a pupil is usually his or her parent(s), is based on this joint responsibility and applies to all pupils, not just those with a disability. However, parent involvement is particularly important in the case of a pupil with a mental handicap. Most people in regular school systems have little or no experience with such pupils. Moreover, there are relatively few pupils with a mental handicap, and there is great variation between them, which means teachers and administrators will lack understanding of a particular pupil's capabilities. Rosi and I know our son better than anyone else does; we know his capabilities and how he learns best.

Our fifth principle, to make a gradual transition from school to work, was developed when we realized that our son could learn a skill in one setting but could not necessarily perform that same skill in another setting. This is called "low skill transference ability" in jargon. We saw that sheltered workshops — in which people with mental handicaps are supposedly trained for jobs in the real world — are almost total failures.

Our local school board was one step ahead of us and had set up a work-study program for its pupils with a mental handicap. Work-study programs are vital if our children with mental handicaps are to have a decent life. They cannot learn about the real world of work while in school; they need opportunities to learn how to work in the workplace itself. Segregated schooling leading to segregated sheltered workshops creates lives of dependency, frustration, anguish and desperation in institutions. Children with handicaps deserve much more than that.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN PARENT PRINCIPLES AND SYSTEM ASSUMPTIONS

It is important to point out that our principles challenge a number of basic assumptions about the way schools operate. Although most of the teachers and administrators who had direct responsibility for our son's education had appropriate and sometimes phenomenal attitudes, we found major problems at the system and structural levels. We were led to think about these problems by system failures and the experiences of other parents. In fact, our principles raise a fundamental question that we thought had been resolved long ago: are all pupils to be given a chance or are some, as George Orwell said, "more equal than others"? There are educators who still believe there should be gatekeepers armed with "objective assessments" to keep pupils with a mental handicap separate from friends and peers. We also know principals, teachers and especially medical doctors who tell parents that children with a mental handicap are sub-human.

THE CASE AGAINST "SPECIAL ED"

We believe that special education should be challenged. It is a faulty system based on a series of myths and failed models. And it is a menace to our children.

Different Needs

One myth is that some pupils are so different from others that they must be dealt with through a separate sub-system of the education system. This myth, of course, belongs to a norm-referenced and system-centred education system. Special education serves to segregate some pupils so the rest of the class will be roughly at the same level and can be taught as a group, not as individual students with different needs. However, special education does not allow for the fact that segregated pupils are not at the same level; they have different needs and cannot be taught *en masse*. The knowledge and experience that does exist in special education could be better used to help regular teachers in regular classes teach exceptional pupils. We found many researchers who now question the value and usefulness of special education, confirming our belief that its theoretical justifications are without foundation.

Pupils are not better served in segregated settings. Our son learned skills in many non-segregated settings — at the YMCA, volleyball camp, minor soccer, various jobs, and at home — only at school did people feel he had to be segregated with "others like him".

Despite the change in attitudes, special education still has many defenders and it provides many jobs. The faculties of education at our universities are one of its major defenders.

In our province, proponents of special education in universities simply deny that all children can be included in regular classes, even in the face of concrete examples that inclusion can work.

Support from Research

Another myth is that research supports traditional special education. We looked at some of the research used to support special education and found that it was poorly designed, poorly interpreted and not relevant to existing reality. In fact, research today shows that it supports integration rather than segregation for students with a disability.

Parents should question the quality and validity of education research in general. Science is not objective and research experiments are designed to produce the results the researcher wants to produce. Experiments are carried out by people to get degrees, jobs, promotions or professional status. In addition, education is an intensely personal interaction between people whose moods and attitudes vary from minute to minute. The use of adaptations of scientific methods designed to study inanimate things seems inadequate for the study of education.

The Holes in the Cascade Theory

Special education generally supports the model of a continuum of learning environments from total segregation to total integration in the regular classroom. Pupils are supposed to progress along this continuum towards the regular classroom, which they are supposed to reach eventually but never do. This is the Cascade model, which it would be more appropriate to call the “anywhere but in the regular classroom” model. It is incredibly wasteful because the many different learning environments must be staffed by special education personnel and pupils must be brought in from far and wide to provide the required numbers at each level. The real figures show that most of the movement in the cascade is from less segregated environments to more segregated environments and that it is unusual for a pupil to progress successfully from a segregated environment to a regular classroom.

The model fails for many reasons. How can a pupil learn how to behave in a regular classroom if he has never been in one but has always been segregated with other pupils who do not know how to behave in a regular classroom? Pupils with a mental handicap need continuity and consistency in order to perform well — as we found with our son — but how can they be expected to survive the discontinuities, inconsistencies and continued changes inherent in the Cascade model? It seems that any pupil who can successfully fight this way into a regular classroom through the Cascade model should have been in the regular classroom from the beginning. That was certainly the case with our son.

A further danger is that, though the Cascade model is clearly segregationist, some people claim it is an integration model. This enables people in school systems to claim to support integration by supporting the Cascade model when in fact they support segregation and rejection. The Cascade model also encourages and rewards teachers who reject pupils whose educational needs they cannot or will not meet. The teacher fails the pupil, so the pupil is thrown out of the class and becomes someone else's

problem. The model's existence also continues to waste scarce resources on segregation that would be better spent on true integration.

Early in the move towards integration, well-meaning administrators promoted the Cascade model, no doubt because it represented advanced special education theory. The support waned when its segregatiouist nature became obvious. However, the model can be made to sound reasonable and protective, and its ideological underpinnings are not always evident, making it the most dangerous weapon in the special education arsenal. It will continually appear like a deadly virus and we must be on our guard against it.

Socialisation and Learning

Yet another myth fostered by special education theory is that children with a mental handicap will be socialized better in the regular class, but that their academic work will suffer. We were once told that this was the trade-off and that we would have to make a choice between socialization and education for our son. People who say things like that seem to believe that children with a mental handicap have little understanding and no feeling. They are wrong. Parents will understand what we mean when we say our son is slow, not stupid. He and his friends understood quite well that they were in segregated classes because they had been rejected by the regular school system because they were considered inferior.

When our son had a chance to go into a regular class he reacted well because he clearly felt he now belonged. He worked harder and progressed more quickly than he had in the segregated classes. Better socialization had a positive, not a negative, effect on his academic progress. A pupil who is surrounded by other pupils behaving normally is likely to behave normally and to work as others work. A pupil in a segregated class is likely to be distracted by behaviours around him or her and imitate them, rather than working.

Most segregated classes provide less individual attention than regular classes, making them inferior learning environments. This was true of the segregated classes our son attended, despite the efforts of excellent teachers in those segregated classes. Some of those teachers who went on to teach in regular classes told us that, in a segregated class, each exceptional pupil gets only five to ten minutes of individual attention on most days. A properly organized teacher with a regular class containing an exceptional pupil can provide more than ten minutes of individual attention to the exceptional pupil without short-changing the non-exceptional pupils. So not only is the learning environment better in a regular class, but experience suggests that there are more opportunities for individual attention.

Assessments of exceptional Students

Our five simple principles also call into question the assessment procedures on which

special education feeds. The people doing assessments in the school system often function as gate keepers; in most schools, a child assessed as having a mental handicap is turned away at the front door of the education system.

Our son has proved wrong every such assessment he has ever had. But why did he have to? The gatekeepers turned him away from the regular school system and it took him twelve years to fully fight his way back in.

While in-class assessments in the regular classroom setting can be useful in determining appropriate work levels, assessments which claim to predict in detail what a pupil will or will not be able to learn are dangerous. They, and the rejection which follows them, have a devastating effect on the self-esteem of the pupil. Segregators do not seem to understand or care.

Assessments associated with “placements” are almost invariably designed to find out what the child cannot do, rather than what he can do. Assessments are almost invariably used against the child. Since the only acceptable placement is in the regular classroom, predictive assessments have no function and no ethical, educational or legal justification.

Some people who argue for assessments say that exceptional pupils must be divided up into sub-categories such as mentally retarded, physically disabled or with behaviour problems. This is equivalent to setting up a category of immigrant pupils and subdividing them into Christian black- skinned, Christian brown-skinned, Moslem brown-skinned, and so on. School systems should be sensitive to the education needs of pupils as *individuals*, not as groups. Our son is more like his brother and sister than like other children with Down Syndrome. There are no special teaching techniques that apply only to pupils with Down Syndrome.

PARENTS, PARTNERS

Many segregationists within school systems cannot accept our principle that “the expert on a pupil is usually the parent”. In fact, the way a person in the education system responds to that principle is often a good indication of that person’s openness to integration. Many good teachers and administrators welcome the participation of parents, and other support personnel, in the overall educational enterprise. Other teachers and administrators say they fear a loss of control over the classroom. Or they seem to reject the idea that parents have anything useful to offer. These fears should be dealt with sympathetically because the successful education of a pupil with a mental handicap and, increasingly, of other pupils, *requires* parent-teacher-administrator cooperation.

We find these fears are based on emotion rather than fact, and there is plenty of experience to show that the fears are generally unfounded. One of the most heart-warming aspects of our efforts over the years was seeing some teachers who were

afraid of “integration” become its strongest advocates once they tried it.

We feel teachers and administrators have developed their fears through incorrect information and attitudes taught by faculties of education. In many cases, we see the teachers and administrators as the victims of *their* education. We find that the faculties of education of all but a handful of our Canadian universities desperately cling to outdated segregationist ideology and concepts based on out-of-date research. They refuse to give teachers the training they need to enable them to provide an appropriate, integrated education for *all* pupils. We have come to the sad conclusion that most faculties of education are incompetent in this major area. On the other hand this means that we, as parents, should be prepared to help and support willing teachers and administrators who want to do the right thing but do not know how.

THE IEP

Parent-teacher-administrator cooperation is important in the formulation of the curriculum or program for the pupil with a mental handicap. If a pupil with a mental handicap is forced to follow the same curriculum as pupil without a mental handicap he or she will fail. For the time being the best vehicle for cooperation is the Individual Education Plan (IEP).

IEPs were originally introduced in the United States because teachers lacked experience in teaching exceptional pupils and it was deemed necessary to impose a mechanism to ensure parent involvement and teacher accountability. In that context, IEPs were a productive mechanism, and they can still be helpful. They provide a means of measuring what an exceptional pupil learns, making it more difficult to blame the pupil if things do not go well.

An IEP should be drawn up carefully and cooperatively but without becoming a major production. The regular classroom teacher may sometimes want to turn to a resource person for advice on the program and its implementation, and the parent may want to turn to another experienced parent. The pupil can often be involved. In exceptional cases, a psychologist or even a doctor may be involved.

The IEP is reviewed and revised cooperatively at regular intervals and should be treated as a guide, not a straitjacket. It also does not guarantee that all will suddenly be well; in fact, educational crimes have been committed against pupils in the name of IEPs.

An IEP is best viewed as a confidence-building mechanism for the parent, the teacher and the administrator, and the pupil. The parent and teacher must be honest and realistic. Parents can tell the teacher how the pupil learns best, what he is interested in, how he reacts in particular situations, how to avoid problems, and so on. If things go wrong or there is dissatisfaction, all concerned must avoid any temptation to blame someone, and instead concentrate on finding solutions cooperatively.

We found that IEPs were not necessary when our son had good, experienced teachers who were committed to integration. We have also known parents whose children have had poor teachers despite IEPs.

A WORD OF CAUTION

Although our principles are simple, putting them into practice is difficult. Parents should be wary of people who promote simple answers to the complex questions facing education today.

One potentially dangerous cry is “back to the basics”. Any education system built around the back-to-the-basics theme will be system-centred and norm-referenced with no place for exceptional pupils. Securing a decent education for exceptional children means supporting integration, with all the inherent challenges involved. It means supporting theories and practices that are called progressive, rather than those that are called conservative.

It is also important to realise that our society asks the impossible of teachers and school administrators. We expect them to resolve all our social problems and have all kinds of programs such as AIDS and anti-racism education and propaganda from the nuclear industry. Integration means appropriate education for *all* pupils and is best accomplished when teachers are not over-stressed.

Parents should support efforts to reduce class size, eliminate curriculum overload and improve support services for teachers; parents should also support rewards for exceptional teachers. Parents must resist any postponement of integration based on the excuse that the system is not ready. If the time, effort and money spent opposing integration were spent implementing it, integration would be a reality.

System-wide integration can work; good teachers and administrators have discovered that they can integrate exceptional students much better than they thought possible.

The ideology of segregation, while still very much alive, is now having to hide and adopt new tactics. We believe that continued, consistent pressure to apply our five principles can keep the segregationists on the run, and help all those in our school systems who want to provide an appropriate, inclusive education for all pupils.

Chapter 6

The Road to Inclusion: One Family's Story

by Alene Steinbeck

There are many dimensions to every story of integration: one that is often overlooked is the impact on family life. What does integration mean on the human level, away from school board meeting and resource teachers? Every family experiences joys and trials in the course of their child's development: the first day of school, the move to a new neighbourhood and a new school, the formation of new friendships. What dimension does the constant struggle for inclusion in the regular school system add to these experiences?

My family's story shows integration from this perspective — one which is often overlooked. It is the story of education and of how education leads to many other things in life. It is a story of friendship, love, community and the future.

I realize, as I look back at my earlier experiences and education, that I never had the opportunity to know people who talked or walked differently from me, or who were labelled mentally handicapped, or who used a wheelchair. I didn't have the opportunity to feel natural or confident around people who were different from myself. My entire generation lacked this experience, which led many of us to believe that people with differences did not belong in our community; they belonged somewhere else, some place "special".

That belief was first shaken in 1979 when, in a Canadian hospital in Lahr, West Germany, a beautiful baby girl with big blue eyes and brown hair was born in to our family. We called her Mandy.

Several days following Mandy's birth, my husband and I received shocking news. The doctors suspected that Mandy had been born with an extra chromosome or, as it is better known, Down Syndrome. My head spun. How could it be? With a pounding heart I hurried back to my room to cuddle my long-awaited baby girl and stare at the face I already loved so dearly. As I held her close, I tried to imagine what the future would hold for our family. All I knew was that I was her mother and she belonged with me. A nurse soon advised me to put my baby down as I was becoming much too attached to her. She said, "It wouldn't do either of you any good". Her words left me feeling angry, confused, defensive and alone.

It was several weeks before I found the courage to phone my parents to inform them of the birth of their first granddaughter. I was unprepared for their total acceptance of Mandy. Their support and acceptance were invaluable in helping me cope at that moment and in the years to come.

I feel fortunate that we had the foresight to reject the advice of the doctors — and the beliefs of our generation — and refuse to institutionalize our child. I will never regret the decision which set my family on a challenging road filled with obstacles.

In the years to come Mandy herself would challenge us all. She would have a powerful impact on our lives and on the direction we would take together as a family. As the mother of a child labelled mentally handicapped, I would have to continually give explanations, challenge conventional decisions and advocate for her rights. Mandy forced me to look for answers, to make choices and decisions. The very people I respected and admired in life became my adversaries.

Mandy enrolled me in a world of battle, a world I knew nothing about. This was especially true of our educational system.

THE FIRST YEARS OF SCHOOL

People's attitudes proved to be one of the greatest barriers. People felt that Mandy had to master an array of skills before she could join the lives of neighbours, friends and schoolmates. I was told that people needed time to get "ready", and attitudes needed to "change" before she could be accepted into their schools. In other words, positive attitudes of the community and of the teachers were requisite for Mandy to attend school.

But I believed that Mandy could not wait for people's attitudes to change. I felt she belonged in the regular school system with her peers.

When Mandy was four years old, our family was transferred to Ottawa, Ontario. I enrolled Mandy in a nursery school for special needs children. I grappled with my conscience at doing this, and, after monitoring Mandy's progress for several months, I gave in to the gnawing feeling that she was in the wrong place. How was she going to make friends in her neighbourhood and learn to cope with everyday situations if she was segregated from other children?

After making many inquiries, I arranged for Mandy to attend a local daycare centre that had set aside three seats in their program for children with mental handicaps. Mandy spent an exciting year there. As she blossomed we saw many changes in her.

At the end of this year, much to our disappointment, Mandy was denied access to the junior kindergarten program in the same school as the daycare centre. The teacher did not feel she could handle a child with a handicap in her classroom.

This threw me into indecision. Did Mandy really deserve the same things other children took for granted? Was I being realistic? I wondered if I should just give up — which would have been the easier route — or if I should persevere, doing what I felt was right for Mandy and helping others to see Mandy as I did.

Should I challenge this system that wanted to keep her out of their lives?

The decision was made. We felt that education was for everyone and that Mandy should and could belong. We decided to approach the school down the street from our home, the same school her older brother, Justin, was attending.

My husband and I met with the principal and discussed my thoughts and beliefs, and my desire to enrol Mandy in the next school year in their junior kindergarten program. He said they did not have any children with handicap at this school; however, did I know of the special school across town for the mentally retarded? I assured him that I was aware of it but was not interested in visiting the special school, nor was I considering it an option for my daughters education. The principal was genuinely supportive and optimistic as he tried to understand my concept. He told me that he would consider my request and would bring it up at the next meeting with his superiors.

As we waited with anticipation, the summer months flew by and fall was upon us. The first day of school approached and still we waited for an answer. Finally, the Friday before school was to begin, the phone call came. That phone call changed our lives. Mandy was to start school on Monday with her brother. We were ecstatic!

The following year was exciting, with none of the anticipated obstacles or problems. It really was an ordinary school year. Mandy was just another kid at school.

Her presence at school that year had a major impact on people's lives, including her brother's. One day, during Education Week, I received a phone call from Justin's Grade 4 teacher. She wanted to share with me an emotional experience she had witnessed that day at school.

Each of her pupils had been required to choose a topic related to education, write about it and present it to the rest of the class.

The teacher said that she became concerned when it was Justin's turn; there he stood at the front of the class with no written material prepared. He proceeded to tell the class that he had chosen to talk about his sister, her life and what his family's dreams were for her. He spoke about the label society had given her, about her struggles, her accomplishments and about how she was just like the other students. She like to skate, watch vidios, go to school, and play with her friends, and her favourite singer was Michael Jackson. Justin concluded by telling the class that he did not need to write down on paper or prepare beforehand what he knew was right because it came naturally from his heart. I was told that this presentation not only moved the entire classroom to tears, including the teacher, but that it was also the most educational presentation the teacher had ever heard.

June came and the school year was winding down when the news came: our family was being transferred to Oromocto, New Brunswick. It sounded like the other end of

the earth. What was to become of Mandy and her education?

With just two days left in the school year and only days before we left for our new home, the school principal called and asked my husband and I to meet with him the next day. Not knowing what it was all about, and feeling both apprehensive and curious, we went to the school.

Upon our arrival, we were escorted into a crowded board room filled with people — teachers and administrators who had been directly involved with Mandy, and other teachers whose only experience had been to say hi to her in the halls. To our surprise, they all thanked my husband and I for giving *them* the opportunity to have Mandy at their school. They told us how sorry they were to see us leave and that they wished we were staying in Ottawa for at least three more years. They added that they hoped Mandy had learned as much from them as they had learned from her.

It was a moment I will never forget. It sealed my beliefs; I made an added commitment to our family's direction.

I later learned that Mandy's presence had set a precedent; the following year the school had three children with special needs enrolled in regular classes.

NEW CITY, NEW CHALLENGES

When I arrived in New Brunswick I was consumed with mixed emotions. I dreaded my new neighbours' reactions to our family; I feared that I would have to explain and fight all over again. It was difficult to have left everything that made me feel safe and secure: my family and my friends. I felt a tremendous burden on my shoulders. Everything had been going so great; and now I suddenly felt desperately alone!

But it was upon moving to New Brunswick that I learned there was a special word for my befief that Mandy should and could participate in regular classes with other neighbourhood children. The word is integration.

That September both kids started school — Mandy in regular kindergarten and Justin in Grade 5 at the same school. While things were off to a smooth start, I soon heard that there was to be a review of school policy regarding integration. A concerned teacher at the school convinced me that it was important that parents like myself become involved in the issue.

I began making phone calls to other parents who were considering integating their children. I explained to them that I had recently moved from Ontario and, like them, had a child with special needs. I asked them if they new that changes to school policy regarding integration of children with exceptional needs were under review. We talked about how important it was that we as parents contribute and voice our opinions and concerns. We agreed that we needed to meet each other and discuss the impending changes which would effect our lives.

Every person I called — which added up to ten families — came to a meeting at my home.

We sat with cups of coffee and shared stories, concerns, ideas and plans for the future. The atmosphere of this first meeting was one of caring and sharing; it was both exciting and rejuvenating.

After everyone left that evening, and as I sat alone in my living room, I was filled with a new, warm, safe feeling. I wasn't alone at all. I knew then that everything was going to be alright. It was a wonderful feeling to finally share and discuss how I felt — my frustrations, worries, thoughts and actions — with other people who understood. It lifted the weight off my shoulders.

The group was immediately active, following the burning issue of integration, and keeping up-to-date on progress, especially in the school system. We prepared and mailed documents to the school district, informing them of the formation of our parent group. In our letter, we spoke of our support for their endeavours to integrate children with exceptional needs into the regular school system.

A formal presentation to the school board was the next item on our agenda. As the designated leader of the parent support group I was responsible for the presentation: the first one I'd ever given! Despite my nervousness, the response was tremendous; our report of our expectations drew the attention of many school board members and the media. We continued to attend school board meetings and were called upon to discuss and comment on other school policies.

The years were both positive and rewarding, not only for our family but for our community. The parent group continued, becoming a united voice, a resource to other parents and to the community, and a source of strength for one another. Because we stood together we saw many significant and exiting changes in our schools and our community.

The most important outcome of our efforts was that Mandy was permanently integrated into the regular school system in Oromocto, New Brunswick. Integration meant that she became a part of one school system that exists for *all* children. It provided the opportunity for her to learn, to participate and to play with her friends in and out of the school.

THE FABRIC OF THE COMMUNITY

Mandy now has friends; I think this is one of the greatest benefits of inclusion. For years I watched Mandy stand alone on the front lawn as all the neighbourhood children rushed by on their way to school or games. I remembered thinking, "Please just one person stop and talk to her; just one of you ask her to play too."

My eyes fill with tears when I remember the first time our doorbell rang and there

stood three little girls asking, “Can Mandy come out and play?” The look of pure joy on Mandy’s face was a dream come true.

The original group of friends soon more than quadrupled in number. Now Mandy’s classmates are the children who speak up and support her; they are her advocates at school and in the playgrounds at home. These children speak proudly of the joys and triumphs they have shared with Mandy, not only at school but in the community. Her classmates call on her to come out to play; they are the friends who invite her to parties and dances and who are anxious to see her at Brownies, gymnastics, figure skating and baseball. These are the children who can’t wait to introduce me to their parents as “Mandy’s Mom; Mandy — she’s in our class”.

Integration is more than just education in school. It is a part of everything we do. Mandy’s integration does not start and stop in school; she is an active member of her community. Besides belonging to the figure skating club and attending the summer playground programs and gymnastics, Mandy was a Brownie for three years. The Brownie leader admitted that when she first learned that Mandy had enrolled in her pack she was scared. But she said that, once she got to know Mandy, she realized, “There isn’t anything she can’t do. She’s not a problem. We just love her and the kids all look for her on Wednesday nights.” Recently, the leader was asked if she had any children with special needs in her Brownie pack.

She replied, “No”. The person asked, “Well don’t you have Mandy?” The Brownie leader’s response was, “Yes, but she doesn’t have special needs. She’s just Mandy.”

Integration has helped Mandy to see herself as part of the whole. Her Grade 1 teacher told me that one day, during math class, Mandy suddenly stood up and literally picked up her desk. She moved it from the last row by the door to the front row in the middle of the classroom. At the beginning of the period, the kids had been asked to move their desks into groups, but, with good intentions, Mandy’s desk had been positioned so that she would not have to move. As the teacher stood there speechless, a little boy at the back of the class put up his hand and said, “Don’t be mad at Mandy, she just feels left out.”

We quickly realized what Mandy was trying to tell us through her actions. In her own way she was showing us that although she was physically integrated she still felt special or different, an outsider. The other kids recognized this and spoke up on her behalf. Mandy’s desk remained in the middle of the classroom, in the front row, for the rest of the school year. The incident also illustrates how Mandy’s participation has enhanced the other children’s learning process, providing a creative, accepting, learning environment for every child. In fact, all students have benefitted in many ways from a unified school system in which all learning needs are readily addressed. The supports and resources provided through integration, such as the methods and resource teachers, teacher’s aides, peer tutors and cooperative learning groups, are providing valuable assistance to all students in the classroom.

A WAY OF LIFE

Mandy has been accepted and made to feel comfortable and welcome and that she belongs in her neighbourhood and community.

She is now recognized as Mandy: a cute little girl with strengths and a personality She has experienced real life situations; she is learning in a setting that will prepare her for life in the community as a contributing and participating adult. She is accepted regardless of her abilities or disability by her peers, by those who will also someday be the adults in her community.

Peoples' attitudes are changing; people are more knowledgeable, more sensitive and more willing to accept children with differences into their classrooms, lives and communities. This letter from the mother of one of Mandy's classmates shows just how much attitudes are changing:

As a relatively new resident of New Brunswick I was at first sceptical about integration. I was concerned that my child, who had previously been in French immersion, would not receive the extra attention that she may or may not have needed. My concerns were totally unfounded. My daughter has not been set back in any way by integration; but she has been greatly enriched, as has our whole family.

My daughters best friend is handicapped. They are in the same class and are close neighbours as well. Morgan does not think of Mandy as handicapped. She doesn't treat Mandy any differently from any of her other friends, and cannot understand why some people make a to-do about being Mandy's "special friend". To Morgan, Mandy is special just because she is Mandy, a loving, generous, funny little girl, her greatest friend.

My personal views on integration have greatly changed. I have watched two little girls blossom together and I feel that wouldn't have happened without integration. My entire family has been enriched by getting to know a "handicapped child"; in fact I sometimes wonder who is truly handicapped. Mandy accepts us with all our limitations and narrow-mindedness and we accept Mandy for what she is, a child who is funny, determined and, in my view, extremely courageous. Integration can teach us all many valuable lessons in accepting others' limitations without harming anyone's academic endeavours.

One of the greatest gifts we can give our children is freedom from prejudice of any kind. By shielding our 'perfect' children we are not doing them any favours; we are, in fact, doing them a grave injustice. Children are naturally non-judgmental and I find it unforgivable to foist the unfair labels and prejudgments of some adults onto the shoulders of children.

— **Candice Gertz, Oromocto New Brunswick**

Looking back, I have no regrets as to the path we chose for Mandy. As pioneers in our educational system and as advocates for the acceptance of people with differences into communities, our pleasure and success came in our relationship with our daughter. As parents we were only catalysts, providing her with the opportunities to build and develop friendships at school and in the community. Yet many times I asked myself, "What do I really want for Mandy?" One day, as I looked out my front window, I knew.

There, as the wind whistled about and the first snow flurry of the year danced in the air, two little girls sat with their jackets off. They knew that they weren't allowed to have their coats off but it was fun. As they laughed and played on the lawn swing they tried to catch snowflakes on their tongues. Suddenly, overwhelmed, tears began to stream down my face. I said out loud, "*This is what it is really all about!* This is the kind of life I want for both my children. This is the future. A future where integration is no

longer an issue but a fact of life.”

I have learned never to “judge a book by its cover”. I have learned that change is not easy and it does not happen over night. You have to make it happen!

As I look to the future I know there are still struggles ahead. But, for Mandy and our family, because of integration, we’ll be able to rise to meet these challenges with others in our community.

Chapter 7

A Will to Learn: The Experiences of a Self-Advocate in the Education System

by Marcia Marcaccio

When I was five years old, I began attending a religious program for handicapped children. My sister, Donna, was a volunteer teacher in the class I wanted to read. My sister said she would teach me. Our friend Lorraine gave Donna teaching supplies to help me read. Lorraine is a teacher.

In September I started Mounthaven School. This was a school for children who have a mental handicap. My brothers and sisters went to a different school. At Christmas time, my parents went to my school for interviews with my teachers. They told my teacher and my principal that my sister was teaching me to read. The principal and my teacher told my parents that Donna should not be teaching me to read. My parents believed the teacher and the principal. They told Donna and me to stop. My parents did this because they loved me and they didn't want me to have problems.

I was taught the same things as the other children in my class. I was taught different things from what my brothers and sisters were taught at their school. It made me feel miserable to be taught different things. It made me feel that I could not do things for myself. It made me frustrated. I felt bad about myself.

I felt I was different from my brothers and sisters and friends and cousins.

Vincent Massey was a senior school program for students who were sixteen years old to twenty-one years old. Every student was handicapped. When I went to Vincent Massey, I wanted to learn things that would help me get a job and be part of the community. I wanted to learn to read, write, do math, take care of children. I felt left out, frustrated and bored because I wasn't learning things.

When I went to school they didn't teach me to read. They taught me yoga and crafts. I was upset with the work training that I had to do. I had to go to a park in winter to paint picnic tables. I had to pack potatoes. Finally, I told my sister that I didn't want to do that anymore. It was cold at the park. The work was dirty. I had to come home dirty. I didn't like it. My sister talked to my parents and they told the teacher that I wasn't to do these things. My principal was mad at my sister. My brothers and sisters didn't have to do that things at their school. I didn't feel I was being respected.

I was bored at that school. I felt bad sometimes. I didn't really have any friends. I liked some of the kids I went to school with but I only saw them at school. I didn't do things with them on the weekend. We lived far from each other and we needed support to get

together. My friends were my brothers and sisters and their friends and my relatives.

About ten years ago, a friend of my family, Paul, said he would help me to read. He taught me to read words from the sports page of the newspaper. It was fun. When Paul was teaching me, I felt good about myself. I realized I could learn to read. I made a decision to do something about it. My teacher didn't support me. They told my sister that she was not being fair to me. They said I couldn't read. They were wrong.

If I could change the school I went to I would change the subjects. I wouldn't want crafts. I would want reading and writing. I had cooking classes but only watched the teacher. I would want to participate more. I would want to learn how to use the library.

I would like to do projects with the other students to learn about things. I would want to learn about geography — about countries and how to use a map. I would like to learn spelling. I would like to learn other languages, especially Italian. I would like to learn math. I did like gym but would have liked to do team sports like basketball. I would like to have had recess so I could meet friends. I would have liked to get to know other students and to do things with them.

I wish I could have given my opinion about what I wanted to learn. I would have liked to have choices. I would want respect and to feel important. I would want to go to school with my brothers and sisters and to learn interesting things.

INTO THE WORKFORCE

Two and a half years after I graduated from Vincent Massey, I was hired as an Educational Assistant at the Separate School Board. There were many good things and there were some problems. The teachers would get upset with me because I did the wrong thing. I didn't know that it was wrong. I could not read the list of duties that the teachers gave me. I was embarrassed to tell them that I couldn't read. When they found out that I couldn't read they said I should not have my job. I did not feel good about myself. I felt that I was different from the other staff. People didn't always want to help me.

My sister and I talked about the situation. She asked me if I wanted to learn. I said I definitely wanted to learn. My parents, my brothers and my other sister weren't sure that it was necessary. Maybe it wasn't a good idea, they thought. They said if I needed reading skills for my job maybe I should quit my job. I thought, "No way!" We looked for a course but everyone said they didn't have a program for "special needs" students. Finally, the adult program at the Separate School Board said OK. I went to the adult literacy program sponsored by the Hamilton Catholic School Board Adult Education Program. I started in 1986 and continue to go for two half-days per week.

Donna hired a tutor to give me extra support for a while. It was great. I was learning. I made a commitment to stay with it.

I love going to Sacred Heart. My teacher Barb and I have a routine. I make a sentence and I say it in to a tape recorder. Barb then writes the sentence and we work on each new word. I make my own dictionary with my new words.

I'm doing so well that I now read in my church on Sundays. When my sister Patty got married I asked her if I could read at her wedding. At first she said no. A friend at church asked me to read on a special occasion. Another friend told my sister that I did a good job. After that she asked me to read at her wedding. My relatives said I did a good job.

I do not have many problems at work. I can read my duties. I can go to P.D. days and I can participate in what's going on because I can read some of the notes and I can write notes. I can now read books. I learn more now. I can be more independent because I can read signs in the community. I can help children to read I feel good about myself because I can do it. I love learning to read. It increases my vocabulary and this helps me to express my feelings and my thoughts better. I am President of People First in Hamilton. I can now write my own agenda for the meetings and I can read letters from other groups that come to me. I read these letters to my group. There are words I don't know yet. I get stuck sometimes but people help me. I keep practising.

Section Three

**Innovations and
Practical
Applications**

Chapter 8

The Methods and Resource Teacher: A Collaborative Consultant Model

by Gordon L. Porter

Since 1985, schools in New Brunswick school districts 28 and 29 have been using an inclusive approach to educate students with disabilities (Porter, 1986). This has required a number of changes in policies and goals, organizational structures, instructional strategies, and support mechanisms. However, the single most significant change has been the redefinition of the school-based special education teacher.

For this new position, we adopted the term methods and resource teacher (M&R teacher), from the Wellington County Separate School Board in Guelph, Ontario (Forest, 1984). We have invested considerable effort in defining the role and in training people for the position.

Methods and resource teachers are primarily responsible for providing direct and effective support to classroom teachers, with the goal of enabling *all* students to be meaningfully included in learning activities in regular classrooms. M&R teachers have a secondary responsibility to “exceptional” students who require individualized supports and services to participate in and benefit from regular classroom instruction.

The main functions of the M&R teachers are collaboration, liaison, program development, monitoring, and professional development. ([See Job Description, page 151](#))

The following description of the role is based on discussions and interviews with M&R teachers, as well as observation and surveys. Gathered in the period from 1988 to 1990, the descriptions, quotations and analysis come from former special class teachers, resource room teachers and regular class teachers. In their new role as M&R teachers, they provide a view of school integration that is firmly connected to actual experience. They have participated the process of change and they share their insights into what works, what skills, qualities and training are required to sustain such an effort, and what work needs to be done day-to-day basis in schools.

WHAT IS THE JOB OF THE METHODS AND RESOURCE TEACHER?

Helping Teachers

“Why don’t you ask me for help?” the methods and resource teacher asked the Grade 12 English teacher who was complaining about having no materials for a student with a low reading level. Teaching has been described as a “lonely profession”; the English

teacher is, like many of his colleagues, reluctant to ask for help, even when it is available. As integration of students with special needs proceeds, however, many teachers are beginning to ask for help. As one M&R teacher commented:

If the classroom teachers are to get this student involved in the class, they need help. I get materials together that the student can do in the class, things the teacher can use with the student.

M&R teachers basically respond to the needs of teachers, and, as with the English instructor, they most frequently help with materials, particularly for reading, language arts and math.

Many teachers are specific about what they want help with, while others are puzzled by a student's lack of success and want the M&R teacher to help determine why.

The second major area teachers want help with is classroom behaviour and discipline. For example, a student may not pay attention in class and may refuse to work or may refuse to work and disrupt classroom activities and affect the learning of other students. In some cases the students have severe behavioural disorders, which are expressed in temper tantrums, physical and verbal abuse of classmates or teachers, or in self-abusive behaviour.

Teachers are asking for help with students who just won't do the work or who are acting out. Sometimes you don't know whether the student is having an academic problem because of his behavioural difficulty or whether he's a behaviour problem because he can't do the academic work:

The behaviour problems that come to me are where a child is what you might call a lazy student. He doesn't get his work done. He's disorganized, hyperactive. Of course, with integration we aim get emotionally disturbed or behaviour disordered kids. I work out a plan with the teacher to decide what behaviour we're going to target and how to deal with the behaviour.

Teachers also need moral support. One M&R teacher reports that teachers just want to talk over their problems, discuss their ideas and get a second opinion on what they're doing. In most cases this is done informally, in the hallway or in the staff room:

Teachers want to talk about the child who isn't moulding in with everyone else. He or she is just not doing well. Sometimes the teacher just needs to ask "why isn't he getting it?" The teacher doesn't understand the child's inconsistencies and wants to talk it over.

[The teachers] need support. They want to know that what they're doing is right. Even teachers who have been at it a while were saying, at the first of the year, "We don't know how to handle [integration of students with disabilities]. I've never had to deal with this before." When I simply outlined what the objective was for the student in the class they took right off. It's amazing. They're doing it right and I just provide a lot of positive reinforcement. For example, I tell them, "You don't need my help, you know what you're doing a you're doing a good job"

Sometimes teachers really need a practical suggestion, some little thing that clicks for them. Sometimes it is related to the student and sometimes to the teacher. Maybe it's an adjustment of teaching style, and the suggestions you make don't fit their style. You have to know what their style of teaching is to really reach them.

Daily Responsibilities, Long-Term Planning

Meetings! A lot of meetings! That's part of the planning, of course. You meet with parents, you meet with teachers, teacher's aides and others. You'd like to have more time to yourself, but you're usually in meetings, I find.

This typifies the role of a teacher acting as a consultant in a school. The major activities identified by methods and resource teachers usually involve partnership with other teachers. This includes extensive discussions with the teacher about the student's difficulty and needs, and content and structure of the individual program.

The work of methods and resource teachers is highly varied, with requirements changing all the time, and people relying on their assistance daily. For these reasons, M&R teachers reported, they have to be both flexible and responsive so they can be available when the teacher needs support, which means they must plan their time very carefully.

They have to be ready to listen to all problems, no matter how simple, and give immediate assistance. At the same time they have to be prepared to respond to the crises which arise in schools everyday:

You have to find ways of being there. Teachers don't always like to arrange meetings, but they like to drop in. Maybe you're right in the middle of something, but you have to make yourself available for them when they're available.

In the methods and resource role you can plan a day, but very often you can only get into a couple of things that you want to do. So you have to be on your toes and be able to be versatile, to change your plans on the spot. In the classroom it's a much more organized day. You know exactly what's going to happen.

The M&R teacher also helps the teacher initiate the integration program for a particular student and get it started in the classroom. One former M&R teacher said:

I had to make sure that the teacher had enough resources to work with. Also, if teachers were having any difficulty, I would see how I could assist them in making it easier for the child to participate in the classroom. I had to be in the classrooms at times monitoring what was going on and the way things were being handled — how the teacher and the student were adjusting and if there were any difficulties.

A final activity that involves considerable time, particularly for M&R teachers working at the junior and senior high school levels, is actually planning and coordinating the overall schedule of exceptional students. Students with disabilities attending high school can find it particularly difficult to have a focus for the day at school.

The methods and resource teacher sees that the student's schedule is well planned and realistic and that the student's progress is monitored carefully.

In addition to assisting students in course selection, M&R teachers work closely with the guidance counsellor and administrative personnel. They also coordinate community work programs; they find the sites and provide training, supervision and monitoring of community placement.

Practical Aspects

I find I have to get an overall picture of the student. It takes a lot of time and you have to look at that student in many different areas to get a true picture of what the problem could be, diagnose where the problem is. Sometimes you think you know and then you get some more information which changes the whole outlook.

The M&R teachers interviewed identified several practical day to day tactics to support the teacher. Some take over and teach the class, which permits the teacher to do planning and curriculum development. A second M&R teacher can work with the classroom teacher for an extended period of time to plan and prepare needed materials. "I know one teacher was having trouble completing a couple of things for an

exceptional child. I said, 'I'll go in your classroom for twenty minutes while you go and jot down your ideas. I'll put your ideas in the right order and work on them for you.'"

M&R teachers report that they prefer to modify and adapt existing curriculum to come up with usable materials. Classroom teachers and students also seem to prefer curriculum materials related to the regular instructional program. As a result, much of the work of the M&R teacher is to assist the classroom teacher in adapting the content and vocabulary of materials so they can be used by exceptional students:

Most teachers feel much more at ease if we can take the regular program and deal with that so that these kids can still be a part of the class. They find it easier to cope that way.

I always make sure the teacher has input. The teacher looks through the objectives with me and then I take away what we have agreed on. I always type it up, then give it to them and ask them to look it over. If I'm modifying the program, I do the modification that we've talked about and I always get them to OK it before I go ahead. They're the ones who tell me whether I'm doing alright.

WHAT IS NEEDED TO DO THE JOB?

Professional Background

Most of the people interviewed for this study had been regular class teachers with more than ten years of experience each before becoming M&R teachers. These teachers were mainly recruited into the M&R position while on staff at the school in which they now work. They were selected for their suitability for the job. Only a few had pre-service training in special education, although a number of the others took special education courses after becoming M&R teachers.

A handful of the teachers interviewed had been special class teachers, specifically of students labelled "trainable mentally handicapped". They evolved into the M&R role as the integration of these students proceeded in the school system.

Most of the teachers felt that regular class teachers experience was essential, and that M&R teachers should be able to identify with the experience of the regular teacher:

I think experience as a regular class teacher is necessary. It would be a mistake to bring somebody totally new into the job. The good thing about having somebody who was a classroom teacher, especially from the same school or district, is that teachers see you as another teacher. I think that's good. You're more aware of what some of the problems are.

Training in special education would be good, but I think more than training it would be [necessary to have] experience in working with kids and being a classroom teacher. I have used a lot of things, techniques and so forth, that I had done in the classroom, as guidelines. And I really feel that has been of more value to me. There definitely has to be training, but more of my ability to work with teachers has been because of my experience in the classroom.

In addition to past experience as regular teachers, the M&R teachers interviewed felt it was extremely important to keep their hand in the classroom on an ongoing basis. Most of them teach regular classes to complete their work assignment or on a voluntary basis. They said it not only gives them credibility and gains respect from their peers, but is personally rewarding as well:

[Some teachers] don't consider M&R teachers real teachers because we're not in the classroom. We're not faced with the day-to-day struggle of the classroom. I think that M&R teachers need to keep a handle on the regular classroom to know what's going on.

One M&R teacher, who was about to teach a regular class for the first time, said:

This year I'm teaching a regular Grade 2 class. I wanted to experience what it was like to teach in a regular class. Otherwise, how can I give teachers advice on what they should be doing in a classroom? I've never really taught twenty-seven or thirty kids all at once before. How do I know how you can handle all those children plus make provisions for a special needs student?

Personal Qualities

What qualities should an M&R teacher have? The overriding opinion is that a person developing educational programs for students with special needs in regular classrooms must be optimistic and have a positive approach, particularly to their expectations of the student with a disability.

It is also necessary to have confidence that teachers inexperienced in teaching students with special needs will respond to the challenge. Many classroom teachers have been told for years that students with disabilities require special instruction from special educators. That thinking is not easily changed and calls for the M&R teacher to be naturally optimist and positive in difficult situations.

Persistence is essential. "You have to be willing to go the extra mile, willing to spend a little bit of extra time, a little bit of extra energy or effort to get ahead and do what has to be done. Longer hours, meetings whenever the parent is available ... you have to be willing to dig for ideas keep looking and reading."

M&R teachers have to work with a large number of people: teachers, administrators, consultants, and parents. The ability to work well with others and to handle interpersonal relationships effectively is another important part of the job. One teacher described this as “accepting people as they are and not trying to change them entirely over to your way of doing things.” One teacher observed that she had to learn to act calm and easy-going and to be open to different styles of operating. Her work as a regular class teacher had not prepared her for this and it required considerable adjustment. There are many different personalities in a school, each reacting in their own way to the suggestions made by the M&R teacher. The need to balance these considerations against the need to push for changes and new approaches for the student makes the position difficult:

Diplomacy is the big one because you have to be a diplomat with parents, you have to be a diplomat with the other teachers and you have to be diplomatic in your services to the child. You have to be very careful that you’re not treating the child as something less than any of the other students in the school. You have to be careful that you’re not looking down on the disabilities of the student. You have to make sure that parents know that this child is just as important as any other child in the school. You have to make sure that you’re making your point clear and making the needs of the student clear to the other teachers without being a threat to them and their secure environment in the classroom.

The M&R teachers interviewed repeatedly stressed they need to be innovative, flexible, creative and observant. “I get to know the student by observing. Prior to an assessment, I go into the classroom, and talk to them on the playground. I make a point of being around them, watching their games.” “I never thought I was, but I have to admit I find I’m getting more and more creative as the year goes on. I’m not afraid to try something different. I came up with ten ways for a teacher to plan a test for a student. And they’re successful.”

They emphasized the need for good problem solving skills, for the ability to have insight into a specific situation and see what was really critical to its resolution. They talked about the need to be alert and aware and to think quickly:

If you are a person with a mind-set that this is the way it should be and it’s the only way to do it, then you’re going to have a lot of stress because if one strategy doesn’t work, you won’t know what to do next. You have to be able to say, “I made a mistake and I can’t change that, but I can go on and do something else and try to make it better”. And I think it’s good if you can make other people feel able to say, “Big deal! It didn’t work. We’ll do something different.” The teacher has to be flexible as well.

This shows that the ability to keep things in perspective and come up with practical

approaches is essential. If suggestions made to teachers are too ambitious, and require unrealistic approaches or changes in the classroom, they're unlikely to be implemented. In addition, the M&R teacher must do everything possible to see that new approaches get off to a good start in the classroom. Throughout the process, they can count on criticism, complaints and grumbling. One teacher said she felt she had to be tough and not "let them make me the low man on the totem pole." Others referred to "having a thick skin" and "letting everything run off you like water off a duck."

One of the most important attributes is a genuine concern for the success of students with special needs. This commitment is especially difficult because the M&R teacher has an indirect influence on a student's success, meaning that they often see the credit for success attributed to someone else. "You won't be given credit. Don't expect people to say, 'Hey, good job!' If there's going to be glory, it's going to be for the regular classroom teacher."

Skills

M&R teachers must know the educational needs of students with disabilities. In an integrated model this requires an understanding and appreciation of the benefits that integrated instruction can bring to the child. This knowledge provides the framework for judgments about the student's program. You have to have a knowledge of what integration is all about. You have to have a value base and an understanding of what the goals are for the education of a student with special needs."

Skills in formal and informal assessment and diagnostic procedures used to determine a student's needs and to develop IEPs are also important.

In addition, M&R teachers need a thorough knowledge of the available instructional materials and resources that can be utilized to the best advantage in the student's program. This makes a background in special education useful. However, most of the teachers felt that these things could be learned on the job.

M&R teachers need to be good at setting priorities and at organizing. Materials have to be assembled and paperwork completed while monitoring continues and new cases are picked up:

There has to be an underlying organization to what you're doing and you have to have a long range plan of what you expect in the next two or three months.

I've learned that I have to be very organized. If I'm not, and I think this is one of the problems I had last year, I just keep thinking there's so much I've got to do and I just have a sense of panic. This year I've learned that I have to be organized, deal with what I think is most important and work my way through. Sometimes I don't get to the bottom of the list but I've found being organized has helped me a lot.

Teachers have different teaching styles and students have different learning styles, meaning M&R teachers need a thorough knowledge of alternate teaching strategies in addition to the school curriculum. They must have a sense of what approach is likely to be most successful with an individual teacher or student. At the elementary level, knowledge in reading, language arts and mathematics is considered the most important. At the junior and senior high levels more attention is paid to course content in social studies, science and vocational subjects.

Training

M&R teachers generally said they thought personal and process skills that underlie the work of the M&R teacher should be present when the position is assumed.

Organizational and interpersonal skills, as well as a sensitivity to student's needs and the determination to solve problems, are all things that are difficult to teach.

Specific skills related to completing assessments, writing IEPs and developing curriculum knowledge are more easily acquired on the job. A commitment to personal development and self-improvement is obviously a great advantage to someone working as a methods and resource teacher:

I've had some special education training, but everything else I've had to learn on my own. I've had to learn how to integrate students, how to define their needs and how to have their needs met. I've had to learn course curriculums so that I can modify them. I've had to develop my own system of modification. The best training is experience. That's the only way. You don't develop an intuitive feeling about something unless you've had experience doing it. I've learned most of what I do day-to-day on the job.

When school districts 28 and 29 instituted the position of M&R teacher, a normal training plan was developed. It included individual work with teachers and half-day or full-day group training sessions held every other week. Outside consultants have been used on occasion, but most of the training has been carried out by district staff including the original methods and resource teachers themselves.

Training focuses on developing an understanding of the philosophy of an integrated program and the role of the M&R teacher in supporting the program. Training in collaborative skills is particularly useful as these skills are critical in establishing the right relationship with the classroom teacher.

"Being a methods and resource teacher is different. We need training on how to be a collaborative consultant rather than the expert."

The M&R teachers interviewed were in ongoing training every other week, which they felt was important for developing a sense of continuity and follow-up, for ideas on new materials and new methods, and "to provide occasions where teachers can sound off to

one another.” The ongoing sessions also help keep the M&R teachers’ morale up and their commitment to carrying out their job high. M&R teachers often feel alone in their perspective and uncertain about matters. Meeting with their peers to talk over the successes as well as the frustrations of the job, and to develop a sense of team work among themselves is beneficial:

The training sessions every other week are great. We’ve been airing a few of our problems and deciding on how to go from there. We decide what we’d like to see done and build from session to session.

I really enjoy talking with the other methods and resource teachers. I think that’s the most valuable thing ... to be able to talk things over and say, “I do it this way”, or “I’ve tried this and it works”. There are so many more ideas [available].

M&R teachers at the high school level suggest that their needs are somewhat unique because of the departmental organization of their schools. They feel they need to meet with other M&R teachers in high schools to share perspectives, problems and solutions.

With the district training program now in its fifth year, districts 28 and 29 teachers feel the need for making adjustments. Each year there are five or six people new to the position and the training they require is quite different from training for more experienced teachers.

They suggest the need for greater individualization of the training with less emphasis on whole group activities and more use of small groups established on the basis of specific need, such as those of high school teachers. Insight into actual experience through hands-on practice is a major training need identified by M&R teachers.

All the teachers saw areas they needed to learn more about including curriculum, instructional techniques and the needs of individual children. Some expressed confidence in their knowledge of regular classroom organization and teaching methods but felt they need more skill in assessment, testing and development of appropriate individual plans for students. Another area in which many felt inadequate was the development of multi-level instructional techniques for use in the regular class.

STRATEGIES FOR THE COLLABORATIVE ROLE

Methods and resource teachers reported using a variety of strategies to support regular class teachers while avoiding positioning themselves as experts who provide easy answers to problems. They stressed the importance of being seen as fellow-teachers and collaborators: “You can’t ask a teacher to do anything you wouldn’t do yourself. You can’t be an expert. You have to be one of them.”

One strategy is to encourage the regular class teacher to take ownership of both the

problem and the plan to deal with it:

In September I thought I was going to do everything. I thought I was going to be Miss Wonderful and do the programs for the teachers, be so much of a help to them. Then I realized, “Hey, I’m doing all of this; they’re not taking ownership; they’re thinking those kids are my problem.” So I had to go back and re-adjust my way of doing things. I think it’s a lot better now that I keep the role of the M&R teacher focused on assisting and being there to assist, but not doing everything.

The M&R teacher has to visit the classroom frequently to maintain contact with the student and monitor the program. This may cause difficulty, as some teachers are not comfortable having visitors in their classrooms on a regular basis.

I make sure that anytime I go into classrooms I tell the teachers why I’m there. I talk to them about the students and the programs and I’m very careful not to say anything about what goes on in their classroom to anyone else. You have to be discreet about it.

The M&R teachers emphasized the need to listen to teachers, especially to their ideas about possible strategies to use in the classroom. M&R teachers can help them select what they think is the most appropriate strategy but it is the teacher who must use it in the classroom:

I ask them what they think would work best. How do they think they can do it? I get them to talk about it and frequently they will make more of a commitment to the idea.

I’ll be honest; I don’t often give them an answer, because I don’t have the answers. I just listen to them and talk, and maybe offer a few suggestions about things I did when I was in the classroom or things that I’ve heard about. I might refer them to somebody else, but I don’t necessarily give them an answer myself.

I ask them, “What have you tried? Do you have any ideas of something else that you haven’t tried, that you’ve been thinking about that might work?” And instead of me saying, “Try this”, we come up with a list together of two or three strategies. I let the teacher choose one of them to try. Often they’ll come back and say, “Look, I tried this particular one and I think it’s going to work.” So, in my view, you can’t shove it down their throats.

Several M&R teachers mentioned using other faculty members to provide reinforcement to teachers. One described a situation where the principal served in this role:

You have to make sure the teachers are given positive reinforcement for what they're doing. They're just feeling their way and they need positive reinforcement to keep going. I've gone to the principal and said, "This Grade 5 teacher is doing a really fine job; why don't you tell her that I mentioned it to you." And the teacher feels that pat on the back and that they're doing a good job; it gives them a little push to go on and keep working at it.

With the many visits M&R teachers make to various classrooms, they become well informed as to each teacher's strengths and where these strengths might be useful in other classrooms. They can facilitate an interchange of ideas and among staff, promoting cooperation among teachers:

Sometimes you have to say, "What about Mrs. So and So next door? She taught a unit like that last year. Have you considered talking to her, or would it help if I talked to her and got back to you?" You really have to use all the resources you can. You can't come up with enough ideas all by yourself even if you're very, very experienced.

The use of group problem-solving through either formal problem-solving teams (see [Chapter 12](#)) or more informal approaches was mentioned by several teachers. In one particular small school, the M&R teacher suggested that all seven staff members act as a team. Now they frequently discuss problems and help each other resolve them. The methods and resource teacher — who was new to the profession — said:

The fact that I've only been teaching a few years is, I think, in some ways a help. I can say to the more experienced teachers, "Well, how would you handle this problem?" It's almost an internship where we're constantly exchanging ideas. There's a lot of feedback. I've presented the teachers with an idea and had them say, "Look, we've done this for a couple of weeks and I don't think it's working." So we pitch in and try something else.

In the high school and, to a lesser extent, the junior high, students typically see a teacher for only one period, which creates problems in the consultation process. Effective group meetings can be especially useful here:

I did an assessment on a learning disabled student who moved into the district. When we had the case conference all the teachers were together, except one, and it was a very effective meeting. They were cooperative and everybody now has a much better handle on this student.

Attention to detail goes a long way in making the consulting role work. For example, it helps to hold meetings at the teachers' convenience:

I think you have to be a little more careful with the teacher who's "bucking". I know that the little things count. If I wanted to meet with a teacher, I would try to arrange a convenient time for that teacher. I would go so far as to arrange the meeting in the smoking staff room if that's what they wanted and I'd make coffee ahead of time and have everything ready so it was pleasant meeting.

Teamwork Between Methods and Resource Teachers

I've learned never to lose my temper. I will hold it back. I may spout off afterwards [to another M&R teacher], but I will not let the [classroom] teacher see that I am upset or frustrated.

Most schools have two teachers working in the M&R role. They rely heavily on each other, sharing the trials and frustrations of the position. At several schools where the M&R teachers were interviewed, they divided the class equally at each grade level. For example, in one school serving Grades 1 to 5, each M&R teacher took responsibility for two of the four classes at each level. They said this keeps each teacher involved with the whole curriculum of the school. It also permits them to work as a team on curriculum questions, and substitute for each other if necessary. The teamwork includes frequent discussion of perspectives on individual cases and appropriate instructional strategies:

We share the work. That way we can talk back and forth and compare what we've done with different students. Maybe something I've done would be useful to her and vice versa. Teachers know which M&R teacher they should go to, but sometimes in an emergency they talk to whoever they meet. We take care of it. We often discuss assessments. It's nice to have that back up, someone who can confirm what you see. It's also great because we're both familiar with all the kids and there are times when we have to sit in on a meeting for the other M&R teacher.

In some schools M&R teachers work out of the same room and discuss things on an informal basis. In other schools, they have formal meetings once a week where they discuss problems or issues. This seems more prevalent at the high school than at the elementary level. One of the high schools reported formal meetings each week that are attended by the three teacher's aides as well as the two M&R teachers. They feel this helps them discuss and resolve student and scheduling problems and deal with organizational issues.

Teamwork with Teacher's Aides

Teacher's aides play an important part in the integration of students with disabilities. The M&R teacher sets priorities and allocates the teacher's aide's time, and also sees that the classroom teacher takes responsibility for the teacher's aide's work in the classroom. The teacher's aide must not be seen strictly as a tutor for the student with disabilities, but as someone to help in any number of ways to facilitate the general operation of the classroom.

The teacher's aide is responsible to the teacher, not to the M&R teacher while in the classroom. So it's up to the teacher, once the program is initiated, to make sure that the teacher's aide knows what she wants her to do.

M&R teachers must include teacher's aides in planning strategies for students. Since teacher's aides are in the classroom with the student, they often have insights and information that can contribute to the problem-solving task. At the high school level, teacher's aides are used to support students as they go to regular classes throughout the school. They also play a major role in community access and employment programs for students with severe disabilities. Teacher's aides are most often the staff member to accompany a student on work placements. In situations where there is only one M&R teacher in the school, the teacher's aide is a source of moral support for the teacher: "It helps a lot, having a teacher's aide, because then you're not there all by yourself. At least you have somebody else there who knows how hard you're working."

Teamwork with Parents

M&R teachers view parents in much the same way they do regular class teachers. They recognize that parents are critical to students' success in school, so they must cooperate with and involve parents. However, like teachers, parents bring unique personalities and levels of expectation to the relationship.

M&R teachers emphasized the need to know the parents well and to develop a positive working relationship. Home visits are considered important, particularly for parents who do not come to scheduled appointments at school. It is important to let the parents know exactly what is happening with their child in school to share the success and also discuss the difficulties that are being experienced.

Parents typically have contact with the same M&R teacher over a number of years, which may prevent parents from seeing that the classroom teacher is responsible for the student's program. Most of the M&R teachers feel that the special relationship they have with the parent is positive but are concerned that the regular teacher and the parent develop a good relationship based on confidence and trust. Among the strategies they use is to have the regular teacher make the phone call to arrange a meeting and to have the teacher chair the planning meetings. This shows that the teacher is in charge of the child's education.

The relationship between high school teachers and parents seems weaker than at other levels. High school teachers usually instruct five or six classes a day and their relationships with individual students is superficial compared to elementary and junior high teachers. As a result, the sense of responsibility for the child's total program is not as developed. Making the relationship even more difficult is the fact that many high school teachers only contact parents when there is something wrong, such as when the child isn't attending school regularly or has had a serious behavioural incident. As a result, the relationship is based on negative events and can be adversarial.

At the high school level, the M&R teacher assumes more responsibility for the programs of students with more severe disabilities. This creates a problem of transfer of identity:

I'm still the one that parents call. The regular teachers haven't made any effort to get in touch with the parent just to find out how they can work with them. There should be a lot more, but I think it all ties to the fact that the regular teachers still don't see these kids as their responsibility. Even the parents don't see the regular classroom teacher as responsible. They still see me because they've dealt with me for three or four years.

Despite the difficulties, the value of parent participation in program planning for students is most apparent. The parents' aspirations and visions for the child's future are

important and need to be incorporated into the overall program planning. Some schools ensure that parents are involve in initial planning to the extent that their goals for the child are a basis for the school program:

We've had parents in for planning sessions and we get very beneficial information from them. Parents have just provided us with so much information that has helped in planning for the students. For example, they said their child likes to do this or he really enjoys doing that. To get from the parents the things that have occurred [at home] is very helpful.

We discuss the programs with the parents. We ask them for suggestions, what they would like and then we try to incorporate those suggestions as much as we can into the program. We maintain close contact with parents. The teachers maintain that contact as well.

Teamwork with the Principal

The relationship between the M&R teacher and the principal is crucial to the success of integration and it must be supported and nurtured.

M&R teachers feel that principals must understand the role of the M&R teacher.

One of the most important contributions the principal can make is to present and clearly define the role of the M&R teacher to the members of the school staff and communicate his or her support of the M&R program. Principals also need to be involved sufficiently to show ownership of integration efforts. This will motivate other staff members to do the same:

The principal has to really know what is going on. He has to be behind it and believe in the program. Because if you have little breakdowns you have to have the support. You have to have the back up all the way down the line, otherwise the system will fail.

This level of support is not always present, however. Some M&R teachers reported that they found principals treating the program with what might be called benign neglect, out of either lack of confidence or lack of interest:

If [the principal] was interested, [in the prgram] it would help. But since the beginning of the year there has been nothing said. If the principal brought it up, teachers would see that he's monitoring it. He could even go into the classes where special needs students are and see how things are going and ask the teachers for copies of the objectives. He could ask the teachers how they're doing with the program. It would be so much more effective if he was [monitoring the programs].

Principals have a strong influence on the efforts of the M&R teacher and can seriously undermine the program. With the principal's positive support and collaboration the M&R teacher can act confidently to help teachers meet student needs.

The M&R teacher also needs the principal to listen to his or her concerns and take action when required. Issues of authority sometimes come up when teachers are asked to collaborate with M&R teachers.

When collaboration is a problem, M&R teachers need a good relationship with the school principal to resolve a situation successfully.

In addition to being up-to-date on critical issues and informed as to planning programs, principals must take the lead in identifying students and teachers who need the support of the M&R teacher:

I had a situation where a student was placed in a classroom where the teacher wasn't really sold on the idea. The principal said, "We've really got to make this situation work, because if it doesn't, it will make it difficult for all of us." So the principal and I have gone out of our way to make sure the program has been a successful experience for the teacher. We've involved her in workshops and given her time out to prepare materials. We've supported her every way we can and it's worked very well. The teacher now believes that it is working and can see changes in the student.

In one instance, a teacher was having a lot of misgivings about having an exceptional student in the room. She felt the support she had was going to be taken away, and I had a hard time convincing her that she had to play a part in meeting the needs of the student. She didn't feel she could do that, so I left it at that point. I didn't feel it was my role to push it with her any more. I talked to the principal and asked him to address the situation from his point of view. In his regular classroom visitation, he was able to get the same point across and after a few weeks the teacher was coming to me and saying "I worked with him [the child] today and it was great."

The M&R teacher can benefit from the advice and guidance of the school principal. This does not mean blind support for everything the M&R teacher does, but a collaborative approach to problem-solving based on mutual respect.

The M&R teacher needs to have confidence that the principal expects program decisions will be supportive of students and that teachers will act to meet students' needs.

M&R teachers reported that they often use informal means to update the principal. They may drop into the principal's office from time to time or have discussions whenever they meet in the school. Others schedule formal meetings with the principal,

and in some cases the guidance counsellor, on a weekly basis.

Out-of-Classroom Instruction

Very little pull-out instruction is occurring in the schools of New Brunswick districts 28 and 29, and M&R teachers feel that very little out-of-class instruction is required. Most of them do very little of it, only twenty to thirty minutes a day, three or four days a week, according to the time-use survey ([see Time-Use Survey A1: Major Activities of Methods and Resource Teachers](#)). Only one teacher had a student out of regular class for longer — six-and-a-half hours out of a twenty-five-hour instructional week. Instead, small group instruction is often carried out in the regular classroom with the M&R teacher or teacher's aide. Considerable use of peer-tutoring has lessened the need for pull-out or cut-of-class instruction.

Individual or small group instruction is most frequently needed for reading and other areas of language arts, or when a student is being easily distracted. Teachers described instances where the special needs student was distracting other students from their work and was taken from the class for a short period of time to get the behaviour under control before returning to the classroom.

Community-based instruction programs also involve time out of class. These include community access activities like going to the library, the bank, the post office, or going out to a restaurant with an adult. In most cases, a teacher's aide accompanies the student.

Districts 28 and 29 policy discourages but does not prohibit pull-out instruction, requiring that the pull-out occur after other alternatives have been tried.

Even then it should be used only for compelling reasons necessary to meet the child's needs:

I have nothing against a student leaving the classroom for a short period of time to meet an individual need. And that goes right through from the multiply handicapped to the most gifted students in our schools. Everybody has individual needs, and if we can meet them by withdrawing the child from class, or giving them an alternative from time to time, then there is nothing wrong with that. However, that's only the case if it doesn't interfere with the child's self-esteem. I think that pull-out should be done cautiously and as little as is necessary.

Individualized instruction in class is the alternative to the pull-out approach. This may be done by the teacher, the teacher's aide, or by the M&R teacher coming into the class:

At present, we haven't had to use pull-out very much. But in essence, our teacher's aides have been ping into the class and providing individual instruction. [They] don't work with the child in a separate group, but within the classroom. And I think it should happen in the classroom, because then the teacher realises what's happening with the child and can have some input.

The M&R teachers interviewed disagreed with the concept of out-of-class instruction as a way of making students "ready" for regular classroom instruction:

Teachers talk about readiness, which I think is a myth. You don't get ready to learn something. You can advance children's interest, by trying to get them involved, but you don't get somebody ready for something.

You have to start the person where they are. For example, getting a student ready for Grade 5 math is ridiculous. [The teacher] should be thinking, "What is it that I want these kids to learn and how can I bring them to that point?" I guess what I'm really saying is: Grade 5 teachers are not matching Grade 5 math, but they are teaching math to Grade 5 students. The teacher has to decide who those students are and where they are in terms of mathematics.

THE CHALLENGES AND REWARDS

The job of an M&R teacher is challenging in many ways. first and foremost, M&R teachers feel they never have enough time to do everything that needs to be done. Program planning, materials preparation and completing the paperwork associated with IEPs and other documents interferes with their ability to get into classrooms to observe and monitor student progress. M&R teachers recognize that they should spend several hours at a time in the classroom but usually only find time to observe for ten minutes to a half hour. As a result, most methods and resource teachers depend to a great extent on the reports of teachers and feedback from teacher's aides.

Methods and resource teachers suggest that there are serious problems with classroom teachers expecting too much of their students with disabilities. M&R teachers must work very hard to see that teachers have realistic expectations and that students don't experience frustration and failure.

While teachers' expectations tend to be too high, parents of students who have spent a number of years in segregated settings often need encouragement to have higher expectations for their children. M&R teachers report that the parents seem reluctant to take risks with their child's placement, putting tight limits on program alternatives. When there is a great gap between the M&R teacher's judgement and the expectations of the classroom teachers and parents, development of an appropriate instructional program becomm very difficult.

It is also difficult to establish integrated programs for students with disabilities when teaching methods over-emphasize content and put little emphasis on individual and group activity, particularly at junior and senior high levels:

There's not much of an emphasis on concrete learning. Instead there's an emphasis on sitting at the desk in rows and listening to the teacher, taking the notes, being able to regurgitate the information. Teachers are getting these kids ready for college or for technical school and don't have time for anybody else. Project work is limited. Teachers don't like to vary from the curriculum. They don't like to see another way. They're not looking at what the student needs at this particular time I find it difficult to get teachers to understand.

The Challenge of Working with Teachers

The constant search for effective ways to work with regular classroom teachers is one of the major challenges identified by methods and resource teachers. One M&R teacher explains that classroom teachers have “different personalities, different knowledge and experience.” They tend to practice their profession in isolation, developing their own approaches to instruction for students with special needs. The M&R teacher must find ways to work as an effective collaborator and problem-solver with each individual teacher. Classroom teachers must be specific about both the kind of help and level of support they expect from the M&R teacher. They must also provide the M&R teacher with feedback on the usefulness of strategies being used. Open communication is necessary if the relationship is to work:

The most difficult part is working with my peers: doing the battles; trying to communicate with them; trying to make them feel secure and give them confidence that they can do what they think they should do. They often know what to do, but just don't think they can.

Teachers who lack confidence in their ability to meet the needs of students with disabilities are reluctant to take risks. They don't want to be responsible for a lack of success on the part of the student. As a consequence, many teachers resist trying something new unless they are assured that it will be successful. This causes a lack of opportunity for the student:

Teachers who haven't been exposed to [special needs] students think that everything they do should be successful. They don't realize that at times they have to learn from mistakes and they can't always be certain that things will turn out the way they want.

Methods and resource teachers frequently feel frustrated by the difference between what they know is possible in classroom instruction and what actually occurs. They are

sometimes caught in an ethical dilemma when they become aware of classroom practices that may be detrimental to individual students:

The methods and resource teacher is not in a position of authority. We are trained in strategies for teaching students at different levels in the classroom. But we don't actually have any authority to tell teachers, "This is what you must do." We can't mandate change. We can only suggest.

[Teachers] will say, "that's a good idea", but unless you're right there, checking all the time, you can't count on them doing it. I think things just fall by the wayside and if you're dealing with a number of different students and a number of different teachers, it's very easy to lose track. I find that frustrating. You are privy to a lot of information you have to control over. You're responsible for the kids; you know where the problem is; but you can't do an awful lot.

Adjustments to the Role

When asked to compare being a methods and resource teacher with regular class teaching, most remarked that the biggest difference is that they now work more with adults, and their involvement with students is indirect. To some, this makes the job very different but others still see it as teaching but redirected to adults. Another difference that teachers identify is the much less structured work day they have as M&R teachers. Some consider the job more demanding and stressful than regular teaching. They feel a lot more pressure from a variety of people as they try to meet all their responsibilities:

My day is more varied. It's a lot more hectic. I deal with a lot more people than I used to. I'm concerned that I'm performing up to snuff much more than in the regular classroom.

You're much more accountable for what you're doing. I like that. I like working under pressure, so I like the feeling of being more accountable. Nobody ever checked to see what I was doing in the regular class, at least in the first few years. I had two or three years to learn the ropes before anybody started checking, so I never really felt that pressure. In this job I'm just new at it, and I feel I'm much more accountable for what I'm doing. People are checking more often because you're dealing with more people.

Finally, those interviewed said they see students differently as a methods and resource teacher. Instead of seeing students as a group, they see students much more as individuals. Several of the teachers said if they returned to regular class teaching they would be more sensitive to individual differences.

A number of the M&R teachers said they miss the direct contact and special

relationships they had with students as classroom teachers.

Changing Attitudes in Schools Towards Integration

Integration is for everyone. For a while I wondered whether it was really going to work for a few, but now I realize it is for everyone. It might not be using the same methods or it might not be for the same time limits, but you have to be open to that. You have to look at the student as an individual. All students have a right schooling and having people be positive — mind you there are a lot of problems. With anything new there are going to be problems — but we're conquering them one at a time. It's great to see it working. I had doubts when I first started.

While this teacher has a very positive and optimistic view towards the integration of students with disabilities, many teachers in districts 28 and 29 don't share her enthusiasm. M&R teachers report that most teachers have accepted that integration is going to take place and that it is probably in the child's best interest. Many are apprehensive about what they are expected to do with the student with special needs. Some teachers are concerned that through classroom integration, the student will miss the benefits of more individualized instruction. One M&R teacher with experience teaching a segregated class suggested that teachers "don't understand that what you do in a one-to-one situation is basically what would take place in the regular classroom." Some teachers continue to nurture the idea that the movement towards integration might end:

There are still people saying it's a cycle ... that we're going to do away with all this integration. I don't think it's a cycle. I think that things are evolving. It may be true that next year we'll do things a little differently, but we will be improving on what we're doing now. We're never really going to segregate those children and go back to the system we had before. I think parents are too aware of the situation to let it go back.

It's not surprising that teachers are reported to be more apprehensive about students with severe disabilities than those with mild or moderate disabilities. The development of positive attitudes toward all students, irrespective of disability, should be a universal goal.

Methods and resource teachers are convinced that teachers need direct experience with integration in order for attitudes to change. They need to get to know the student and directly experience the benefits the student gets from integrated education:

One teacher who has a special needs student was really nervous and very uptight. Since it was his first year [with a student with challenging needs in his class] he depended on me almost one hundred per cent during the months of September and into October. But now he's enjoying this student. He comes to me probably two or three times a week to ask a question, but he's taken the student as one of his own and has done a lot more than I had even hoped. Experience does make a difference. They have to have a year under their belts before some of the fear is alleviated.

The acceptance of integration grows with experience, but it doesn't eliminate teachers' concerns about a number of very practical matters. One M&R teacher pointed out that teachers become more anxious and concerned about integration as classes increase in size. Teachers are also concerned about having students with severe behaviour problems in their classes. This includes students who are physically aggressive towards other students or the teacher and those who are selfabusive.

They express concern about the effect students with distracting or disrupting behaviours have on other students and their ability to pay attention and benefit from instruction. Again, however, direct experience seems to be the key to a fear of the unknown. Once the teacher gets to know the student and begins to experience the success of integration, attitudes begin to change.

One of the M&R teachers noted an interesting ambiguity between the way some teachers talk about integration and the way they act. She suggests that while some teachers still say they are opposed to it, their actions aren't consistent with their words:

Even though you hear them saying things against [integration], their actions don't support what they're saying. I think people are still afraid of saying in front of their peers, "Well, maybe it's not such a bad thing." They've been saying that it's so terrible for years and they can't lose face and say that may be their attitude has changed. There seems to be a thing about it that once you select a side you have to stay with that side.

The attitudes of teachers in districts 28 and 29 have been changing for the positive. One M&R teacher surveyed the opinions of teachers in her school about integration. She reported that twenty-four of the thirty teachers responded and only two of the twenty-four teachers indicated they did not think that students should be integrated. Although a few continued to have negative attitudes about the integration process, twelve of the twenty-four said that their attitudes had changed and nine of the twelve reported that their attitudes were more positive.

Sources of Personal Satisfaction

There was a time when I distrusted regular education. I would never have allowed a child who had special needs to go into a regular school system because I thought it would kill them. But after seeing that it could work and being part of it and seeing the change in the children, naturally I had to change my attitude. I always believed in individualized education, but I wasn't sure that it was possible in the school system. But now I can see — I mean it stares me in the face everyday — that schools can change, that teacher practice can change.

This attitude is not unique. Many educators, are sceptical of the capacity of regular school programs to accept and provide for special needs students.

However, a new and optimistic view is not unique either. Most of the methods and resource teachers feel very positive. They feel that integration is working and that their role in support of regular class teachers is an important element in making it work.

The rewards they receive are quite different than those experienced in the regular classroom. M&R teachers get satisfaction from facilitating the success of others. They have to enjoy being advocates for students and their families. They have to be challenged by the help they provide to teachers to find alternate strategies for students:

I've had a lot of satisfaction from seeing the improvements in students, when in September, I thought, "What are we going to do with this child?" [I've had satisfaction from] seeing integration work, and the support of staff and administration and students. We've had so many students who have taken it upon themselves to make it work.

[I enjoy] seeing the results! When you actually see a student progressing you feel good about it because chances are that progress would not have taken place unless there had been intervention of some kind and that's when you feel good.

When you watch a student with special needs with friends around, going on her own to the cafeteria, you feel good.

I think the biggest thing that we've done, other than integration, is to make teachers aware of the fact that all children are not learning at grade level, and that they have to teach them at their level and have them meet with success at that level. A lot of children are having their needs met, [who] before would have just been pushed along or ignored. Teachers are addressing the whole situation differently.

What we're really talking about is just good teaching practice anyway. We're not really saying anything new to teachers. It's just making them re-think and look at what they've been doing all along. I think there's a tendency now for teachers to see every child as an individual rather than have a mass of thirty kids. I think in a few years teachers won't be as reluctant to have multi-level instruction in the classroom as now. Everybody doesn't have to be learning the same material at the same time.

CONCLUSION

It is clear that the recruitment and selection of appropriate candidates is essential for the M&R teacher concept to work. Special education training would be a benefit, but regular classroom teaching experience is an essential prerequisite. Teachers with successful teaching experience bring a background and measure of credibility to the position that can't be taught. Ongoing training is necessary and teachers who have the potential should be recruited and encouraged to switch to the M&R teacher role.

It should be accepted that not everyone who tries the position will find the job suitable. Some teachers find it difficult to switch to a collaborative consultant role. Others will find they miss the security of regular teaching assignment and want to return to it. A reasonable amount of turnover should be welcomed and can prove beneficial by bringing new people with new ideas into the position. Experience shows that those who leave the position return to the classroom with improved skills and an enhanced perspective on meeting student's individual needs.

Teachers and principals in districts 28 and 29 indicated that they needed more training and experience to understand the M&R teacher role. This is essential if M&R teachers are to play their part in the process of inclusion. For the program to work well teachers need to gain an understanding of the value of school integration and their responsibility in carrying it out. Direct experience with a student with a disability appears to be a critical part of this process. Successful experiences must be shared and the idea that integration is a fad or a cycle needs to be put to rest.

M&R teachers identified a number of strategies they have found effective in working

with regular class teachers. It will be important to share that information and develop additional approaches. Many principals also need to be more involved in the program. Their participation, understanding and support is critical. It's clear that when principals take an interest and show leadership they can give the program the credibility it takes to be successful.

It is important to consider the classroom practices that facilitate the inclusion of students with disabilities. Instructional practices need to change. The reliance on teacher-directed instruction and mastery of content does not encourage participation by students with disabilities and it is questionable how much it benefits other students. Progressive teaching methods like multi-level instruction, cooperative learning, peer-tutoring, project work and activity-based learning need to be promoted.

Special educators need to ensure that the general effort to improve instruction includes factors relevant to students with special needs.

It will be necessary to advocate for sufficient resources to carry out an inclusionary program. Class size has a definite effect on the ability of teachers to meaningfully integrate students with special needs. A class with twenty-five students including one with special needs is much more manageable than one with thirty-four students. Ongoing training is required for both regular teachers and M&R teachers. A sufficient number of M&R teachers need to be provided as well as teacher's aids and other consulting professionals. Integration is not a way to reduce the cost of special education. It is a way to enrich the quality of education for *all* students.

Finally, it's important that those responsible for the program resist being dogmatic or defensive. They need to be open and receptive to constructive suggestions to improve both the policy and practice of the model. New ideas need to be incorporated into the plan as it goes along. The opinions of those participating must be respected, and flexible responses developed to deal with new situations. Integration must be seen as consistent with providing better education to all students.

TIME-USE BY METHODS AND RESOURCE TEACHERS

On several occasions we have had M&R teachers track their use of time to provide an objective look at their activities. This makes it possible to monitor the degree to which day-to-day practice corresponds to the theoretical model for their role. The most recent survey was completed in January 1990 during the fourth full year of an integrated school setting.

Twenty-five methods and resource teachers completed a time-use log for two consecutive teaching days. They recorded the major activities they were engaged in during fifteen-minute time segments throughout the work day. Four major categories of activity emerged: 1) collaborative consultation; 2) teacher support; 3) instruction; and 4) other ([see chart A1](#)) .

The category that took up the major portion of time — 32.5 per cent — was collaborative consultation. This involves collaborating with teachers, teacher's aides, other M&R teachers, parents, the principal and consulting professionals such as psychologists. Time spent monitoring in-class activities was also considered a collaborative function.

The second major area is teacher support activities. This category included areas like referral and assessment, planning, IEP development and the preparation of materials for instruction. These activities took 24.7 per cent of the M&R teachers time.

A third category, instruction-related tasks, totalled 27.9 per cent of the time. This area was made up of three distinct activities: 1) occasions when the M&R teacher provided direct instruction to the whole class so the regular teacher could work with the individual student or do program development for a student; 2) individual or small group instruction in the regular classroom in partnership with the regular teacher; and 3) pull-out instruction in the resource room.

The fourth and final category of activity included all the other activities teachers engage in such as professional development, meeting with students or student groups, school duty, and a variety of other activities. This area accounted for 14.9 per cent of the M&R teachers time.


Charts [\[A2\]](#), [\[A3\]](#), [\[A4\]](#) and [\[A5\]](#) detail the use of time in each area. Most of the time M&R teachers are actively engaged in collaborative and supportive activities with other staff members, students and parents.

It is interesting to note that only about 13 per cent of the M&R teachers' time was devoted to pull-out instruction. Special education teachers have substantially changed the way they use their time over the past five years. As resource teachers and special class teachers, they were providing direct instruction in a segregated classroom or to a small group on a pull-out basis.

There was an emphasis on special education teachers replacing regular classroom teachers as the instructors of special needs children. In their new capacity as M&R teachers, they spend a majority of their time consulting with and helping teachers rather than replacing them.

Time-Use Survey A1


A1: Major Activities of Methods and Resource Teachers



All M&R Teachers

TIME-USE SURVEY A2


A2: Collaboration



Combined M&R Teachers

TIME-USE SURVEY A3


A3: Instruction



Combined M&R Teachers

TIME-USE SURVEY A4


A4: Teacher Support



Combined M&R Teachers

TIME-USE SURVEY A5

A5: Other Activities



NOTES ON THE STUDY

In January 1988, interviews were held with thirteen teachers who have worked as methods and resource teachers in New Brunswick school districts 28 and 29. Two of the thirteen were working in other capacities during the 1987-88 school year and reflected on their previous experiences. The interviews were held in the school where the teachers are on staff, and lasted from forty-five to ninety minutes. The interviews were taped and the resulting transcripts provided the information base for the study.

The study was based on qualitative research methods and utilised an inductive approach. The interviews were openended and the teachers were free to take the discussion where they wished. However, the focus of the interview was on their work as methods and resource teachers.

Ten of the teachers completed a time-use log over two work days in the weeks following the interview. They recorded their major activities for each fifteen-minute time period while they were at school. These were used for analysis of their actual work activities.

The information from the interviews and the time-use logs was used to generate the research findings. Time-use logs were also completed by all methods and resource teachers in 1989 and 1990. The results for 1990 are reported in the charts A1 to A5. The analysis and synthesis involved extensive sorting and organizing of the data to

generate the themes that are described. The findings are firmly “grounded” in the recorded views of the methods and resource teachers.

JOB DESCRIPTION FOR METHODS AND RESOURCE TEACHER

GENERAL

Methods and resource teachers consult and collaborate with teachers, parents, and other personnel and/or agencies to assure student success in learning. Their job responsibilities include collaboration, liaison, program development, monitoring, and professional development.

SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES IN EACH AREA

A. Collaboration with school and district staff, parents, students, and outside agencies:

1. Provide support for personnel involved in meeting student needs.
2. Develop and evaluate individual programs.
3. Handle student referrals.
4. Support the need for a collaborative, problem-solving approach in handling school concerns.
5. Organize problem-solving teams to handle challenging situations.
6. Obtain needed information/strategies for working with students with very challenging needs.

B. Liaison with school and district staff, parents, and outside agencies:

1. Coordinate case conferences.
2. Coordinate the transfer of student information during periods of transition. (i.e., grade to grade, school to school).
3. Request the assistance of specialists and agencies as required.

C. Program Development

1. Assess program needs of students referred.
2. Gather and consolidate background information on student achievement and behaviour and determine where further diagnostic assessment is required.
3. Administer and interpret academic tests needed to establish appropriate instructional programs.

4. Assist teachers in the inclusion of assessment recommendations in IEPs or adjusted program.
5. Assist teachers in adapting regular programs and instructional procedures to meet student needs.
6. Assist teachers in utilizing strategies that promote the inclusion of all students (i.e., multi-level instruction, cooperative learning).
7. Assist teachers in documenting adjustments in programs for students with special needs.
8. Assist teachers/guidance counsellors in establishing and implementing behavioural programs in cooperation with the school principal and school psychometrist.
9. Provide assistance in the classroom as required when implementing new instructional strategies.
10. Provide individual and small-group instruction on an ongoing basis for compelling reasons necessary to meet student's instructional needs.

D. Monitoring:

1. Implement strategies agreed upon through case conferences, consultations, or problem-solving sessions.
2. Monitor the effectiveness of individual programs.
3. Monitor the coordination of support personnel involved in individual cases.
4. Monitor the need for and use of resource room materials.
5. Monitor teacher assistant timetables and student schedules.
6. Monitor the school process for identifying and meeting the needs for "at-risk" students.

E. Professional Development:

1. Attend professional conferences, workshops, and in-service training sessions within and outside the district.
2. Promote personal growth by conducting or participating in the presentation of school and district professional development sessions.
3. Set personal goals.
4. Keep informed on current issues of relevance to the role.
5. Participate in research projects within the system.

REFERENCES

Forest, M. (1984). Education update: Wellington County Separate School Board at work. *Mental Retardation*, 34(3), pp.35-39.

Porter, G.L. (1986, November). School integration: Districts 28 and 29. In *Education New Brunswick*. Fredericton, N.B.: New Brunswick Department of Education, pp. 6-7.

Chapter 9

Leading the Way: The Role of School Administrators in Integration

by Darlene E. Perner

A new era for integrating exceptional students began in August 1986 when an innovative education law came into effect in New Brunswick, Canada. It was introduced as Bill 85. Part of the legislation requires the integration of exceptional students. As stated in the *Working Guidelines on Integration*:

School boards are instructed to place exceptional pupils in regular classrooms with non-exceptional pupils unless such placement proves detrimental to the needs of the child or other children. Whereas formerly a case had to be made to include an exceptional pupil in a regular class, this section of the legislation requires that a case must be made to remove a child from a regular class.

— *New Brunswick Department of Education, 1988*

THE LEGAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF INTEGRATION

Since 1986 and the passage of Bill 85, many school districts in New Brunswick have integrated exceptional students in regular classrooms. However, integration was in effect for a number of years in New Brunswick prior to Bill 85 and, as a result, teachers and principals developed ways to implement integration and make it successful for their own situations. They drew on various sources of expertise including workshops, books, articles, visitations, courses, sharing sessions, and practical experiences. Even before Bill 85, professional development in integration ranged from visitations outside of New Brunswick to individual consultations with teachers and administrators.

In 1986 and 1988, a series of regional workshops on integration were sponsored by the New Brunswick Department of Education. The series consisted of three workshops in 1986, attended by 104 classroom teachers, methods and resource teachers (see Chapter 8) and school and district administrators; and four workshops in 1988 with 170 educators in attendance. The main purposes of these workshops were: 1) to provide training to teachers; 2) to share experiences; and 3) to problem-solve.

Following the second series of regional workshops, a provincial meeting on integration was held in March 1988. It was attended by fifty-five classroom teachers, methods and resource teachers and school administrators from across the province. The participants were selected for their experience in the integration process; they could

provide useful information to other educators working towards integration. At this meeting the teachers and administrators shared their experiences, discussed their needs and concerns, and helped one another to solve specific problems.

At both the meeting and the workshops, people were asked what had been particularly helpful to them in making integration work. In addition, similar information was obtained from school administrators at a meeting of three districts held in April 1990. The feedback has become useful as strategies and recommendations for successful integration.

Without a doubt, the school principal is one of the key persons in successful integration. Educators who were asked for feedback said they realized the importance of a positive school environment in making integration work. They gave valuable recommendations for school administrators involved in the integration process.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Make a Commitment

Because the principal is seen as the leader of the school, it is imperative that the commitment to integration be reflected in the school administrator's behaviour. Principals who were interviewed about integration by the California Research Institute (1989) said, "... building leadership (is) characterized by ... unwavering commitment."

In New Brunswick, educators have indicated that the most progressive schools are the ones with school administrators who have a commitment to integration. One group of teachers stated, "The success of integration in these schools is based on school administrators who planned, promoted, implemented and rewarded."

Overcome Fears and Prejudices

For some school administrators, making a commitment to integration meant overcoming fears and prejudices, and changing attitudes about students who have special needs.

In order to better understand integration, it may be helpful for administrators to spend time talking to parents, other principals, teachers, and friends who have had experiences with exceptional students and who can help to allay fears. Observing and meeting these students may help school administrators to feel more comfortable and to know what to expect in different situations.

In addition to changing their own attitudes, school administrators are responsible for helping their staff to overcome

They can do this by arranging for teachers to visit classes where students are

successfully integrated, to read articles and books, to view videos on integration, and to talk to students, parents, principals and teachers who have had experience with the integration process.

One administrator said he finally understood what integration was all about after reading Don Little's article, *A Crime Against Childhood — Uniform Curriculum at a Uniform Rate: Mainstreaming Re-Examined and Redefined* (1985). A teacher said that after he saw CBC's *The Journal* documentary, *Different but Equal*, he had a better understanding of parents' reasons for wanting integration. He indicated that he had been affected by this news story and felt more motivated to make integration work. Even when school administrators had no opportunity to personally prepare for integration, they said they and their staff were still able to make a commitment. As one principal said, "Even before our school district developed their integration policies and practices, I knew it was the right thing to do and my staff supported me." Similarly, another educator stated, "For me, it meant just saying to myself and others, 'I'm going to try this and do my best!'"

Initiate Integration

The educators involved in the provincial workshop could not agree on how school administrators should first involve all their staff in the integration process. Some principals thought that at first they should allow their staff to volunteer to integrate an exceptional student into their classroom. Then other teachers would have many opportunities for sharing, observing and in-service training, and would become involved naturally. They felt this process would allay initial teacher fears.

Other principals thought that all teachers on staff should be responsible for integrating students with special needs right from the beginning.

Students would automatically be placed in their age-appropriate class and, through direct experience and training, the teachers would become less fearful and would change their attitudes.

For the most part, teachers felt that actually having an exceptional student integrated in their class had changed their attitudes and provided new learning experiences. As one teacher described it, "Integration is in-service, ongoing learning from the exceptional child" Another teacher stated, "Integration is a catalyst for other things; now I look at working with other kids, like gifted and many others who are out of the mainstream in my class."

There was agreement, however, that to ensure the full benefits of an integrated program, the school administrator should be responsible for providing support to the teacher. Initially this support might include release time for the teacher to plan, consult and attend in-service training, and provisions for helping the teacher directly in the classroom through a methods and resource teacher, a teacher assistant, and

student and parent volunteers.

Teachers with experience in integration wanted their colleagues to try an integrated classroom and know that it was acceptable to make mistakes. Many teachers felt that they learned through experience because their principals had allowed them to try different ways of integrating students.

Allow for Transitional Planning

Planning the student's transition from separate to integrated settings was seen as an important strategy in the integration process. Planning should begin before an exceptional student enters school or at the end of the previous school year. Principal support and involvement help make transitional planning run more smoothly and effectively.

Release time should be arranged so teachers receiving an integrated student have adequate time to observe, meet with the parents and current teachers, and prepare for the student.

Similarly, the current teachers need time to prepare the receiving teachers. This may include observing the receiving teacher in the classroom environment, meeting with him or her and following up on observations and meetings once the student has been in the receiving teacher's class.

This planning often becomes more crucial when a student is entering a new school such as junior or senior high. The principals between the schools need to facilitate scheduling times for these observations and meetings.

Enhance Teacher Expectations and Attitudes

In some cases, teachers said they needed to raise their expectations and enhance their attitudes toward their exceptional students. This appeared to be particularly true for teachers of high school students. In other cases, classroom teachers had expectations that were too high, and consequently became frustrated because their exceptional students were unable to perform like the other students.

When exceptional students do not perform at an expected level, the teachers often feel they are not doing enough for them. To help alleviate confusion and develop realistic expectations, teachers need to be involved right from the beginning. Administrators should ensure that all classroom teachers are involved in the initial planning sessions for integrating exceptional students. Even though at the high school level this would involve many teachers, it would help all teachers to know in advance what is expected of them and their students. The initial meeting helps prevent teachers and students from becoming overwhelmed and frustrated by vague and unclear expectations and goals. Once the student is in the regular classroom, it may be helpful for the principal, the classroom teacher, and the methods and resource teacher to collaborate in

answering the following questions:

1. Why is the student in the regular class?
2. What will be expected of the student?
3. What will be expected of each teacher?

One teacher summed it up: “It was helpful this year when I was told by others that it was alright to have different expectations for my special needs students. Then I finally felt the pressure was off.”

Prepare All Teachers

Many principals and teachers indicated that, in retrospect, it was the special education teacher who had the most difficulty changing roles to accommodate integration. The special education teacher in one school needed to “let go” of the special education students and the self-contained classroom. One teacher, who had an exceptional student in her special education class for eleven years, said she “needed preparation and time to learn how to ‘let go’ and to trust other educators with her exceptional students.” There was an obvious need for support in overcoming these apprehensions and it was recommended that the principal be responsible for preparing school staff including the special education teacher.

One of the most effective and beneficial ways to prepare staff is by providing school-based training, which can be used to assess and address the needs of individual teachers. It is also helpful to have articles, books and video tapes available for staff to read and view. Sharing, problem-solving sessions, and school and class visitations were also identified as useful means to teach about integration and inclusion.

Expand Resources

The educators recommended that the use of school resources be expanded when integrating exceptional students and that school administrators be flexible and creative in using school resources. For example, a teacher who uses cooperative learning strategies may lend a hand in integration along with the methods and resource teacher.

When integration is being initiated, a student may be placed in a Grade 8 class instead of a Grade 7 class because of particular Grade 8 students who may be more supportive and helpful in including the student with special needs. Initially, a teacher who is active in extracurricular activities may feel more comfortable being responsible for including the student with special needs in extracurricular activities rather than in classroom activities.

Use and Enhance Support Services

The teachers felt that school administrators should advocate at the school board level for support personnel such as a methods and resource teachers and para-professionals. They also indicated that the principal should organize in-school support such as volunteer programs, peer support groups and resource centres.

Once principals have established a variety of support structures within their schools, teachers may be more willing to accept assistance from other staff, using in-school services more readily. Initially, many teachers felt challenged by the experience of integration, assuming it was totally up to them to make integration successful. They hesitated to ask for help and often the school administrators and other staff members were not sure how to help their colleagues. Over time and with the establishment of additional school resources, these teachers realized they didn't have to do it alone, and there were other people available to help them solve problems.

Teachers identified their principal most frequently as the person to listen to them and occasionally teach their class to give them an extra period for planning. The methods and resource teacher was also identified as a source of this assistance, as well as an aid in adapting curriculum and providing additional resource materials. Once classroom teachers realized that the principal was working to provide additional supports for them, they were more likely to ask for help and less inclined to feel like failures because they *did* ask for that help.

Provide Time for Visitations and Observations

Most educators felt that the school administrators should facilitate staff visits to observe classes of teachers who have experience in integrating exceptional students. The educators also indicated that it was important for the school administrators to advocate at the district level for teacher visitations. In addition, the principals should arrange the visitations and be in direct contact with other principals.

Teachers said they gained a great deal of knowledge from these visits. They also felt rewarded by their principal when they were given the opportunity to visit on a school day and learn from their colleagues.

One case involved two students with severe disabilities who were being educated in a segregated class. The staff considered them to be too severely handicapped to be integrated into regular classes. The principal wanted to have these students participate in the regular class but knew his staff needed assurance that this was possible and beneficial. He contacted a principal in another school district where a student with similar needs was integrated in a Grade 6 class. Arrangements were made for two teachers to visit this school. By visiting the Grade 6 class and meeting with the principal, classroom teacher, and methods and resource teacher, the two visiting teachers were able to see the possibilities for integration in their school. Upon their return, the information gleaned from their visitation helped the principal and the

teachers to initiate the integration process for their two students.

Provide Scheduled Preparation Time

The methods and resource and classroom teachers were supportive of principals who planned for and scheduled additional preparation time for them. This was done in a variety of ways. For example, one principal developed an extensive integration plan and presented it as a school project. She requested additional supply teacher days for her staff so that the classroom and methods and resource teachers could meet on a regular basis during the school day for planning and preparing adaptive lessons and materials.

In another school, the principal first scheduled the integrated teachers for physical education, art and music classes, and at the times they wanted. One teacher in this school chose to have her art, music and physical education back-to-back so she could have at least one long, uninterrupted preparation period per week. Another teacher in this school requested her special classes at the end of the day so she could continue her preparation right after school.

In another school the principal allowed his staff to brainstorm for ideas on giving extra preparation time to one teacher who had an exceptional student integrated in her class. The teachers decided that their colleague would be released from lunch and recess duty. The principal also taught this teacher's class one period every two weeks in order to provide time for her to collaborate with the methods and resource teacher.

The educators described another popular strategy. The administrators and methods and resource teachers supply taught for a period while classroom teachers used the time to plan or meet with their own methods and resource teacher.

Meet with Teachers

Many teachers, both regular class, and methods and resource, agreed that they felt well supported by principals who were available to meet with them either on a regular basis or at their request. The teachers mainly needed their principals to listen to them in an open-minded way, be a sounding board for innovative ideas, support them and reward them.

Share Experiences and Problem Solve

Throughout the process of integration, sessions for sharing both successful and unsuccessful experiences and for problem solving have helped educators to make changes and experience the benefits of integration. Sharing successful experiences may help to allay the fears of teachers and school administrators who are new to integration.

Common concerns and unsuccessful situations may be discussed and analyzed so that

solutions can be found.

Principals should be responsible for providing a means for teachers to share with each other. In some schools this was done informally at regularly scheduled pot-luck breakfasts or lunches, and formally at staff meetings. In fact, one principal typed all school announcements in a flyer and the teachers were responsible for reading these before a staff meeting. Questions about the announcements were answered at the staff meeting but reading them in advance gave the staff more time to share integration experiences and to problem solve.

Establish School-Based Teams

One of the most beneficial aspects of integration is how it encourages and allows school staff to problem solve collaboratively. In the past, teachers were often left alone to solve problems that occurred in their classroom. With the onset of integration, however, opportunities were established for school staff to meet and develop a diversity of solutions to problems. These problem-solving sessions or team meetings provide teachers and school administrators with the opportunity to pick and choose solutions, and implement ones that best meet their own needs.

While school-based problem-solving teams (see [Chapter 12](#)) are a structured means for teachers and school administrators to share and problem solve, teachers also collaborate informally. One district found that sharing and problem-solving sessions did not have to be structured but occurred naturally at lunch and recess breaks or even outside of school.

Teacher assistant teams (Chalfant, Pysh and Moultrie, 1979) and other types of school-based planning teams (Thousand, Fox, Reid, Godek and Williams, 1986) were recommended many times as helpful models for teachers involved in integration. It was agreed that the team's function varied depending on the needs of school and staff.

Most often team members have helped to solve particular difficulties that arise in the classroom environment. At other times the team members have helped teachers prepare for integrating exceptional students or have assisted in establishing a student's individual educational plan. Some administrators stressed that during the formative years, the principal should act as chairperson of the teacher assistant team (TAT). Once the TAT is running smoothly, the principal should remain on the team but not necessarily as chairperson. Many school administrators indicated that they had included as team members teachers who had not been accepting of the integration process. They often found that participation in the team process helped change these teachers' attitudes and behaviour.

Another factor emphasized by school administrators who had established TATs in their schools was scheduling of team meetings. It was felt that, whenever possible, team meetings should be scheduled during the school day rather than before or after school.

There was also agreement that reasonable time limits be established and adhered to for these meetings. As one administrator stated, "People appreciate knowing that the TAT session will end on time, and usually are not opposed to staying after school if they have participated in making the decision about the meeting time."

Increase Parent Involvement

Many educators identified the parents of exceptional students as primary sources of support in the integration process. All people agreed that effective parent-teacher communication was an important component in making integration work.

In order to have a strong working relationship with parents, principals should establish procedures to allow parents to be involved in their child's educational plan. Parents should be involved in decision making and they should participate in the planning team. Parents should also be invited to visit and observe the class, especially when there is a difference between how the student is performing at school and at home.

The McGill Action Planning System (Lusthaus and Forest, 1987) is an excellent procedure for involving parents and allowing parent participation and decision making. This system has been used extensively throughout New Brunswick in planning integrated programs for students with severe disabilities. School administrators have also found the McGill Action Planning System useful in helping resolve conflicts between parents and teachers.

Increase Parent/Community Communications

The teachers and principals questioned said that school administrators should be responsible for informing parents and the community about the school's integration philosophy and policy. In some districts, brochures were developed to help inform parents about integration and student services.

There were a variety of suggestions on how to involve parents more in their children's school life. These included: an active Home and School Association; periodic newsletters; and information meetings for parents and people in the community.

It was also suggested that school administrators take the initiative and meet with parents before problems arise. For example, one principal had heard that a parent of a non-disabled student was upset about the integration process in her school. The principal immediately called that parent and said, "I've heard you have some concerns about John's placement in Mrs. Ryders class. Could we set a time to meet and discuss your concerns?" She met with the parent on the following day and listened to his concerns. She then explained the reasons for integration and had the parent observe his child's class, which included the child with special needs. By the end of the school day, the parent was satisfied and appeared to have a better understanding of integration and the school's philosophy and practices. The school administrator, by

acting immediately on a rumour, alleviated a potentially harmful situation and cleaned up misunderstandings about integration.

Support the Methods and Resource Teacher

As stated previously, both the regular class and methods and resource teachers need support from the school administrators in implementing integration. Initially, the methods and resource teacher may have to assist the regular class teacher in a variety of ways such as by providing more planning time and consultation. In order that this be carried out effectively, the principal should help with planning, organization and scheduling so that the classroom teachers can be released for specific periods.

Many principals said they have found it important to select methods and resource teachers who are able to assume some leadership and to collaborate effectively with staff and parents. Principals also tend to rely on the expertise of their methods and resource teachers. As one principal stated, however, “Even though I rely on my methods and resource teacher to provide leadership in integrating our exceptional students, I feel it is my responsibility to keep in close contact with her so that I can provide the necessary support.”

Assign Teacher Assistants

At the outset of many integration programs, teacher assistants were often assigned to individual exceptional students. As a result, the teacher assistants often took on “ownership” of the exceptional students who were assigned to them. Consequently, the classroom teachers’ role in educating these exceptional students diminished and the students became more and more isolated in the regular class.

In order to prevent this situation, the educators recommended that the teacher assistant be assigned to the teacher rather than the student. The teacher would then be responsible for making sure the teacher assistant helped the class in a variety of ways and became an integral part of the class.

Reward Successes and Promote Public Awareness

All people involved in the workshops stressed the importance of school administrators rewarding effective teachers and sharing successes with school board members, district office administrators, other educators, parents and the community. For example, some schools made short videos showing how exceptional students were integrated in their classes. Other schools, which had volunteered to initiate integration projects, allowed outside educators to visit and meet the teachers who were experienced in the process.

Many principals requested that their teachers experienced in integration be allowed to attend and make presentations at conferences and workshops. One teacher said. “I realised my year was successful when my principal asked me to share my experiences

with other teachers in the school. His request was a real compliment.”

CONCLUSION

In the past few years, more and more educators have gained experience in integrating exceptional students in regular classes. Many strategies have been developed and have helped educators initiate integration and make the process successful (Biklen, 1985; Sailor, Anderson, Halvorsen, Doering, Filler and Goetz, 1989; Stainbeck and Stainback, 1989).

In New Brunswick, workshops have been held with educators experienced in integration to identify and discuss what has helped them. Over the course of these workshops, it was found that what was effective for one educator may not have worked for another. Therefore, many strategies have been presented here and more than one may be implemented to assist staff in a particular school or school district.

REFERENCES

Biklen, D. (1985). *Achieving the complete school: Strategies for effective mainstreaming*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

California Research Institute. (1989). *What makes integration work? Strategies ... a part of the TASH Dissemination Project*, 1, p. 1.

Chalfant, J., M. Pysh and R. Moultrie. (1979). Teacher assistant teams: A model for within-building problem solving *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, 2, pp. 85-96.

Little, D.M. (1985). A crime against childhood — uniform curriculum at a uniform rate: Mainstreaming re-examined and redefined. *Canadian Journal of Special Education*, 2, pp. 91-107.

Lusthaus, E. and M. Forest. (1987). The kaleidoscope: A challenge to the cascade. In M. Forest (Ed.), *More Education Integration*. Downsview, Ont.: The G. Allan Roeher Institute. pp. 1-17.

New Brunswick Department of Education. (1988). *Working Guidelines on Integration*. Fredericton, New Brunswick: Department of Education.

Sailor, W., J. Anderson, A. Halvorsen, K. Doering, J. Filler and L. Goetz. (1989). *The Comprehensive Local School: Regular education for all students with disabilities*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Stainback W. and S. Stainback. (1989). Practical organizational strategies. In W. Stainbeck, S. Stainback and M. Forest (Eds.). *Educating all Students in the Mainstream of regular Education*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., pp. 71-87.

Thousand, J., T. Fox, R. Reid, J. Godek and W. Williams. (1986). *The Homecoming Model*:

Educating students who present intensive educational challenges within regular education environments. (Monograph No. 7-1), Burlington, VT.: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities, pp. 33-37.

Chapter 10

The Role of the Classroom Teacher

by Margaret Murray

Other than being a parent, I cannot think of a position in which a person wears as many hats as that of a teacher. Not only are the roles of the teacher numerous and varied, but a teacher must switch from one to another spontaneously, smoothly and professionally.

The inclusion of students with a mental handicap in a regular classroom does not, in my opinion, create new roles for the teacher. It does, however, require a honing of existing skills, and a reassessment of traditional practices and attitudes.

The primary role of a teacher is, as always, to teach; but integration broadens the focus to include an examination of what we are really teaching, in the general sense, and how we are teaching it. This broadening of vision is challenging, frightening and exciting, all at the same time. The combination of such strong emotional forces should jolt us out of our complacency, out of the secure niche we have made for ourselves. If all the support systems are in place and the teacher's focus is positive, teachers and students alike grow and benefit from the experience. The secondary role of the teacher, therefore, is to respond professionally to the challenge, fear, and excitement of teaching all children.

I will examine some approaches to that response. I am confident that as teachers read they will frequently say, "I am doing that in my classroom already", or at the very least, "I can do that". And administrators will feel that they have teachers on staff who fulfil the requirements capability. This is because the similarities between teaching a regular class and an integrated class far outnumber the differences.

I will examine the role of the teacher from four perspectives. The first deals with the teacher as a person and as a professional. The second addresses the teacher operating in many capacities in the classroom. The third focuses on the specific relationship between the teacher and the exceptional student in his or her class. Finally, we have a look at the highly collaborative nature of the classroom teacher-support system liaison.

THE TEACHER: PERSONALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY

Strategies in Preparation

Teaching an integrated class requires a personal as well as a professional commitment. It is not enough for the school board, the superintendent and the school administration to support the philosophy of integration. The actual success or failure of integration hinges on the classroom teacher's beliefs and practices. In fact, the strongest indicator

that integration will be successful is the degree to which the classroom teacher believes in the idea. The teacher must believe that the school is the most natural setting for students to grow and learn from each other and from educated adults.

One of the most common remarks teachers make when facing integration is that they are not ready for it. They say there is too much they do not know and they feel ill-prepared. These are real concerns and should be acknowledged.

However, it seems to be the human condition that few of us are prepared for the major challenges in life, such as marriage, parenthood, or career changes. While I think it is important to recognize the challenge of an integrated classroom, I believe it is equally important to embrace integration with optimism.

In addition, preparation does not necessarily mean textbook knowledge of various physical and mental conditions. Preparation may simply consist of studying the student's individual education program the time he or she entered the school system. It helps put things in perspective to see where the student was at the beginning of his or her education and what growth has occurred over the years. It relieves teachers from feeling that they have complete responsibility for the future success of the student and it gives teachers reassurance to see themselves as part of a team. Further preparation would involve discussions with parents to strengthen understanding of potential goals.

Avoid lists of things the student can and cannot do. They can be both discouraging to the teacher and damaging to your creative vision. Children who have a mental handicap can be handicapped by our perception of their limitations.

The most important part of preparation is to meet and get to know the child. No matter what physical or mental challenges the child presents, he or she has the same basic needs as all other students — the need for understanding and respect, the need to be listened to and appreciated, and the need to learn in his or her own style. If teachers address these needs competently, everything will fall into place.

Creative Freedom

When teaching in an integrated setting, teachers should permit themselves some creative freedom. When teachers first begin their careers, they are daring, trying new ideas, making mistakes, reveling in their successes. Unfortunately, creativity is an early casualty in many classrooms, not by design or intent but by a slow and quiet process as teachers slip into comfortable routines.

Because a child's special needs may be beyonds teacher's experience, we are forced to throw out some of our traditional methods and find innovative approaches. What we discover is that all our students benefit from this change in practice.

One year I was assigned to teach french to a class which included a blind student. Although it was a language course, the lessons included a lot of visual stimuli. In order for the blind student to participate and be involved, the language had to come alive,

which we achieved by physically acting out situations. The students loved not having to sit at their desks doing board work. The results were so much better that I used the same approach in another French class I taught which did not include anyone with special needs.

Over the years I have had students with a wide range of needs. They have opened my eyes to countless new ways of doing things. And because of this creative freedom, I have realized that the child's learning process is every bit as important as what he or she learns.

Common Objectives

For many children with special needs, the regular academic objectives are not appropriate. Programs need to be modified, with much more emphasis placed on helping students to develop into functional, contributing members of their community.

Teachers should have a vision of the desired results and avoid confining themselves to a list of objectives for a particular grade level. Everything a teacher plans for the student should fit into the vision the teacher and the parents, and, in many cases, the student have for his or her future.

Collaboration

Because teachers often view having a student with special needs as a big responsibility, it is wise to embrace the collaborative spirit. Collaboration with other school staff members is an extremely intelligent approach with far ranging benefits.

While it is true that an open-door policy is often threatening to teachers trying new strategies to meet the needs of their integrated student, it is equally true that two heads are better than one. An observer, such as another staff member, can often shed light on factors in the classroom environment which may be influencing the way a student is learning or behaving.

Integrated classroom teachers also have the right to be demanding. They should ask for release time to attend workshops or to visit classrooms or schools. They should request parent volunteers and aides. In some cases extra preparation time is allotted or smaller class sizes given to teachers who work in an integrated classroom. Administration should be made aware that teachers need their support in the way of special resources and additional support people.

The strategies outlined above are practised in classroom every day. They are not particular to an integrated classroom but are found wherever students and teachers enjoy learning together.

THE TEACHER AND THE CLASSROOM

It has always been a characteristic of education that there has never been enough time to get everything done. Today, even with advanced technology surrounding us, it seems

that more and more activities are cutting into our precious minutes. Each child needs time with the teacher, and teachers make conscious efforts to interact with each student every day. But we never feel that we have spent enough time with each student.

This feeling only increases when the class includes a child with special needs. Because of their needs, they generally require even more one-on-one attention.

Strategies for One-on-One Attention

The following strategies call on various resources and tactics to enable the teacher to focus more time on each student.

The first resource is the para-professionals in the education system: teacher's aides, assistants, and trained volunteers. The teacher can ask this other adult to handle the class, which may be working on an assignment prepared by the teacher, while the teacher works with an individual student. Or the teacher may ask the aide to work with the individual student on a task again prepared by the teacher.

The second source of help is the children themselves. It is a wise teacher who realizes he or she is not the only instructor in the classroom. Peer tutoring is a growing practice not only within a class but across grade levels as well. One of the wonderful things about children is that they do not see the limitations of other children. They are compassionate and passionate at the same time. The most unmotivated student turns into a zealot when asked to help another student. A word of caution: monitor the tutoring so that the time spent is meaningful to both parties.

Another strategy is to design activities for the whole class which free the teacher for short blocks of time to work with an individual student. Again, the activity should be worthwhile for students, but one which requires only minimal interaction with the teacher.

A fourth strategy is parental support. It is important to choose parents who have a strong commitment to their involvement. Working with small groups in the classroom, a parent can add a warm and caring touch that all children enjoy and many children need.

Creating a Community Atmosphere

To work well, a class has to be a cohesive unit which pulls together for the benefit of all students. It is the teacher's responsibility to promote a feeling of community and an appreciation of the differences which make up that community.

This is an increasingly challenging role as children from different backgrounds are brought together.

Sometimes, the teacher is forced to become a social coordinator, creating a cooperative rather than a competitive environment by designing activities, both academic and

social, which support cooperative values. Since social development is critical to successful functioning within a community, the teacher's role as coordinator is important to all students in the class. Individual children are not lost in the cooperative structure; instead, they are shown that they each have something to offer which is of equal value to everyone else's contribution.

In a classroom which includes a child with a mental handicap, the teacher includes this child in most activities and quietly encourages interaction without drawing special attention to it. The other children soon assume responsibility for any extra needs the child might have. It has been my experience that they develop strong bonds with the child and may need only to be cautioned against doing too much for him or her.

Monitoring the social development of all students provides teachers with opportunities to assess the growth and maturing of individual students.

Motivation

In a classroom where teachers need time to work closely with children with special needs, the teachers need to be motivators. They must encourage students to do their best, think problems through and develop self-discipline. This develops independence and permits the teacher to have quality time with an individual student without having to continually break away to quiet or direct the other students.

From my observation, smoothly running classrooms have teachers who are motivators. They have regular discussions with their students on the benefits of sharing ideas, on problem solving techniques, and on responsibility. These discussions are ongoing and are rarely reactive in nature.

Often in these classrooms there is greater freedom of movement and a mutually agreed upon noise level.

Part of providing motivation includes designing activities which children find interesting and challenging. As in any classroom, this requires activities covering a wide range of abilities. Cooperative activities and learning centres lend themselves well to multi-level lesson plans ([see Chapter 11](#)).

The physical layout of the classroom can also be structured to promote independence. All materials are organized and visible. Instructions for centres and activities are posted. Specific places for completed assignments are established, as are procedures for leaving the classroom, late arrivals, and free time. At all times, students know what they are supposed to be doing. While the teacher is responsible for designing, initiating and monitoring all activities, everyone benefits as students become more independent.

Providing Role Models

Probably one of the most important roles a teacher can play in an integrated classroom is that of a model for his or her students. The teacher should treat every member of the class with equal respect and show that he or she values every student, including the

special needs child.

This approach may feel unnatural, however, as teachers are in the business of teaching, and are in the habit of constantly rewarding those who learn well. It is understandable to have more respect for successful students and to pay more attention to their ideas. In an integrated setting, however, these teacher distinctions can be detrimental. Less successful students will find someone who they consider to be worse off than themselves to bear the brunt of their frustration — and that may well be the student with a mental handicap. As mentioned earlier, a sense of community is needed in the classroom, and the teacher models the way community members should treat each other.

The teacher should include all children and make no exceptions, showing that everyone is valued and accepted. At assemblies, plays, concerts or sports days, the teacher should insist that all students are included. The pupil who has a mental handicap should be included in activities in the cafeteria and library, and in fire drills or on field trips. By modelling normal interaction and promoting it in the classroom, the teacher gives students something they will carry into their adult lives in the community.

Learning Through Observation

It is now a common belief that teachers learn as much about their students through observation as through formal testing. The teacher can use keen observation in an integrated classroom to prevent problems. In a class including students with behavioural problems, the cooperative spirit will take a while to build. In any class there will be bullies and people who make fun of others. Through careful observation by the teacher, negative situations can be minimized and the teacher can develop strategies which allow everyone to be more comfortable in the classroom.

Some interactions may seem harmless in the eyes of the instigators — like teaching the child with a mental handicap to say “bad” words. But, since the long term goal is to help this child develop into a social member of a community, setbacks are not appreciated. Students must be educated to understand this. Observant teachers will also pick up on things they can work on to help the child socialize: table manners, conduct when eating, personal hygiene.

The teacher’s role in the classroom stretches well beyond the narrow limits of “instructor” to include: time manager, social coordinator, motivator, model, observer and more. Again, most teachers will have read much here that is familiar to their daily routine.

THE TEACHER AND THE STUDENT WITH A DISABILITY

Multi-Level Instruction

While each member of the class should be treated equally and given the same rights

and value, equality must not be confused with sameness. All students in the class are individual and have needs different from each other. Individualization within the class should be built in as much as possible. We must acknowledge that students do not learn at the same rate or in the same way, and we should be equally aware that one set of goals is not appropriate for all students. As logical as this sounds, it is sometimes difficult for teachers to accept.

One of the most useful strategies for the classroom teacher is to design lessons which permit multi-level participation (see Chapter 11) . This means, for example, that while some students are reading a novel, the child with a visual impairment is listening to a taped version of the novel, while other students with lower reading vocabularies have access to a modified version or a peer reader. It means that while one student prepares a written report, another prepares a report orally or with pictures.

Multi-level instruction promotes the use of questions designed to address all of Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom,1969) — levels of cognitive difficulty developed by Benjamin Bloom, a psychologist and educational theorist at the University of Chicago (see Bloom's Taxonomy) . Therefore questions will reach children at different levels of understanding. Similarly, many learning tools, including computers, calculators and recorders, are encouraged and accepted so that all children can be involved.

Life Experiences

Providing meaningful experiences is one of the most interesting aspects of teaching children with special needs. Because many of the students I have worked with have had limited understanding of their world, it is essential to create situations which bring them greater knowledge.

This may involve bringing pets to school, cooking, dressing up in costumes, working with utensils or taking nature walks. For older students, it may be visits to businesses and places outside the school.

It is important not to isolate the student from his peers during these experiences. Involve the whole class or small groups, depending on the situation. Because children learn terrific lessons from other children, minimize the teacher's role and maximize the students' during these activities.

Highlight Strengths

Teachers can also create situations which highlight the strengths of the student with a disability. Everyone has strengths; and it is interesting that children view achievement with equal admiration regardless of who is the achiever. I remember watching some young children being tutored in reading by a blind student who was reading braille. These youngsters were genuinely impressed, but not because this student could read — they expected older kids to be able to read. They were impressed because she had a special skill and could decode dots with her fingertips. That was "cool!" A child who had been labelled autistic had an uncanny mathematical memory and was

regarded with some degree of awe by his classmates. During math competitions, he was always in demand as a teammate. A student with a mental handicap was a terrific runner and during sports day he was cheered vigorously and genuinely by his classmates.

While we may design activities which will allow the strengths of our students with disabilities to shine, we must be cautious that they are not artificial. We are not trying to spotlight the child, we only want to build in activities that will allow him or her to experience success and receive the admiration of classmates. As teachers, we know the importance of building self-esteem; the link between high self-esteem and success is the same for all students.

More often than not, children will create their own moment in the sun. Unintentionally and unexpectedly, they will do something, and other students will take notice. Perhaps my favourite memory of just such a moment is of a Grade 3 French class. Every day I wrote the date in French in a sentence on the board. We would repeat it a few times and move on to something else. One student, who had been labelled autistic, usually spent five or six minutes laboriously copying the sentence into his notebook. He was never asked to, nor did any of the other children copy the sentence. It was just something that he had decided to do. This went on for several months. One day in early spring; I was late putting the date on the board because a little girl met me at the door and wanted to tell me about her birthday. I looked into the classroom to see every eye staring at the board. I was amazed to see this little boy finishing the date sentence. He had written it in French by himself, unaided. It was letter perfect. We were collectively impressed. Several students spontaneously went over to him and told him what a great job he had done. Their praise came not only because he had done it but also because they knew that they could not! After that, several children wanted to try writing the date and eventually some of them succeeded. That is the kind of situation teachers wish for regularly — where one student teaches others something worthwhile! Teachers should allow themselves the flexibility to capitalize on these moments.

Developing Independence

The teacher must also concentrate on developing independence in the child with a disability. All students need to be independent, but for a child with a disability, it is one of the most important and intensely difficult things the teacher will help that student achieve. The struggle is long and gains are often made in small steps.

Some members of my class worked with a student to help him walk home from school. He does not live far from the school but he had never walked anywhere by himself.

For several months they walked behind him, prompting him when necessary to stay on the sidewalk or to stop at the sign or keep walking. Progress was slow but they continually came closer to their goal. Another child was learning to use his wheel chair, and yet another to manoeuvre her way to various parts of the school although she is totally blind.

Other students are dedicated helpers in this fight for independence. Young children do not see disabilities in the same light that adults do. We tend to be overwhelmed by the disability and the obstacles it creates. Children just see the moment and they do whatever has to be done to fix things for that moment. Watch them interacting: directing, encouraging, helping or just plain nagging, "Will you hurry up!" Another interesting reason for including other children in efforts to reach goals is that children will do things for other children that they will do less willingly for an adult.

Teacher as Supporter

Each child with special needs who I have worked with has inadvertently defined a special role for me: the role of supporter. As classroom teachers, we need to be the supporter of our children, to be there for them, to listen to their concerns and to understand them. No one needs this more than children with disabilities. Their teachers must be available to explain to other educators their strengths, learning styles, and goals, to tell who their friends are and to suggest strategies.

The teacher does not need to be an expert or have all the answers for the child. But it should be clear that the teacher supports this child and will do whatever he or she can do to help; it should also be clear that the teacher appreciates the support of others. Interestingly enough, when we actually ask for help, we often get it.

Teachers who have integrated classrooms design lessons which include all students according to their learning styles. They include activities which will build on the strengths of their students. They strive to give their students the tools for

THE TEACHER AND THE SUPPORT SYSTEM

Methods and Resource Teachers No matter how experienced, enthusiastic or determined teachers might be, they will find their roles easier if there is someone to help. Methods and resource (M&R) teachers ([see Chapter 8](#)) are, first and foremost, experienced classroom teachers who have received additional training in areas such as student assessment, Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and multilevel instruction. They provide the teachers with assistance in: assessment, planning, instruction and evaluation for students with special program needs. An important working relationship exists between the classroom teacher and the methods and resource teacher.

Assessment: A student with special needs is usually identified upon entry into the school system, and, as that student moves through the system, his or her file is updated frequently. If new problems or circumstances arise, the teacher gathers information on the child and consults with the M&R teacher. At this point, the M&R teacher reviews the program needs of the student and decides if new or further assessment is necessary. It is important to note that much of the assessment is done through observation rather than formal testing. The M&R teacher reviews the information and makes recommendations.

Program adjustment: The M&R teacher and the classroom teacher develop an IEP for the student which includes recommendations from the assessment. Together they modify the regular program or develop special programs to meet the student's needs.

Parents are frequently asked for their input, as it is imperative that home and school focus on similar goals.

Some parents are very involved in setting goals for their children, wanting their children to be included in regular programs and activities as much as possible.

The IEP is generally written with both short and long term goals and may be adjusted frequently. If something in the program is not working, the classroom teacher and M&R teacher revise the program. Flexibility is important.

Assistance through various stages: Regular classroom teachers of children with special needs almost always need assistance in modifying programs and instruction. The methods and resource teacher is a strong support in these areas.

The M&R teacher helps select appropriate materials, and organizes them so they can be used effectively. The classroom teacher keeps the M&R teacher informed on the usefulness of the materials.

The M&R teacher helps the classroom teacher to identify the student's learning style; using this information, he or she helps select the best methods of teaching the student. He or she may even help out in the classroom when the regular teacher first puts a new, specialized program into action. In some cases, the M&R teacher may work in the classroom with the student on an ongoing basis to meet the student's needs.

The classroom teacher implements the programs or methods recommended by the M&R teacher, and reports any success or failure. If the M&R teacher has been working one-on-one with the student in the classroom, the classroom teacher watches and discusses the strategies and methods in order to carry them over into other classroom activities.

Together the M&R and classroom teachers decide on evaluation procedures where appropriate and organize a schedule for evaluation. The classroom teacher does any testing and keeps a record of procedures used. The test results are used as a guide in revising the IEP if needed.

The M&R teacher will assist the classroom teacher in reporting to parents; he or she will also consult with parents on any matters regarding their child which arises in the classroom.

Attendants and Aides

Other members of the support team within a school include attendants, who are available to help with children with total care needs such as feeding and toileting.

Aides, on the other hand, generally assist in the academic program. Both attendants and aides receive their instructions from the classroom teacher who remains responsible for the programs and students in the class. The classroom teacher may also seek support from psychologists, speech pathologists, diagnosticians, specialists for children who are blind or deaf, and sometimes physiotherapists.

When problems arise, the classroom teacher can request that a problem-solving team be formed by the M&R staff. The team is a problem-solving unit made up of volunteer staff members (see Chapter 12). Frequently, the team includes the school guidance counsellor, district psychologists, a member of the administration, and, of course, the M&R staff.

The team approaches the problem using a prescribed plan, and offers a series of possible options for the classroom teacher. Follow-up sessions are arranged to provide the teacher with continued support if needed.

These resources help teachers do the best possible job. A close working relationship with people in these supportive roles ensures that the student with special needs will be assessed accurately and that feasible programs will be drawn up which are implemented properly. A close relationship also makes teachers feel that they are not alone; the value of that support is immeasurable.

CONCLUSION

My goal has been to show the simplicity of integration. In fact, so much of what has been described here is already accomplished well by teachers every day in classrooms everywhere.

Any teacher who believes it is his or her professional responsibility to accept and teach all children will find a way to make integration work. Any teacher who believes it is his or her personal responsibility to uphold the value of all children will do so.

REFERENCES

Bloom, Benjamin S. (Ed.). (1969). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The classification of educational goals*. New York: David McKay Company Inc.

Chapter 11

Implementing Multi-Level Instruction: Strategies for Classroom Teachers

by Jean Collicott

The classroom teacher always, ultimately, controls the expectations and accomplishments of the students for whom he or she is responsible. Five years of experience in the integration of children with disabilities into regular classrooms has shown me that the teacher who sets an example for others, especially students, in the acceptance of children with disabilities and mental handicaps in the regular classroom.

Where teachers have taken the initiative in accepting a child with a disability and are actively working to promote acceptance and interaction, the child has been accepted by peers in the classroom. Conversely, when a child with a disability has been supported entirely by a teacher assistant, with minimal teacher interaction, he or she has not become a true member of the class.

Therefore, it is vitally important that the teacher develop strategies for involving all children in classroom activities so all students will be seen as valuable members of the class.

Since it is impossible and indeed not even desirable for a classroom teacher to spend a great amount of time working individually with an exceptional student, it is necessary to focus on accommodating the exceptional student's instruction with other students.

— *Campbell; Campbell; Collicott; Perner and Stone, 1988*

In order to make this accommodation within a single classroom setting, teachers are now challenged with the task of restructuring their classroom practice. As an alternative to preparing and teaching a number of different lessons within a single class, teachers must develop a framework for planning that allows for one main lesson with varying methods of presentation, practice, and evaluation. Multi-level instruction is one approach to the development of this framework.

WHAT IS MULTI-LEVEL INSTRUCTION?

Multi-level instruction (Schulz and Turnhull, 1984) is based on the premise that one lesson will be taught to the whole class. It is an approach to planning that assumes the individualization, flexibility and inclusion of all students regardless of their personal level of skills. It allows the teacher to plan for all students within one lesson, thereby

decreasing the necessity for separate programs while allowing the teacher to weave individual goals into the classroom content and instructional strategies.

In order to achieve this, teachers need to fully understand the concept of multi-level teaching strategies. To develop a unit or a lesson that is truly multi-level, the lesson must have a definite aim for all students. It must also include a variety of teacher techniques aimed at reaching students at all levels. This means:

- considering student learning styles when planning presentation methods;
- involving them in the lesson through questioning aimed at different levels of thinking (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy, a taxonomy of levels of cognitive difficulty developed by Benjamin Bloom, a psychologist and educational theorist at the University of Chicago, ([see Bloom's Taxonomy](#)) ;
- allowing that some students will need adjusted expectations;
- giving students a choice in what method they will use to demonstrate their understanding of the concept being taught;
- accepting that these different methods are of equal value;
- evaluating students based on their individual differences.

THE FOUR-STEP PROCESS IN DEVELOPING A LESSON

In order to develop a lesson that meets these objectives, teachers may use the following four-step process as a guide:

1. identify the underlying concepts;
2. determine the teacher method of presentation (teaching style, questioning techniques, partial participation);
3. determine the student method of practice (allowing for variation in assignments based on Bloom's Taxonomy, different presentation modes, and partial participation);
4. determine the method of student evaluation (considering different levels of skill and accepting a variety of evaluation procedures).

STEP ONE: IDENTIFICATION OF UNDERLYING CONCEPTS

The first step is to identify the underlying concepts to be taught within a unit or a particular lesson. It is important to understand that underlying concepts are not merely the objectives established for a particular course. Objectives may be only part of a much broader picture.

Teachers must identify, in the material they are teaching, what they would like all the

students in the class to understand when the lesson has been completed.

Different content may be necessary for students with different levels of skill. However at the end of the lesson all students should have a similar understanding of the concept, taking into consideration the level at which they are working.

This will involve close scrutiny of the materials to be taught. Many school programs now in use especially at the junior and senior-level, rely heavily on the teaching of content. The difficulty with teaching excessive content is that many students who could successfully grasp the overall concept cannot master all the content. There is a need to clarify the difference between the underlying concepts and the content which is used to develop these concepts.

Imagine a traditional lesson on conflict within a story taught at the junior or senior high school level. Students are generally expected to recognize specific types of literary conflict. This is evaluated by having them read a particular story or novel with the aim of identifying examples of conflict. It is easy to imagine the difficulty experienced by students working at a reading level below that of the reading material. The difficulty is not in understanding the concept of conflict but in reading the material in order to complete the assignment. By placing emphasis on the ability to read and write without allowing other means for demonstrating learning or illustrating knowledge of conflict, students are “handicapped” by the structure.

Instead of expecting all students to know the types of literary conflict and read all the material, the teacher can approach this concept in a broader sense. If the teacher were to concentrate on acquainting all students with an understanding of conflict and have them identify the types through examples in real life, the types could later be related to a particular novel or short story. This would allow all students to be involved in the concept while variations are made in the assignments to accommodate different levels of skill.

STEP TWO: METHODS OF TEACHER PRESENTATION

Once the underlying concepts of the lesson are established, it is clear that the lesson cannot be presented in one way to all students, if all students are to be successful. Therefore, the idea or concept to be learned must be presented in such a way that all students are able to gain varying degrees of knowledge based on their level of understanding.

Learning Styles of Students The teacher must remember that a class is made up of students who learn visually, auditorially, and kinaesthetically. Most children tend to use one perceptual style more than the others. Teachers need to plan instruction which addresses each student's dominant perceptual mode. Although eighty to eightyfive per cent of students are visual learners, teachers tend to teach most often in an auditory fashion. Teachers could meet the needs of visual learners by using the blackboard

more and incorporating filmstrips, films, pictures, charts, and overhead transparencies into their lesson presentation (Wood, 1984).

Teachers should obtain more information about perceptual learning modes, observable behaviours connected to each mode, and teaching techniques for each mode (Wood, 1984; Schulz and Turnbull, 1984).

To return to the example of teaching elements of a story or novel, in using the multi-level approach to teach the idea of setting in stories a variety of different modes could be used. The idea of setting could be introduced by getting students to discuss their own lives. This would allow each student to express orally, perhaps to a partner, the setting of his or her life. A student with limited verbal ability might be asked specific questions by a student who has been coached in what to ask. Another approach might be to discuss the setting of a picture, a television show, or a story chosen by the student.

In an elementary lesson on capitalization, a discovery approach could be used. Instead of the teacher giving the student rules for capitalization, the student could be given a paragraph, asked to locate the capital letters, and then, in a group, discuss why capital letters were used in those particular situations. In this way the students have to come up with rules on their own rather than memorize rules given to them.

In a math lesson on percent, students could be asked questions based on particular objects that are in the room. For example, they could be asked to give the percentage of windows that are open; the percentage of students in the classroom who have blue eyes; a percentage to indicate the number of students absent from the class that day; or various other problems that the teachers could devise. These questions would not be based on problems from a text book but on relevant material that is at hand. Those students who have difficulty with reading would be able to work on the concept of percent from these preliminary problems without having to worry about being able to read a problem from a textbook.

Levels of Cognitive Domains

Another consideration in presenting the lesson should be the involvement of students at their own level. This requires the use of Bloom's Taxonomy in the development of questions and assignments. Bloom's Taxonomy, or other similar structures that indicate levels of thinking, are useful in structuring questions to ask students at various levels. All students can be involved in the lesson if suitable questions are developed to allow their involvement. Although Bloom's Taxonomy is well known, it is utilized less than would be expected for preparing questions and assignments for students. The chart that follows indicates the levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, defines each level, lists key verbs used to ask students questions, and lists products or activities that students could produce or perform at the indicated level.

Bloom's Taxonomy

Areas	Definition	Key Verbs	Classroom Products
Knowledge	knowing and remembering facts	match, recognize, list, describe, name, define, show, record, select, identify	report, map, worksheet, chart
Comprehension	understanding	explain, locate, inquire, demonstrate, discover	diagram, model, game, picture, teach a lesson, dioramas, time line
Application	doing, making use of what is known	model, apply, code, collect, organize, construct, report, experiment, sketch, paint, draw, group, put in order	survey, diary, mobile, scapbook, photographs, stichery, cartoon, model, illustration, sculpture, learning centre, construction
Analysis	explaining what is known	categorize, take apart, analyze, separate, dissect, compare, contrast	graph, survey, report, time line, family tree, commercial, fact file, questionnaire
Synthesis	putting together the known into something new	add to, create, imagine, combine, suppose, predict, role-play, change, hypothesize, what if?, design, invent, infer, improve, adapt, compose	story, poem, play, song, pantomime, news article, invention, radio show, dance, mural, comic strip
Evaluation	judging the outcome	justify, debate, solve, recommend, judge, criticize, prove, dispute	editorial, survey, self-evaluation, letter, conclusion, recommendation, court trial

(Gearhart, Welshahn, & Gearhart, 1988)

Levels one and two, knowledge and comprehension, are used most often by teachers. The remaining four levels — application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation — should be used by teachers more often than they are at present. Even for students who have difficulty with learning, the higher levels of the taxonomy should be utilized. A student with learning difficulties could still do a question at the evaluation level as long as the question was relevant to the student's own life or dealt with concrete rather than abstract ideas. Evaluation of various ideas is an important skill that all students should

be encouraged to develop. The teacher has to work with students at their current level of skill to encourage them to develop higher thinking skills to the best of their ability. Students experiencing learning difficulties should not be kept at the knowledge and comprehension level. In fact, these areas are often very difficult for students to master because of the heavy reliance on the memorization of material.

Partial Participation

Whether a student should participate fully or only partially is decided in the planning as well. Partial participation might involve each student doing a segment of an activity based on his or her level of skill. Group work with each member assigned a different task is the most common example. A student who is able to understand a concept but works more slowly than the rest of the class may have two options:

1. to have more time to complete the same objectives;
2. to be responsible for understanding the concept but to not have to complete all the activities required of other members of the class.

Partial participation is particularly important for students with more severe learning disabilities. Students who are unable to do the main objectives of the lesson but have their own specific objectives can be included in the activities of the class but their participation will certainly not be at the same level as other students.

For example, a student with very little written language might be expected to be involved in the public speaking unit in the Language Arts program at the junior or senior level. However, the expectation for his or her presentation would be different from that of the other class members. The student might be expected to do an oral presentation that is shorter in length and based on a personal experience rather than on a topic that has to be researched.

STEP THREE: METHODS OF STUDENT PRACTICE AND PERFORMANCE

The third step in the four-step process for multi-level instruction is determining the method of student performance. The method of performance that the student utilizes to show he or she understands the concept taught should follow the same variations discussed under method of presentation. There should be an allowance for assignments based on varying modes of learning, assignments based on different levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, and assignments that show partial participation. This will allow students who would not be able to read a story, for example, to be taught the concept of setting and to complete assignments to illustrate this understanding. Assignments might be oral or written, or involve drawing or acting. If the main objective is to have all the students understand setting, it can be reached in many ways, all of which are equally valuable.

In allowing for different methods of student performance, perhaps the most fundamental issue is the idea of choice. Students must be allowed a variety of different ways to show that they understand a concept. This involves an acceptance that the written word is not the only way of expressing understanding. It also involves instilling in students an acceptance that other ways of expressing understanding of a concept are of equal value.

What must be discouraged is the idea that the written word is the most important way to express ideas, and that drawing or illustrating is done only by students who are unable to express themselves in the more vital written format. When all methods of expression considered of equal value and all students are encouraged to express their views in different ways, the students will begin to see all methods as having equal value.

Many teachers will have concerns related to the seeming de-emphasis on reading and writing skills. The examples of alternate methods of student performance are an attempt to emphasize different presentation techniques, not to suggest that reading and writing be avoided. The intention is to ensure that attempts are made through various teaching styles to reach all students. All students should be able to appreciate and understand the main idea taught. There is no attempt to suggest that students will not be expected to read selections or write responses where appropriate.

However, some students will be unable to succeed with the prescribed material, and alternate materials will have to be used so all students can attempt similar activities. Many strategies can be used for reading adaptations, including using textbooks or library books at a lower reading level, taping books, highlighting pertinent materials in textbooks with a coloured marker, providing study guides or outlines of the major concepts, or rewriting material at a lower reading level (Schulz and Turnbull, 1984). These methods still place an emphasis on reading and writing but at the student's appropriate level.

Use of Bloom's Taxonomy

Assignments should not only allow for different modes of presentation, but should be written at different levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, 1969). That way, students who need to be challenged more than they are by the regular curriculum will have activities at their level; and students who have difficulty doing work at the grade level will have activities that allow them to express their knowledge in a different format.

The following activities, assigned to a class to show their understanding of plot of a story, illustrate the use of different modes of presentation and the different levels of Bloom's Taxonomy:

1. *Discuss the plot of television shows to allow for verbal rather than written presentation.*

This task involves knowledge and comprehension.

2. *In small groups, write or discuss what each student did that day.*

This involves practice in sequencing so students can develop an understanding of the order of events. It allows for small group activity where students have the support of others who have more skill in the area, and it allows them to all participate in an activity.

3. *Use charades to act out events in a particular plot while the rest of the students identify the part of the plot being shown.*

This allows students who are able to act the part to be very visible in the lesson as well as show that they understand the events in the story. It provides an opportunity for other students to analyze the particular presentation and decide what is being shown.

4. *Record sounds or music that could be used to illustrate certain segments of the plot.*
- This combines plot with atmosphere to challenge more advanced students.

5. *Write a plot in point form.*

This is helpful for weak writers to improve their writing skills, as well as providing practice for other students in note-taking. The students with more advanced skills would be expected to rewrite the points in paragraph form.

6. *Complete collage of events on the plot.*

This allows students who have no written ability to illustrate that they have an understanding of the plot by means of a visual presentation.

7. *Explain which part of the plot is most convincing.*

This evaluation question can be done either orally or in a written format. It allows all students to use evaluation as a technique and allows them to do it in different formats based on their ability levels.

(Sample Lesson One includes a number of other activities at various levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.)

When students are presented with a variety of assignments at varying levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, the need for enrichment as well as modification can be met. Most students, when given the choice of assignments, will select one that is appropriate. However, there are two notes of caution:

1. Some students will choose the activities which are the easiest for them, as they may not be highly motivated. This can be monitored by having students maintain a chart showing their choice of assignments in various units as they are covered. Restrictions can be placed on the number of activities a student may do from a particular unit.
2. Students may feel they are unable to do certain activities and, because they never choose them, they never have the opportunity to improve their skills in that area.

A student's choice of assignments should reflect a reasonable balance between the need to succeed for motivational purposes and need to learn new skills for the purpose of future success.

Partial Participation

In the area of method of student practice, partial participation is an important concept. Students with very limited academic ability can still be involved in activities in the class, based on their specific objectives.

A student may be placed in a group in order to meet objectives in his or her personal program. Objectives might focus on social skills or communication skills. The teacher would be aware of the reasons for the student being in the group and would concentrate on the development of the targeted skills, rather than on the attainment of academic knowledge about a particular subject. Examples of inclusion of students with special needs are found in sample lessons .

Specific Strategies

Cooperative learning is an excellent strategy to consider when choosing a method of student performance (Johnson, Johnson and Holubec, 1984). It accommodates partial participation by students who cannot do all the required work. It allows for social skill development and cooperation among all students, as well as providing a choice of activities that will utilize the various levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. Cooperative learning, as a strategy, cuts across two steps in the multi-level instruction process — the method of teacher presentation and the method of student performance.

The discovery approach is another strategy which covers both teacher presentation and student performance. If the students, for example, are expected to discover the rules for punctuation by completing an activity initiated by the teacher, the method of teacher presentation is student discovery and the method of student practice is also discovery.

STEP FOUR: METHOD OF EVALUATION

The fourth step in the process, the method of evaluation, is very closely linked to the method of student performance and involves the same three areas — modes of student performance, Bloom's Taxonomy and partial participation. Students should be evaluated on their assignments with equal weight being given to each mode of presentation. Written work is not made more valuable than oral or artistic work. In this way, contributions are of equal value and a student who cannot write is not devalued in the eyes of the class.

Bloom's Taxonomy should be used in the development of test questions. However, if different levels of questioning such as analysis, synthesis or evaluation — which are not typical test questions — are included, the student should be prepared for this type of questioning. It is not appropriate to deal exclusively at the knowledge,

comprehension, and application level in the classroom and then expect students to make the leap into the higher levels of thinking on test questions.

The main point to remember is that, in multi-level instruction evaluation is based on the individual level of skill of the students.

SUMMARY

In multi-level instruction: a concept is determined; a variety of methods of presentation are employed to meet all learning styles; choices are given in assignments to allow all students to participate; and evaluation of students is based on the individual ability levels of the students. Multi-level instruction is a means of developing lessons that allow all students to participate to their fullest extent, and be legitimate members of the class.

REQUIREMENTS FOR MULTI-LEVEL INSTRUCTION

Multi-level instruction does not consist of strategies designed for use only in certain situations. It is a process that can be developed across the curriculum. Therefore, it requires a great deal of commitment and planning by teachers. It does not require extensive training, although it does challenge teachers to rethink material previously taught. It may mean that a teacher must abandon lesson plans used many times before, and be open to new approaches to that same material. It requires time to plan new lessons and a willingness to give up the role of presenter for that of facilitator.

Multi-level instruction requires movement away from a teacher-controlled classroom and towards more choice and autonomy for students. It is a means of meeting the needs of students at their level while also meeting the needs of the curriculum. This however, entails a great deal of work on the part of teachers. Why should teachers be willing to expend the energy that is necessary to bring about these changes?

Rationale for Multi-Level Instruction

One rationale for multi-level instruction is that it encourages inclusion and integration. At the same time it addresses different learning styles. It allows teachers to reach all of the students some of the time (it is not possible to meet all of the needs of the students all of the time). However, the use of a variety of techniques within the same unit or lesson eliminates the need to teach the lesson many different times, in many different ways, to meet the individual styles of the students.

The multi-level instruction approach does take students beyond the knowledge and comprehension levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. It allows for enrichment for very able students as well as modification for students who have difficulties in learning. It stresses cooperation among students and allows evaluation at individual skill levels.

It allows students choice in expressing the knowledge that they have gained. It also meets students' social and emotional needs as well as their academic needs. Student

involvement with peers is encouraged because of the emphasis on cooperative learning. Permanent grouping is discouraged. This strategy fosters social relations in the classroom which are important in making all students feel a part of the group.

Multi-level instruction allows for participation of all students in the learning process and an acceptance of each person's contribution. It develops and encourages the concept of self-worth in all students. Increased motivation through the involvement of students in the activities of the classroom makes classroom management easier.

The thought and planning needed to determine the underlying concept of the material should result in a more meaningful curriculum. Teachers will be aware of why something is being taught and will focus on helping students understand various concepts, rather than on memorization of material.

TRAINING CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Today's classroom teachers realize that many styles of education will be necessary to meet the needs of the variety of learners in their classroom. Multi-level instruction is but one way to meet these needs. In order to develop this skill, teachers require some initial training. However, the main components of training in multi-level instruction are time and practice in developing lesson plans that incorporate strategies to allow for inclusion.

In two particular school districts, training for classroom teachers was provided in the following way:

1. Principals were asked to select one or two teachers who: a) would be willing to train other teachers; b) were at present showing some success with inclusion strategies; and c) were well respected by other staff members for their competency. These teachers formed a cadre to be trained and later to provide training to the rest of the staff.
2. Schoolboards in the two districts agreed to allow an extra professional development day before the end of the school year for in-service training. Each school was allowed to choose its own day within certain time parameters. District staff responsible for assisting in the training attended these school-based training sessions.
3. The selected teachers were brought together for a full-day training session. They were then asked to practise the techniques of the multi-level approach in their own classrooms. Selected lesson were viewed and feedback given by schoolboard staff. A second training day was provided to allow for planning for the school training sessions. The teachers had the freedom to present the material according to their own plan, although there had to be a common outline to assure consistency across the schools.
4. Methods and resource teachers ([see Chapter 8](#)), principals, and vice-principals

received training in the fundamentals of multi-level instruction so they could act as support personnel.

5. The principals and vice-principals were responsible for developing a plan to provide ongoing in-service training to the rest of the staff in their school. The main focus was training in small groups with collaboration among teachers; the groups also had time to develop and implement the newly acquired skills. Principals and vice-principals supported the training by monitoring the skills when they observed teachers as part of teacher supervision; they also provided ways for teachers to share strategies at various staff gatherings.
6. It was the ongoing responsibility of district staff to monitor the implementation of the plans and provide assistance as requested.

The training approach used relies on collaboration among teachers in developing and sustaining multi-level instructional strategies. A collaborative team approach allows teachers to share ideas and support colleagues who are feeling the stress of having to meet diversified needs that they may not feel equipped to handle. There is no time limit for the completion of training, as it must be an ongoing process that allows for differing rates of acceptance of change by teachers.

CONCLUSION

Because teachers are now responsible for a greater diversity of students in regular classrooms, a wider range of teaching strategies is needed to meet the needs of these students. As the integration of students with special needs has evolved, inclusion has become a major concern. Multi-level instruction is a teaching method which allows teachers to meet the individual needs of students and provide quality education for all. This will not be easy to do, nor will it happen quickly. However, if inclusion of all is to be a characteristic of the education system in the future, there must be commitment to the development of multi-level instruction. That will require a commitment to the ideology and a commitment to providing the resources needed for its implementation. Both students and the education system will achieve a higher level of success as a result.

SAMPLE LESSON ONE *THE NOVEL OR SHORT STORY*

Language arts lends itself to the format for multi-level instruction, as the following unit plan for teaching a novel or short story illustrates.

CONCEPTS TO BE TAUGHT:

character
plot
climax
setting

atmosphere
conflict
theme

METHOD OF PRESENTATION:

One suggestion for teaching these concepts was through the use of a movie (e.g., *The Outsiders* by S.S. Hinton). This would be effective for all students and particularly for two groups — visual learners, and children with low reading levels. The concepts would be presented by a variety of modes and then the novel could be the vehicle for project work based on understanding the concepts.

METHOD OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE:

A variety of assignments was developed to show an understanding of each concept as it was covered. They ranged from the concrete to the abstract in ideas and from the knowledge level to the evaluation level of Bloom's Taxonomy.

METHOD OF EVALUATION:

Individual assignments were used as the major evaluation. Main concepts were tested in a written form where possible. Adaptations were made for students who had limited writing skills.

METHODS OF PRESENTATION AND STUDENT PRACTICE FOR SPECIFIC CONCEPTS:

Setting

1. Have the students describe the settings of their lives to each other.
2. Describe a setting and have the students draw a picture to illustrate it or find a picture that closely resembles it.
3. Have the students name the setting for a variety of situations depicted through video, pictures, written paragraphs.
4. Discuss or draw pictures of the setting of television shows.
5. Have the students read books or stories at their own reading level and describe the setting.
6. Have the students create a setting for a particular atmosphere.

Plot

1. Discuss the plot of television shows.

2. Divide students into small groups and have each student write or discuss what they did that day (for practice in sequencing).
3. Have a student act out events and have the other students identify the part of the plot shown.
4. On tape, record sounds to fit certain segments of the plot.
5. Have students write a plot in point form. This is helpful for weak writers as well as being practice in concise note-taking for others.
6. Instruct students to create a collage of events in the plot.
7. Have students explain which part of the plot is most convincing.

Characters

1. Have students describe how characters are similar to someone they know.
2. Ask students to describe which character they liked and disliked the most.
3. Instruct students to compare a character's qualities to qualities the student admires.
4. Choose two or three teachers and have students compare and contrast their characters.
5. Ask students to judge what might have happened in the character's life to make him or her turn out that way.
6. Have students describe a character and relate the character to an animal.
7. Have students discuss a character's speech patterns.
8. Instruct students to develop a wardrobe for a character.
9. Have students sketch what a character might look like.

Atmosphere

1. Ask students to indicate how atmosphere was developed in a television show.
2. Have students use music to create an atmosphere.
3. Have students use colour to create an atmosphere.
4. Have students decide what atmosphere is established by a specific tone of voice.
5. Make tapes of sounds illustrating certain atmospheres.

SAMPLE LESSON TWO *EXAMPLES OF INCLUSION STRATEGIES*

A group of methods and resource teachers were asked to collect examples of inclusion activities they had seen in various classrooms. The following are examples of some of these lessons with inclusion activities which allow children with varying abilities to participate.

Lesson: Social Studies

Topic: Sir Wilfred Laurier

Grade: 8

The concept to be learned was “Who is Sir Wilfred Laurier?” Sir Wilfred Laurier was discussed by the teacher.

His picture was used for identification. The students took turns reading aloud material on Sir Wilfred Laurier. Students with reading difficulties were given short sections with fairly easy vocabulary. The student with a serious speech problem due to a brain injury was asked occasionally to choose the next reader. In checking for learning, a number of students were asked to name the first French-Canadian prime minister. After a few students answered correctly, the student with the speech difficulty was asked the same question but only had to say his lastname. She he was also expected to identify his picture from the pictures of prime ministers posted around the room. For seatwork she was given a picture of Laurier with his name written under it and another sheet with the same picture and a blankspace under it. She was required to write his name in the space. This met two objmtives established for her:

1. learning the main concept; and
2. improving her printing skills.

When the class was tested she was expected to complete a test as well. (Linda Fanning, 1989)

Lesson: Social Studies

Topic: Chinese Culture

Grade: 9

In studying the culture of China, students were divided into groups to research different aspects of Chinese culture. Each group was expected to do a written account of their topic, complete a visual presentation illustrating pertinent points, do an oral presentation to teach material to the class, and develop, administer, and evaluate a short quiz on the material. Students were divided into groups based on their individual skills and abilities. An attempt was made to have heterogeneous grouping. The student with more severe learning difficulties was placed in a group with very supportive students. This group dealt with the economy of China. Her part involved doing a poster on different forms of currency. She was responsible for knowing the types of money on

the poster and assisting when the class presented the information.

She felt that she belonged and was a part of the class. (Larry Harley, 1989)

Lesson: Language Arts

Topic: Learning New Words

Grade: 2

Each student in the class wrote a paragraph about himself or herself using a list of new words. The student with special needs had a paragraph prepared that was based on her life. From it, a list of important new words was developed and she was given exercises to learn the words.

Mary

Mary is a girl. She is in Grade 2. Her teacher's name is Mrs. James. Mary has black hair and blue eyes. She is a very pretty girl. Mary rides on a bus every day. She lives in a new house. Mary has two sisters and one brother. Their names are Amy, Elizabeth, and Tommy. She has many friends at school. One friend is Beth. Another friend is Larry.

Read these words:

friends	eyes	girl	grade	name	rides
pretty	brother	house	hair	sisters	

Complete the sentences:

Mary is a _____.

She is in _____ 2.

Her teacher's _____ is Mrs. James.

Mary has black _____ and blue _____.

She is a very he _____ girl.

Mary _____ on a school bus.

She lives in a new _____.

Mary has two _____.

She has one _____.

Mary has many _____ at school.

At this point the sentences were put in a paragraph identical to the original paragraph and the student was asked to fill in the blanks. (Wendy Manuel, 1989)

Lesson: Language Arts

Topic: Listening Skills

Grade: 3

Alter several listening activities, the teacher realized that a student with special needs was having serious difficulty with the exercise. He constantly interrupted by moving

about the class distracting others. The teacher photocopied pictures from the book she was reading and had the student with special needs place the pictures on the board at the appropriate time using magnetic strips. At first, she tapped a bell to indicate when he was to place the pictures on the chalkboard. The technique allowed for inclusion of the student as well as keeping him on task. The student had become a valued member of the class and was actually helping other students to improve their listening skills. (Sherille Crouse, 1989)

Lesson: Social Studies

Topic: Introduction of the province of Québec

Grade: 5

The boundaries and important places in Québec were discussed. The students were expected to label these places on a map using an overhead produced by the teacher. The student with special needs was assisted by assigned students. Lines were drawn on the map within which the names of places were printed. The spelling was checked by the students, who were also expected to make notes about the places or events discussed. The important facts were written on the board to provide a guide for the students to use for writing complete sentences. The student with special needs listed the facts but was not responsible for writing the sentences. As a result, the student felt a part of the lesson. He benefitted from the lesson by learning the main ideas and the class benefitted by learning a study skill — utilizing key facts to remember notes.

Lesson: Math

Topic: Recognition, Identification and Construction of Solids

Grades: 2-5

When the concept of solids was introduced by the teacher, models were given to all students to observe and manipulate. The student with a visual impairment was allowed to manipulate the model for the entire time the teacher was discussing the figure. When constructing a model of the solid the teacher worked from this student's desk. As each step was introduced the teacher assisted the child by showing her how to fold the paper and by allowing her to feel it after each step. The child was able to see, through touch, the flat sheet of paper turn into the desired model. This technique could be used for teaching other concepts, such as perimeter, area and volume. (Lois Wright, Joan Sheen, 1989)

SAMPLE LESSON THREE ADAPTING LESSONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

A group of methods and resource teachers compiled a list of suggestions for including students with disabilities — both those with verbal skills and those without verbal skills. They are suggestions geared to various levels of disability and they range from simple techniques for involvement at the verbal level to more complex ways of delivering instructions and developing writing skills. They are listed in order of

complexity under verbal and nonverbal categories.

SUGGESTIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH VERBAL SKILLS:

1. Have the student identify an object which is being used in the lesson.
2. Use the student's name or a fact about that student in the lesson — such as an article of clothing, a skill they have, or a physical feature.
3. Have the student repeat other students' responses.
4. Have the student give an example from his or her own experience that relates to the lesson.
5. Give the student "think time". Call on the student and say it will be his or her turn soon.
6. Use short, sequential instructions with back-up written instructions.
7. At the beginning of the lesson use concrete language. Abstract, higher level language can be used later.
8. Check for understanding by having students retell instructions or paraphrase information in their own words.
9. Check for oral reading ability in order to avoid embarrassing situations. Allow students with severe reading problems to do oral reading practice outside the classroom.
10. Include the student in small group discussions. Some verbal prompting may be needed by designated members of the group.
11. Use peers to drill key words and ideas in order to make the student accountable.

SUGGESTIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH OUT VERBAL SKILLS:

1. Assign students on a rotating basis to help others with seatwork.
2. Students who have difficulty writing notes from the board can be required to copy only main parts of the notes. The main ideas could be underlined so the student knows what to copy. The student could also be given a photocopy of another student's notes.
3. Non-readers could be provided with taped notes done by the teacher or another student. The notes would only include the essential points.
4. In oral spelling tests perhaps the student would only be responsible for beginning or ending sounds.
5. Reading material at the appropriate level which addresses the same content may

be used for seatwork. Taped material may be used as well.

6. Pictures may be used to supplement key information, or pictures may be the starting point for writing or speaking activities.
7. Written tests may need to be reorganized using the following techniques: provide a word list when using fill-in-the-blank questions; have the student choose the best possible answer from two alternatives; have the student label diagrams with given terms; ask the student to complete “tell in your own words” short answer questions.
8. Have students do poster theme projects related to key words or concepts in the lesson. (Wendy Dickinson, 1989)

References

- Bloom, Benjamin S. (Ed). (1969). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The classification of educational goals*. New York: David McKay Company Inc.
- Campbell, C., S.Campbell, J.Collicott, D.Perner and J.Stone. (1988). Individualizing instruction. *Education New Brunswick*, 3 (June) pp. 17-20.
- Dickinson W. (1988). Unpublished material on Verbal and Nonverbal Inclusion Strategies.
- Falvey, M.A., J.Coots, K.D.Bishop and M.Grenot-Scheyer. (1989). Education and curricular adaptations. In S.Stainbeck, W.Stainbeck and M.Forest (Eds). *Educating all Students in the Mainstream of Regular Education*. Baltimore, Maryland: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., pp. 143-158.
- Fanning, L., et al. (1989). Unpublished Material on Inclusion Strategies in Districts 28&29, Woodstock, NB.
- Gearhart, B.R., M.W. Weishahn and C.J.Gearhart. (1988). *The Exceptional Student in the Regular Classroom*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co.
- Johnson, D.W., R.T.Johnson and E.Johnson Holubec. (1984). *Cooperation in the Classroom*. Edina, Minnesota: Interaction Book Company.
- Schulz, J.B. and A.P.Turnbull. (1984). *Mainstreaming Handicapped Students*. Newton, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Wood, J.W. (1984). *Adapting Instruction for the Mainstream: A sequential approach to teaching*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Chapter 12

Problem Solving Teams: A Thirty-Minute Peer-Helping Model

by Gordon L. Porter, Mary Wilson, Brian Kelly and Jeff den Otter

PROBLEM-SOLVING STRATEGIES FOR TEACHERS

Schools which successfully include all students must employ a range of strategies and techniques so teachers can gain the support they need. The teacher-helping-teacher problem solving strategy has proven to be an effective method of creating open, productive collaborative consultation among educators. We have developed and refined the strategy over several years. It has been particularly useful as we have implemented integrated or inclusionary programs for all students.

The fundamental principle of the process is that *teachers can help other teachers*. Problem solving proceeds through an orderly sequence of steps from the initial designation of the problem to the development and implementation of a plan to resolve it, to evaluation of progress, to monitoring. The process is dynamic, evolving, flexible, and cyclical in nature.

HISTORY

Programs for teachers of students with special needs have come under a variety of labels: pre-referral intervention; teacher support teams; and teacher assistant teams (Canelli and Lange, 1990; West, 1990; Chalfant, Pysh and Moultrie, 1979). Our present use of problem-solving teams in New Brunswick school districts 28 and 29 originated with the teacher assistant team (TAT) concept developed by James Chalfant and his associates in the United States. This model was created to address the increasing referral of students to special education services and to stop the flow of referrals for formal assessment. The goal was to handle more situations at the school level, reduce the number of inappropriate referrals, and use special education personnel more effectively.

In 1979 we brought Chalfant and Pysh to our district to train teachers and administrators from each school in the use of their model. Subsequently, schools set up teams by either recruiting volunteers, holding elections or having the principal choose team members. Despite the fact that results were mixed and the model eventually fell into disuse with teams disbanding in most schools, we had many positive experiences with the TAT model. Those experiences became a useful resource as teachers worked hard to meet the challenge of integrating students. We looked anew at the elements of the TAT model that were most compelling for our circumstances and our present day

problem-solving teams become an outgrowth of our experience with the teacher assistant team model.

Our revised model is a mix of old and new ideas. The purpose of referral is now to give teachers needed support to keep all students in regular classes. The facilitator is most often a school-based methods and resource teacher or a guidance counsellor. The make-up of the teams is flexible and open to whatever considerations seem relevant. The process followed during the thirty-minute meeting, however, is similar to the TAT model.

One of the most meaningful changes has been the perspective brought by the teachers themselves. Changes that occurred during the last decade, particularly the move to integration, have altered our assumptions of educational practice and made teachers much more open to working cooperatively with their peers. It has become understood that teachers can no longer work in isolation and still meet the needs of every student. They increasingly accept the philosophy of collaborative consultation, “an interactive process which enables people with diverse expertise and experiences to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems. The outcome is enhanced, altered, and different from the original solutions that any team member would produce independently” (Nevin et al., 1990).

FEATURES OF THE COLLABORATIVE MODEL

Collaborative Partnership

There are several important features of problem solving in a collaborative environment. The first is that team members work together to solve problems in a partnership that emphasizes trust, openness, and cooperation. Being collaborative implies that they work jointly on an equal basis, and partnership suggests that they have specified and mutually agreed-upon responsibilities. This equality ensures that collaboration is effective, deriving the maximum benefit from the consultation process (Villa et al., 1990). Out of these balanced relationships come “people and systems that are more self-help oriented, more self-sustaining, and more pro-social”. The process also helps increase people’s confidence in their ability to solve problems.

Members of the teams make different contributions based on their expertise and varying responsibilities; they work together in a complementary and interdependent fashion. The teachers bringing problems to the team must provide information on context and ecological factors affecting the situation which will help in developing interventions. They must also help in deciding what interventions will be most useful in their setting based on their skills (Idol, 1990).

All participants are responsible for defining and analyzing problems, for establishing and maintaining the collaborative partnership, and for follow-up. Since the referring teacher is responsible for the student and for implementing the interventions, he or

she is the best judge of what strategies are suitable and makes the final decision.

Preventative Function

Problem solving has a dual focus. It provides a mechanism to deal with immediate problems, and it has the potential to help teachers control the factors that cause and maintain the problem. It can both ease existing problems and prevent existing difficulties from being more severe.

The first objective is met by developing specific interventions to deal with the current problem. The second is accomplished in a less direct manner. Teachers can share their experience and expertise with each other when they interact frequently. Problem-solving sessions means the opportunities for interaction. Teachers can share knowledge and improve their skills so similar problems can be dealt with more effectively in the future. In most cases, it is necessary for teachers to address several problem situations successfully before they can handle problems independently. Training teachers to deal with a single problem situation has been ineffective in teaching them general skills for coping with a variety of circumstances (Pryzwansky, 1989).

Participants

The team should have five to seven members. At minimum, a facilitator and three other teachers are needed to make the problem-solving process work effectively. As noted earlier, the facilitator is often a methods and resource teacher or guidance counsellor, but can also be an administrator or teacher. On occasion the student who is the central figure in the situation may be requested to participate since he or she has the most at stake in the process (Thousands and Villa, in press, b).

The facilitator must ensure that the atmosphere remains supportive and non-judgemental. The facilitator must identify possible participants, schedule the meeting and ensure that teachers share their expertise and knowledge so creative solutions emerge. He or she must also assist the teacher in selecting strategies for possible use, in developing an evaluation plan, and in follow-up and implementation.

Addressing the System

Regular use of problem solving leads educators to look beyond the immediate situation to prevention and, ultimately, to issues related to the organization of the school. School organization can bring about many day-to-day problems food by students and teachers (Skrtic, 1991). The connection between a student's problem and system variables that may be contributing to the problem or preventing solutions must be identified and dealt with. Educators cannot assume that problems are only internal to the child. This perspective shifts the focus and broadens the goals of the consultation or problem-solving process (Gutkin and Hickman, 1990).

Empowerment

The empowerment of regular classroom teachers is central to the use of problem-solving teams. The emphasis on collaboration with peers rather than referral to

“experts” is an important factor in this empowerment. Colleagues help fellow teachers clarify needs and locate resources; at the same time they ensure that opportunities are available to constructively resolve their own problems (West, 1990).

Enhancement of Student Well-Being and Performance Although problem solving focuses on improving teacher’s skills and performance, the ultimate beneficiary is always intended to be the student. While the focus is usually on one student, it is possible to see the entire school benefit.

THE TEAM PROBLEM-SOLVING PROCESS

Teachers usually work to solve problems on their own before seeking consultative assistance. Typically, they try various classroom interventions, confer informally with other teachers, or meet with parents. The teacher may seek advice from a resource person because of his or her expertise or because a supportive relationship has developed between them. Most classroom problems are solved in this manner. If independent problem solving doesn’t work, teachers may request assistance from a colleague at the school or district office, or from the school problem-solving team.

Meetings with a team can be requested by the teacher or suggested by a resource person, typically a methods and resource teacher, or by the school principal. Meetings must be formally arranged because of the work involved in coordinating five to seven people. Problem-solving team meetings are effective for particularly frustrating situations, or when it is deemed important to promote communication among a number of teachers.

Consultation does not end with the peer problem-solving meeting. It may be decided, for example, that it is more efficient to have an methods and resources teacher, guidance counsellor or district-level resource person work with the referring teacher to thoroughly develop the specifics of a particular intervention.

STAGES OF PROBLEM-SOLVING MEETINGS

Stage 1: The facilitator states the reason for the meeting and explains the process to be followed and the problem to be dealt with. He or she can also outline the problem-solving process if needed. Additional responsibilities of the team facilitator include:

1. helping the referring teacher state clearly and concisely what the problem is by finding out specifically what the teacher wants to happen that is not happening now. The more precise the problem is stated, the better;
2. briefing the other team members on the problem. This is not always necessary, but often helps the prrocess;
3. asking one team member to act as recorder. This member can still be an active participant in the group;

4. helping each team member stay on topic, and give clear, appropriate, practical suggestions;
5. ensuring that the meeting lasts no longer than thirty minutes.

Teachers who have participated in problem-solving meetings state that facilitators should be positive, business-like, task-oriented, and able to clarify issues and summarize well.

Stage 2: The referring teacher makes a brief oral statement about the problematic situation.

Stage 3: Team members ask questions of the referring teacher to clear up any uncertainties they may have as to exactly what the problem is or what the circumstances are.

Stages 2 and 3 permit team members to focus on defining the parameters of the problem for the teacher. After the referring teacher provides a vignette of the situation and his or her concerns, team members may ask for some specific examples of the behaviour, such as “You find that Susan is aggressive toward other children. Can you give me some specific examples of her aggressive behaviour?”

During stage 3, team members may:

1. Look for factors that may trigger or maintain a problem; identify and analyze conditions that alleviate the problem.
 (“Does Mary seem to work better when you... ?”);
2. Look for consequences that may maintain the behaviour. They may explore actions that are already occurring or could be instituted to improve behaviour or performance.
 (“What do you do when Joe does complete all off his homework?” “What types of things does Julie really like to do?”);
3. Assess other factors in the student’s environment. Significant people in the student’s environment are identified and asked questions to assess their attitudes and expectations regarding the problem. Relevant instructional variables and classroom or home routines are explored;
4. Identify all available resources; identify the strengths of the child.
 (“What types of things does Jeff do well?” “In what subject area is William succeeding?”)

The process of clarification helps make the problem specific enough that team members feel they understand it clearly. The facilitator provides input to pull the threads together so the team has a mutual sense of the issues causing a problem for the referring teacher.

Stage 4: Once the problem has been clearly defined and analyzed, a range of possible interventions must be generated. A round-table brainstorming session is held to generate suggestions from team members as to how the problem may be solved. Brief, practical statements are encouraged, and are directed to the facilitator. The referring teacher does not interact with others at this stage.

The central rule of this phase of the process is to avoid evaluating ideas until the brainstorming segment is completed. There is often more than one way to resolve a problem, and by generating a number of possible solutions the team is more likely to come up with an intervention that is both effective and acceptable to the referring teacher.

Team members usually suggest some change in classroom management or instructional strategies in areas like curriculum content, rewards or instructional techniques. They may also suggest changes to teacher behaviour, peer and sibling behaviour, and the physical arrangement of the classroom (Gutkin and Hickman, 1990).

Stage 5: The facilitator and the referring teacher go over the suggestions and strategies together. The referring teacher evaluates them to determine how beneficial they will be for the child and how feasible it is to implement them. The ultimate selection of strategies rests with the referring teacher who is asked to rate each suggestion by assigning a number to it:

number 1 is an idea or strategy that the teacher wants to try immediately;
number 2 is an idea or strategy that has merit, but is not a priority; and
number 3 is an idea or strategy that has already been tried or is not seen as immediately practical by the referring teacher.

When rating strategies, teachers should keep in mind:

1. Interventions should focus on the positive rather than on control and suppression of challenging behaviour;
2. Teachers should choose the least complex and intrusive intervention. Where possible, the focus should be on helping the referring teacher modify instruction or general behaviour management strategies. Making changes to techniques the teacher already uses is intrusive or aversive to the teacher than learning a new procedure (Axelrod, 1990);
3. When a new skill must be developed by the teacher, it should be designed to fit into the present classroom structure and routine as much as possible (Conoley and Conoley, 1988).

Stage 6: The facilitator establishes a plan to follow up on the ideas or strategies that have been selected by the teacher. This might include arranging for more detail on a specific idea, providing assistance in further developing a plan of action, or setting a date for a future meeting to evaluate the plan.

The roles and responsibilities of all participants must be assigned and agreed upon. All aspects the plan should be put in writing, at least in outline form, so each person involved has a clear idea of his or her responsibilities. The specific techniques to be used should be set out step-by-step in the outline. The time of day and the settings or subject area in which the intervention will be implemented must be decided. This written plan also serves as a record for people's accountability.

Stage 7: The facilitator thanks team members and ensures that all participants leave feeling that something constructive will come from the meeting.

Teachers always have favourable comments regarding problem-solving meetings. They appreciate the variety of practical suggestions that result from the meeting. They are pleased that it only takes thirty minutes from beginning to end.

They report a ripple effect from the process where the solutions developed in the meeting may be relevant to other problems. And the teachers leave the meeting feeling empowered and supported by their peers.

CASE STUDIES

The two case studies of actual problem-solving meetings provide specific details that illustrate the operation of a problem-solving team. The first is from an elementary school and the second is from a high school.

Case Study One: Amanda

Amanda is a nine-year-old student in Grade 4. She is having difficulty in language arts. Though she likes books and expresses herself well verbally, she is not a fluent reader and does not express herself well in writing. She is described as being very cooperative and anxious to succeed. However, she lacks organizational skills, independent work habits and a level of comprehension necessary for her to be successful.

She was referred to the school methods and resource teacher by her home room teacher. The methods and resource teacher completed a reading assessment and located suitable reading material for Amanda. Her teacher tried physically separating her from a particular student Amanda seemed to find distracting. The teachers also attempted to find something to praise her for every day. A problem-solving meeting was set up.

Stage 1: The methods and resource teacher, acting as the facilitator, welcomed the participants who included the referring teacher, the guidance counsellor, and three other teachers. She stated that the purpose of the meeting was to help the referring teacher find some practical suggestions to help Amanda in language arts class.

Stage 2: The referring teacher gave a brief description of Amanda and specified that he wanted her to improve her reading skills and to work independently, and also to gain self-confidence.

Stage 3: Team members now had a chance to ask any questions for clarification. One member wanted to know whether there was support from the home, which there was.

Stage 4: During the brainstorming session all suggestions were directed to the facilitator. The suggestions were:

1. Have Amanda read to a younger student.
2. Repeatd reading: have Amanda read the same story several times.
3. Have her keep a journal to express her feelings.
4. Meet with her parents to develop a plan.
5. Make up a checklist of things that she has to do to be more organized. She can check off each item as she completes it.
6. Have her copy class rules for a display.
7. Have the homeroom teacher discuss with her how important it is to ask for help. Include peers.
8. Limit homework time.
9. Establish a private signal with her that will indicate that she needs help.
10. Use computer software to help with reading and writing.
11. Teach Amanda the five-finger test for choosing her own reading material. Take a book and open it to any page and as you read put a finger down for any word you don't know. Five fingers for one page means the book is too difficult; no fingers means it is too easy; somewhere in between is best.
12. Have Amanda present oral book reports.
13. Ensure that homework is related to reading.
14. Have Amanda read to a parent for fifteen minutes every night. Have them read alternate paragraphs to each other.
15. Make sure that Amanda is not singled out.
16. Make Amanda responsible for fewer questions than the rest of the class.
17. Have her write daily about herself. It should be short and should be marked and returned with constructive criticism.
18. Praise her for good health.
19. Have someone read to her every day.
20. Have Amanda repeat directions to make sure that she understands what is expected of her.

21. Have her write with a peer.
22. Use the Specific Skills Series reading comprehension book.
23. Plan a time every day to check on her organization.

Stage 5: The facilitator and the referring teacher went over the suggestions and the referring teacher assigned either number 1: an idea to try immediately; number 2: a good idea, but not a priority; or number 3: an idea that has already been tried or would not work. In this case, the referring teacher choose three ideas to try immediately.

Stage 6: The facilitator assisted the referring teacher in establishing the following action plan:

1. The methods and resource teacher will arrange and participate in a meeting with Amanda's parents to discuss her progress to date and to begin formulating a plan for her success.
2. Amanda will begin repeated readings. The methods and resource teacher will supply a one-hundred-word passage each week and a chart to record the mistakes and time the exercise takes each day. Since these will both decrease, this activity will give Amanda a sense of accomplishment and greater self-confidence.
3. Amanda will write daily about herself (about My Favourite Pet, What I Like About My Friend's House, My Favourite Holiday). This exercise will be short and will be marked and returned to Amanda with constructive criticism.
4. A follow-up meeting will take place in four weeks to review progress.

Stage 7: The facilitator thanked the participants and assured each one that their help was greatly appreciated.

The follow-up meeting was held to assess progress to date. The referring teacher was extremely pleased with the results of the suggestions which he had tried after the problem-solving meeting. He and the methods and resource teacher had met with Amanda's mother and found her to be cooperative. The suggestions for improving her reading and writing skills had been equally successful. He had seen a remarkable improvement in Amanda's writing and said that she was reading with much more confidence now. His over-all assessment was positive; he found the problem-solving process to be a valuable strategy.

Case Study Two: Nathan Basically there is a behaviour problem. Nathan, a Grade 11 student, disrupts the class, causes serious difficulties for other learners, and refuses to take responsibility for his own behaviour.

Stage 1: The facilitator explained that the purpose of the meeting was to help the referring teacher develop some strategies to deal with Nathan, a student in her Grade 11 English class. The facilitator specified that the referring teacher was looking for

ideas to confront Nathan with the reality of the effects of his behaviour and also some strategies to help change his behaviour.

Stage 2: The referring teacher elaborated on the problem by stating that Nathan's disruptive behaviours included pushing desks, striking out to other students, staying turned around in his seat, and continually talking. When she talked to him privately about this, Nathan refused to accept that there was a problem; instead, he blamed the other students.

His seat had been changed a number of times, but this had not helped. His work had been modified because of his weak reading skills.

Stage 3: The following questions were asked for clarification:

- Does he have friends in that room? (Not really.)
- What is he really good at? (Spelling, basketball.)
- Is his behaviour the same outside the class? (Yes.)
- Does he have friends outside the class? (He spends time with one or two students.)
- Does he change his behaviour after you speak to him? (For a few minutes.)
- How does he react to one-on-one talks with you? (He gets very angry.)
- Is work experience part of his program? (Not yet, but he will be going out to work at a later date.)

Stage 4: The brainstorming session provided the following suggestions:

1. Choose the smallest behaviour that you want to stop and develop a plan to stop that behaviour with built-in rewards.
2. Video-tape Nathan in the classroom over a period of time to show him what he is doing or have some observation done to establish a baseline of his behaviour.
3. Provide modification to plan for success and reduce frustration.
4. Tape materials that he has to read and provide discussion time, so that he will understand what he reads.
5. Provide time for small cooperative group work.
6. Hold cooperative group activities that stress social skills.
7. Work with school social worker to set up behaviour modification plan.
8. Look at relationships with friends.
9. Bring parents in and make frequent home contact.

10. Establish peer monitors and/or a buddy system to help with problem behaviour.
11. Have Nathan meet regularly with the guidance counsellor.
12. Catch him being good — reinforce good behaviour.
13. Have Nathan meet with the teacher before class to check on homework completion and outline activities for the day.
14. Give Nathan responsibilities both inside and outside the classroom.
15. Relate his behaviours to people at his work placement.
16. Reverse role playing.
17. Isolate him when he is really disruptive.
18. Encourage him to join a team.

Stage 5: The facilitator and the referring teacher went through the list of suggestions. Nine ideas were chosen to act on immediately.

Stage 6: The facilitator provided a list of the nine actions chosen by the referring teacher and suggested that they meet within the next few days to review them in case she needed assistance with any of the ideas. The referring teacher agreed to meet and said she would share some of these ideas with Nathan's other teachers.

Stage 7: The referring teacher stated that she felt much more optimistic regarding Nathan and thanked the group for their suggestions. The facilitator also thanked the participants for their help.

CONCLUSION

Tom Skrtic (1991) has criticized education systems for their rigidity and inability to be truly adaptive to the needs of students. He advocates that schools must operate as adhocracies where both students and teachers work in a collaborative manner, applying their unique strengths to the problems of the group, and pooling their resources to come up with novel and innovative ways to meet student needs.

Education is seen as a dynamic and flexible process constantly attuned to the needs of the learners. The adhocratic school has a problem-solving focus, involving collaboration among a number of professionals who pool their skills as peers in the group. In this system, teachers have the freedom to problem solve without fear of criticism. They can also develop confidence that the system is flexible enough to allow innovative solutions to be implemented. In addition, the range of feasible solutions is mostly increased.

We have found teacher collaboration in the form of peer problem-solving teams helpful as we work to integrate students with disabilities into regular classrooms in

our schools. The process provides a way to help teachers develop strategies to instruct students who do not easily fit the standard curriculum or instructional assumptions. Peer problem-solving teams have helped us promote the goals of inclusionary schooling. A commitment to collaboration is needed to create schools where mutual support in solving problems prevails.

REFERENCES

- Axelrod, S., L. Moyer and B. Berry. (1990). Why teachers do not use behaviour modification procedures. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 1(2). pp. 309-320.
- Canelli, A. A. and S.M. Lange. (1990). Considerations for future research in the institutionalization of school-based consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 1(1), pp. 87-98.
- Chalfant, J.C., M. Pysh and R. Moultrie. (1979). Teacher assistance teams: A model for within-building problem solving. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, 2(3). pp. 85-96.
- Conoley, J.C. and C.W. Conoley. (1988). Useful theories in school-based consultation. *Remedial and Special Education*, 9(6), pp. 14-20.
- Friend, M. and L. Cock. (1990). Collaboration as a predictor for success in school reform. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 1(1), pp. 69-86.
- Giangreco, M.F., S. Edelman and R. Dennis. (1991). *Common Professional Practices that Interfere With Integrated Delivery of Related Services*. 12(2). pp. 16-24.
- Gutkin, T.B. and J.A. Hickman. (1990). The relationship of consultant, consultee, and organizational characteristics to consultee resistance to school-based consultation: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 1(2). pp. 111-122.
- Idol, L. (1990). The scientific art of classroom consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 1(1), pp. 3-22.
- Nevin, A., J. Thousand and P. Poulucci-Whitcomb. (1990). Collaborative consultation: Empowering public school personnel to provide heterogenous schooling for all — or, who rang that bell? *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 1(1), pp. 41-67.
- Pryzwansky, W.B. (1989). School consultation: Some considerations from a cognitive psychology perspective. *Professional School Psychology*, 4(1). pp. 1-14.
- Skrtic, T.M. (1991). *Behind Special Education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization*. Denver: Love Publishing Co.

Thousand, J.S. and R.A. Villa. (1991). A futuristic view of the REI: A response to Jenkins, Pious, and Jewell. *Exceptional Children*, 57(6) pp. 556-562.

Thousand, J.S. and R.A. Villa. (in press,b). Collaborative teams: A powerful tool in school restructuring. In R.Villa, J. Thousand, W. Stainback and S. Stainback, (Eds.). *Restructuring for Heterogeneity: An administrative handbook for creating effective schools for everyone*. Baltimore: Paul H.Brookes Pub. Co.

Villa, R.A., J.S. Thousand, P. Paolucci-Whitcomb and A. Nevin. (1990). In search of new paradigms for collaborative consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 1(2). pp. 279-292.

West, J.F. (1990). Educational collaboration in the restructuring of schools. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 1(1), pp. 23-40.

West, J.F. and L. Idol. (1987). School consultation (part 1): An interdisciplinary perspective on theory, models, and research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 20(7). pp. 388-494.

Chapter 13

Student to Student Curriculum and the Development of Peer Relationships

by Julie Stone and Charlotte Campbell

In four years as consultants for the integration of students with a mental handicap, we have had the opportunity to observe, analyze and compare many classrooms. We have found that the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classes has been most effective in schools where supportive and interdependent relationships between students have been successfully developed. In fact, many teachers and parents are beginning to realize that one of the basic reasons for including students with disabilities in schools and classrooms is so they can be supported in building relationships.

Weebster's dictionary defines a relationship as the state or condition that exists between people or groups of people who deal with one another. In schools, students spend most of the day interacting with the curriculum and with each other. Teachers have found that curriculum and regular classroom activities operate as a springboard for the learning necessary for students to form relationships and become happy and successful in their adult lives.

FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL INTEGRATION

We have identified many important factors which contribute to the success of integration: the belief that all students are capable of learning; the day-to-day modelling of effective leadership; an in-school approach to problem solving; and the inclusion of parents in the planning process. These are contributing factors; they set the stage for integration. They do not, however, guarantee the same quality of learning and the increased social relationships which exist in classrooms where teachers deliberately plan for peer interaction and for participation of students with disabilities in regular curriculum activities.

SUPPORT IN BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS

The Importance of Friendships

Full inclusion in the integrated school depends on the recognition that supporting students to build relationships with their peers is a critical aspect of school life. Teachers who have had experience in integrating students with disabilities acknowledge that students who are accepted, liked and involved with their peers show gains in academic, social and physical development.

Students who have spent years in segregated, "handicapped only" settings have been

denied opportunities to form the social relationships enjoyed by their non-handicapped peers. Depending on the nature of the student's disabilities, relationships formed in special classes tend to be adult-child rather than child-child relationships. They are dependent relationships rather than friendships born of mutual interest, attraction, or common skills. Relationships formed in segregated settings also tend to be one-sided helping relationships that are usually not reciprocal in nature. Teachers help students, but there is little possibility for students to help teachers or peers.

While teacher-student relationships are important, educators and parents have realized the importance of student-student relationships.

Teachers in integrated settings realize that in order to compensate for the lack of opportunities for students with disabilities to form relationships with non-handicapped peers, situations must be set up in the classroom to encourage and teach disabled and non-disabled learners to interact.

The skills for working in groups, solving problems and tolerating differences can be learned by all students if they are invited to participate in classroom learning activities. We have observed that teachers have created a variety of ways to encourage such relationships.

DEVELOPING STUDENT-TO-STUDENT INTERACTION

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is an effective strategy that provides opportunities for students with disabilities to participate and build relationships with their non-disabled peers. Cooperative learning involves structuring learning tasks so that students work together in small groups to achieve shared academic goals (Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson and Skon, 1981). Students are accountable and responsible for their own achievement, as well as for the performance of the other members of their group. They also practise social roles as they work to solve problems, learn new material or create projects and documents.

Incentives are built into cooperative learning activities to encourage children in the group to work together to teach each other components of the lesson. By using criterion-referenced evaluation, teachers can modify and individualize goals to fit certain students' abilities without jeopardizing evaluation for the group (Campbell, Campbell, Collicott, Perner and Stone, 1988).

Teachers who regularly use the principles of cooperative learning report that it is a powerful tool in teaching children to respect and get along with each other and in improving the social and academic climate of the classroom. One teacher explains:

We worked in groups often. In these groups, no matter what, there was always something that Dennis could do successfully, whether it was describing pictures, repeating words or role-playing. It did not take long for the other students to become adept at creating ways Dennis could actively participate in their group. Their ideas and suggestions often far surpassed my own.

— *Bagnell, 1989*

Research has shown that cooperative learning results in higher achievement and greater retention of what is learned than do traditional competitive or individual learning situations (Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson and Skon, 1981). Other benefits, substantiated by research, include increased student persistence in learning a task, more intrinsic motivation, higher levels of self-esteem, acquisition of stronger collaborative skills, development of positive peer relationships that extend beyond cooperative learning activities, and the promotion of helping, sharing behaviours.

As one teacher realized, it is necessary to give students many opportunities throughout the day to share and explore ideas and bond together. Curriculum is naturally a common subject of discussion:

September came and all my children arrived. Events went very smoothly. I felt I was meeting the needs of all my children. I breathed a sigh of relief; all was going well. However, around the end of October I became vaguely dissatisfied with the learning of my special needs child. She was in my class, but was she truly a part of the class? Finally, I modified all her subjects to fit in with the rest of the class; whatever we did, she did.

I had not been doing this because my special needs child had little or no speech. When we all began doing the same subjects, she began to respond to the other children, making more attempts to communicate verbally with them.

I still wasn't satisfied. Things were going well, but my special needs child was still not interacting enough with other children. Also, some of my other students were beginning to show very serious problems. They needed more of my time.

Then one day in Woodstock I was introduced to cooperative learning. The workshop was exiting. I felt that I had a partial solution to my problems in the classroom. This strategy made sense. There are a lot of things you need to learn about cooperative learning, but basically it is students helping students strive toward an academic goal. Not only academic skills but social skills are taught and evaluated.

It took awhile to set up the cooperative lessons, but when they began they were exciting. The children were working together in groups, responsible for their own learning as well as others' learning. It was amazing to see children on their knees in their chairs, working through problems or discussing different topics. Now it was really hard work to pick out my special needs child. She was part of the class, working along with the other children, sometimes with an aide, sometimes with me, but mostly with the children. She was well on her way to becoming independent as well as interdependent.

— *McManus, 1989*

In addition to using lessons to promote the development of relationships, teachers have been creative in devising ways to weave support from other professionals into the fabric of everyday classroom activities and student routines (Giangreco, York and Rainforth, 1989).

Through problem solving with other professionals, parents and peers, teachers work towards physical and recreational goals in ways that, at the same time, encourage the student's inclusion in the mainstream.

One teacher explained how Aidan, a student in Grade 5 who was seriously injured in a car accident, is encouraged by his peers to use his right hand to raise his weak left hand when he wants to ask a question or make a comment to the teacher or his classmates. It takes him a little longer, his teacher observes, but it is a natural way of practising the stretching motion needed to maintain muscle tone in his weak arm. Classmates nearby remind Aidan to sit up straight throughout the class by gently taping his back when he forgets and slouches in his seat. His classmates know that Aidan's dream is to walk again and are thrilled to be able to help in any way they can. One of his friends wrote:

When he said his biggest dreams are to be able to walk and drive a car, I felt like jumping up and saying, “I’m with you all the way Aidan”, because I want to help him. Is there any way I can help Aidan?

— *McLaughlin, 1989*

If Aidan had been sent to therapy outside of the classroom for this exercise, he would have missed the opportunity for peer encouragement and interaction that being in the classroom afforded him (Giangreco, Edelman and Dennis, 1990). His non-handicapped peers would have missed an opportunity to witness first-hand Aidan’s determination and his struggle to regain his strength. Aidan provided a good role model for his peers, and the teacher provided a natural vehicle for peer relationship development — the regular classroom.

Outside the classroom, teachers, parents and other students can find ways to involve the student in as many school activities as desired. Through intramural activities, clubs and informal school groups, students with disabilities have opportunities to become an integral part of the recreational and social life of the school.

They have the chance to form and maintain valuable peer relationships with their non-handicapped schoolmates.

Peer Tutoring

Another way teachers are encouraging students to form relationships while assisting in each other’s learning is through peer tutoring. Teachers use this strategy effectively in many learning situations throughout the school day. The simplest approach is a system of peer partners who help each other in a variety of ways: reviewing rote material; preparing for a spelling test; learning math; or working together to correct each other’s assignments and edit essays. Peer partners can help each other synthesize and assimilate new material; for example, they can work together summarizing and sharing key points in a text.

Teachers also use the peer partner system to motivate and encourage students to try new things or to expand limited skills. One example we observed involved a young student named Donnie in a Grade 4 classroom. Donnie sat with a peer at a table. The peer was doing an exercise in his math notebook while Donnie manipulated some plastic blocks placed on his desk by the teacher. The peer used the blocks for assistance in solving equations while Donnie used them to develop fine motor control, and to see and touch number groups.

At first, Donnie knocked the blocks off the table and his peer partner bent and picked them up, arranging them in a pattern. Donnie ignored the blocks. The peer picked up a block and showed Donnie how to open it. He showed Donnie the small plastic toy inside. The peer encouraged Donnie to pull open the block by himself. Donnie pushed the blocks away. Donnie’s peer then took a Cheezie from a bag in his desk, showed it to

Donnie and hid it inside the block. Donnie struggled to open the block and, when successful, ate the treat.

The peer then showed him two blocks. “I have two blocks now, Donnie,” he told him. “I’m going to put the Cheezie in one of them.”

“See if you can get it out.” In Donnie’s full view, the peer placed one of the treats inside one of the blocks. Donnie chose the correct block immediately, struggled to open it, and seized his prize. The game continued for several minutes. As Donnie struggled to open the block each time, the peer-carried on with his own work.

The peer then took the two blocks and, holding them out of Donnie’s sight under the desk, placed a Cheezie in one of the blocks and placed the two blocks back on the table. Donnie tried to open the blocks as the peer carried on with his work Donnie was successful and his peer gave him a smile and a thumbs-up signal. Donnie smiled broadly as he enjoyed his prize.

Cross-Age Tutoring

Some teachers successfully employ cross-age tutors — older students who assist younger students with their work. Older students may read to their young peers, listen to them read, or assist them with story writing or math. Although this technique requires more time to set up because teachers are needed to assist tutors in preparing activities and presentation strategies, teachers remark that the result is well worth the effort. Tutoring gives older students the opportunity to analyze and think through a particular skill or activity at a deeper level than they would ordinarily. Teachers remark that students are often better than teachers at explaining an idea or procedure because young people relate so well to one another.

Cross-age tutoring also provides excellent opportunities for students who are experiencing learning difficulties themselves to support and help other schoolmates. The tutoring provides older students with opportunities to practise certain lessons and to be on the giving side of a relationship during school. Teachers using this technique remark on how it benefits the tutors’ self-esteem and how this feeling carries over into their general self-confidence.

Peer Modelling

Another powerful technique which requires less preparation than peer tutoring is peer modelling. In this situation, a student models for another classmate how to perform an activity or skill. For example, one student might show his classmate with a disability how to use a pencil sharpener, play a cassette player, or find his way to the next class. Sometimes, the teacher first needs to model the procedure for the nondisabled student. Often, however, students spontaneously initiate and devise clever ways to encourage a peer to take part in a myriad of activities.

A high school computer teacher described how a capable student voluntarily spent

time in class with Todd, a nonverbal and overly timid classmate. Todd was often observed standing back from the other students with his arms held up tight against his chest, wringing his hands. The student worked with Todd, teaching him how to use a simple computer program. As weeks passed and opportunities for exchanges between Todd and his computer partner were maximized, Todd's classmates noticed him showing more interest in communicating with and being around other students and teachers during the day. He still stood apart from his peers often, but he now exhibited a more relaxed body posture. The speech pathologists and teachers then reviewed their efforts to encourage Todd in his attempts to speak, identifying additional strategies to build his new-found confidence. Meanwhile, the computer student was challenged by her involvement with Todd. On her own, she designed several other computer programs for him, which were later entered in the district Science Fair.

CREATING TIME AND SPACE FOR FRIENDSHIPS

Teachers who realize the importance of peer friendships for students with disabilities capitalize on the many opportunities for interaction that naturally arise during the course of the school day.

They have learned that there is very little possibility for the formation of relationships if students are not in close proximity to one another for a reasonable length of time.

Students who merely visit classrooms for short periods of time have less chance of forming relationships than do those who spend the best part of the day with other students. Teachers have argued that students who are removed from the regular class for remediation frequently miss out on important moments of the day. They question whether what is learned outside the classroom is as valuable as what is missed. This has led classroom teachers to collaborate with resource room teachers on devising ways to incorporate individual instruction within the regular class structure.

Rubbing Elbows

Teachers are also finding that seating arrangements influence the opportunities for students to interact with one another. Seating a student at the side or back of the room, as often happens in order to accommodate the teacher's assistant, does not create the same proximity as seating the student with a handicap in the midst of his peers. Having a student with a disability in a position to rub elbows with the other students makes it more difficult for the teacher and peers to inadvertently "overlook" him or her. A close seating arrangement also provides natural opportunities for neighbouring students to interact during the day.

In the case of Patrick, a Grade 3 student who was unable to talk, the teacher moved his desk from the side of the room where he sat with the teacher assistant, to the middle of the second row. She observed that students near him began to duplicate his communication gestures in order to initiate an interaction with him. When he began to respond to their initiations with smiles, squeals and gestures, the students were so

excited that their initiations escalated. They then began to invite him to be partner in line as they got ready for class movement, recess and music.

They also began to run and play with him in the playground at noon and recess time. This interaction was made possible because the teacher realized that having Patrick off to the side kept him apart and special, and placed barriers between him and his classmates. The teacher also realized that having an adult between Patrick and the students also created a barrier, so she instructed the teacher assistant to move about the classroom and assist other students as well. This illustration also points out the importance of reciprocity. If Patrick had not responded in some way to the initiations of his peers, their attempts at interaction would have diminished over time.

A Means of Communicating

Teachers are now exploring ways of promoting communication among students in the classroom. Non-disabled students are learning how to use communication boards, gestures and signs, computerized devices and eye contact to help students who are unable to talk to their peers.

One teacher gave a student who uses an adaptive device an opportunity to teach her classmates about its unique characteristics. Mary, a senior high school student who has multiple handicaps, uses her eyes and a specially designed communication board to make her needs known. She made a presentation to several high school classes about the organization of her board and about how she used it to gain some control over her life. Mary became the teacher for a time and, as a result of her lesson, the students became interested in other forms of communicative devices. They also were able to see Mary from a different perspective. She was no longer a person of mystery, but another teenager with a unique way of talking to her peers. Her teacher had created a way to highlight Mary's abilities and to show that her desire to communicate her ideas and dreams was the same as that of her fellow teens.

Assigning Tasks

Patrick's teacher also created ways for Patrick to assist his peers in their work in order that he could reciprocate the assistance he received from them. Each student had a personal notebook which they wrote in everyday. The teacher pasted a picture of the owner on each notebook and Patrick, who could not read, could then identify the picture, match the picture to the person, and pass the notebooks out to his classmates. He was also able to lend crayons and glue and other things he had in his desk to a classmate who had learned to sign with him. Not only was Patrick able to reciprocate conventional greetings and help in the classroom, he was practising some of his individual academic goals as well, which included signing, matching and student identification. Behavioural goals such as moving quietly around the class and passing out books without pushing, prodding or hitting were also being practised and achieved.

Jane, a student in Grade 5 who could speak in short phrases but who could not read or write, was involved in a Scrabble game the teacher devised to assist students in

practising spelling and vocabulary words. The teacher explained to the group that Jane was allowed to place up to five letters around an existing word on the gameboard even though she could not really spell. The student to her right would ask her what word she had created before tallying her score. In this way, Jane was involved in the vocabulary of the classroom and she was expected to learn. She was also made a vital part of the classroom culture because the curriculum became a vehicle to highlight her thoughts and interests, which she revealed in the words she chose. This set the stage for the development of friendships.

The teacher observed that Jane's in-class relationships were carried over into the playground. Even though Jane was fairly unstable on her feet, she was invited to jump rope by the students in her class. Several of the students demonstrated for her and then took great pains to make sure that she got over the rope.

By slowing the rope down as it neared the ground, Jane could step over it without becoming twisted in it and falling down.

Jane and the students kept count of her successful steps, and Jane's turn terminated when she failed to step cleanly over the rope. Then, much to Jane's surprise, she was required to swing the rope for the other players. This also turned out to be an excellent form of physical therapy for Jane. The relationship among the students had been fostered in the classroom by the teacher's skill in revealing the thoughts and interests of the students. It has also been fostered by the teacher's trust in the student's ability and willingness to adjust to one another after the first stages of the relationship had been modelled and encouraged.

Friendship Circles

People have found friendship circles (Snow and Forest, 1987) to be an effective way of building relationships among children or young people. To form a friendship circle, students who are interested in being involved in the life of a fellow student are brought together on a team. With the guidance of an interested and sensitive adult, these students help make decisions and plans for and with the individual. They become involved with the student on a personal basis both inside and outside the school. They brainstorm ways of including the student in their own and other social circles. They identify barriers that prevent the student from participating in a particular setting or activity and then work together to break the barriers down.

This is not a “specialfriendsproject” or a “buddy system” for “unfortunate” students, or a chance for students to do a good deed for the day. The circle of friends is a network that allows for the genuine involvement of children in a friendship, caring, and support role with their peers.

— ***Forest and Lusthaus, 1989***

Circles meet regularly to plan outings and activities and to discuss the things they have

learned about themselves and others. Just as real friendships grow, evolve and change, teachers have found that the composition and personality of friendship circles change over time. This fluidity is expected and allowed. Teachers involved in successful friendship circles are aware of the natural ebb and flow of affection, attention and activity. They note, however, that a core of students usually stays together for long periods of time, which attests to the permanence and mutuality of the friendships created.

AVOIDING PRECONCEPTIONS ABOUT FRIENDSHIP

Teachers and parents voice their concern that, despite inschool successes, a young person with a disability usually does not have “real friends”. As one high school teacher summarized:

For all that Doug is involved in the life and activities of the school, with all the friends and acquaintances he has here, after school he goes home and sits in front of the TV ... rarely does he go out; rarely does anyone call.

— *Young, 1990*

Both parents and teachers express dismay that outside school hours their children and young people spend long inactive periods of time without seeing anyone outside their immediate families or the paid professionals in their lives. Isolation, loneliness and boredom are still realities for many. When people with disabilities talk about their lives and what is missing, they repeatedly point to the difficulty of building and maintaining lasting friendships. They talk about the need to feel that their lives touch others in important ways, and the need to know that their existence makes a positive difference. The physical and social barriers imposed by society, which for years separated and devalued people with disabilities, are hard to break down.

Building ongoing friendships that extend outside school and into the neighbourhood has been a challenge for teachers and families. Part of the challenge is that friendship cannot be defined, analyzed, predicted or assigned like school work.

Friendship is like sex: we always suspect there is some secret technique we don't know about.

— *Pogrebin, 1987*

Friendship can only be encouraged by setting up opportunities for matches to form.

Difficult as it is to define friendship, it is easy to describe why friendships are important and how they enrich our lives. They help us stretch beyond our families; they help children rehearse adult roles; they are a haven from stress and they demystify strange and inappropriate behaviour (Perske, 1988). As one youngster

commented,

Your friends will like you even when you act like a jerk.

— *There's Always Belinda*, 1989

Friendships expand our world and our perspectives; they are attractive and generate their own energy; friendships are freely chosen and voluntary; they are mutual and reciprocal, coming and going with intensity varying over time. Friendships have their ups and downs, joys and pains, laughter and tears (Pogrobin, 1987).

Some teachers become discouraged and doubtful when searching for ways to help a student with disabilities make friends. They feel that “real” friendships cannot exist between disabled and non-disabled people and that efforts to encourage friendships are staged and phoney.

In actual fact, adults can overlook or misinterpret relationships that exist between disabled and non-disabled students. We must be careful not to impose a stereotypical image of how friendships should look and therefore devalue budding friendships that have non-traditional features. There have been some remarkable friendships between disabled and non-disabled students.

Teachers in one school were truly amazed to hear about a student’s efforts to visit his friend with a disability who was in the hospital struggling with a life-threatening condition.

The two students had spent time together in school during noon hours and they shared a few classes together. Although one of them had difficulty speaking and often engaged in echolalia (the involuntary repetition of a word or sentence just spoken by another person), the friends had obviously found other ways to communicate their feelings, interests and thoughts.

Some teachers had seen the relationship as one-sided and felt that the non-disabled student was being charitable. When it was discovered that the non-disabled student had hitchhiked fifty kilometres in the middle of a Christmas cold snap, wearing only a light jacket with a broken zipper, to see his friend in the hospital, the adults took the friendship more seriously.

CONCLUSION

Teachers who use the various strategies outlined above to encourage peer relationships know that full integration will only occur when students interact comfortably with one another both in school and in the community. Since most of the hours of a student’s day are spent in school, teachers can use curriculum and school activities as a vehicle to encourage and maintain friendship.

Proximity and reciprocity are important in setting the stage for interactions. In order for people to form relationships, they must be in the same place for a reasonable length of time.

And if a student's gestures of friendship are repeatedly ignored, he or she may stop trying to interact. The onus is on the teacher to encourage students with disabilities to respond and to inspire non-handicapped students to persevere and search for responses which might otherwise be overlooked. Eye and head movements, position changes, smiles and gestures are sometimes the only way a person has of responding to his or her peers.

Human beings present particular personality traits and specific interests or skills which make them attractive to one another.

It is important for teachers to highlight these qualities in their daily work with students.

We have witnessed relationships form and flourish in the classroom and, in some cases, extend beyond the boundaries of the school. In order for this to happen, interaction between students and relationship building must be modelled and taught. Our experience shows that curriculum and classroom activities provide the best opportunities for the elements of peer relationships to fall naturally into place.

REFERENCES

Bagnell, B. (1989). My experience with integration. In M. Leavitt (Ed.). *Teaching All Children: Stories in the classroom*. Fredericton, N.B.: Department of Education, pp.17-21.

Campbell, C., S. Campbell, J. Collicott, D. Perner and J. Stone. (1988). Individualizing instruction. *Education New Brunswick*, 3, pp. 17-20.

Forest, M. and E. Lusthaus. (1989). Promoting educational equality for all students: Circles and MAPS. In W. Stainback, S. Stainback and M. Forest (Eds). *Educating All Students in the Mainstream of Regular Education*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co., pp. 29-42.

Giangreco, M.F., J. York and B. Rainforth. (1989). Providing related services to learners with severe handicaps in educational settings: Pursuing the least restrictive alternative. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*. 1(2). pp. 55-63.

Giangreco, M.F., S. Edelman and R. Dennis. (1990). Common professional practices which interfere with the integrated delivery of related services. *Remedial and Special Education*. 12(2). PP. 16-24.

Johnson, D., G. Maruyama, R. Johnson, D. Nelson and L. Skon. (1981). *The Effects of Cooperative, Competitive and Individualistic Goal Structures on Achievement: A*

metanalysis. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Mclaughlin, E. (1989). Aidan and his friends. In M. Leavitt (Ed.). *Teaching All Children: Stories in the classroom*. Fredericton, N.B.: Department of Education, pp. 10-13.

McManus, J. (1989). Integration Experiences. In M. Leavitt (Ed). *Teaching All Children: Stories in the Classroom*. Fredericton, N.B.: Department of Education, pp. 31-32.

Pogrebin, L. (1987). *Among Friends: Who we like, why we like them, and what do we do with them*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Perske, R. (1988). *Circles of Friends*. Burlington, Ontario: Welsh Publishing Company Inc.

Snow, J. and M. Forest. (1987). Circles. In M. Forest (Ed). *More Education Integration*. Downsview, Ont.: The G. Allan Roeher Institute.

There's Always Belinda. (1989). Video produced for the Ontario Association for Community Living by CSA Video Communications, Toronto, Ontario.

Chapter 14

Beyond Behaviour: A Case of Social Intervention Strategies for a Student With Challenging Behaviours

by Brian Kelly and Jeff den Otter

As the integration of students with special needs has developed, people have come to realize that, in order to be successful, an integrated structure must be built on three components: physical factors, curricular factors and social factors. Social factors affecting strategies of inclusion are a unique challenge and they need attention equal to that given to curricular and physical concerns. In the following pages we describe the strategies used to increase the social integration of a girl who has extremely challenging behaviours. Her example illustrates the fact that effective intervention strategies can improve the relationships and the lives of all children with special needs.

SUE

This is the story of Sue, a young girl with special needs who had been attending her neighbourhood school for four years. Even in a school district with a five-year history of inclusion, Sue was considered an exception because of her extremely challenging behaviours. And despite the regular classroom setting, there were concerns that her life differed too much from that of her peers.

However, Sue's story illustrates that children with extremely challenging behaviours can be fully integrated into the regular classroom. It is an example of effective intervention strategies put in place to make a real qualitative improvement in her relationships.

In finding effective approaches for Sue we came to see that the strategies became a spark which made people re-evaluate other people and their capabilities. The strategies we chose were Supportive Peer Relations and Gentle Teaching. Both of these involved inviting children and adults to participate in the social inclusion of Sue.

SUPPORTIVE PEER RELATIONSHIPS

Philosophy

In order for children to develop, they must be involved in relationships. Through relationships they acquire, by direct learning and adoption of social roles, the attitudes, values, roles, competencies, and ways of perceiving the world that are shared by their families, schools and communities. Children who are not involved in caring and supportive relationships tend to become increasingly alienated and disconnected from

people and activities in their families, schools and societies.

Fostering peer relationships is one means of promoting meaningful interdependence. Peer relationships can provide feelings of support, belonging, acceptance and caring. They give the opportunity to acquire appropriate social roles, and they provide the sensitivity required to build and maintain meaningful relationships. They enable the internalization of values, attitudes, perspectives and goals needed for responsible decision-making and long-term friendships that will provide assistance in adult life.

In our schools and homes there has been a relative neglect of constructive child-to-child relationships. There is often an adult-centric perspective in which adults are seen as the only people who can support and nurture children who are lonely, challenging or in difficulty.

Similarly, Brendtro and Ness (1983) discussed this phenomenon in schools and the perceived monopoly by adults:

The increasing sophistication of human service professionals has given rise to a myth and the belief that only those with high degrees of training can be effective in teaching or treatment. Although it is commendable that the emerging professions have sought to improve the qualifications of practitioners, this emphasis has sometimes obscured the reality that young people can, and usually do, have more influence on one another than do adults.

Facilitating peer relationships requires building and maintaining supportive and caring relationships in which the person is valued as a separate and unique individual, regardless of the perceived special need. Having friends who value appropriate behaviour and behave as competent role models is essential for most children, adolescents and young adults. In contrast, being isolated from peers is one of the major symptoms of psychological distress. Psychological distress can be the result of isolation (i.e., streaming students) or it can cause the isolation (i.e., students who become lonely because of a lack of social skills). Influencing the peer group may be one of the most important actions adults can take to ensure that children who are distressed have an opportunity to become successful and competent members of their peer groups.

Children with disabilities typically have not had the opportunity to experience or develop a range of social relationships with their peers:

as a result, they spend inordinate amounts of time in solitary activities; they spend excessive amounts of time with adult family members and paid caregivers who almost become unnaturally intrusive in their lives.

— *Brown et al, 1989*

If a group of peers does not include a child with a disability in their relationships,

adults usually take responsibility for replacing the peer group. But adults are inappropriate role models. What is work for adults is normal activity for children.

The regular classroom is an important place for healthy, inclusive peer relationships to develop. Children who are disabled need support in developing relationships, and nondisabled children need support in accepting their peers who have disabilities. Teachers can play a key role in ensuring that these relationships develop.

Involving the Children

There is a reawakening interest in using students as a positive influence on the behaviour or learning of their peers. Adults are usually surprised to discover that children are capable of performing many functions that were once thought to be the exclusive province of adults. Giving youth more responsibility in our schools is an untapped resource that offers great potential for innovation. Research on instructional strategies such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring has demonstrated the advantages of making students more responsible for mutual learning.

Another means of facilitating peer interdependence and responsibility is to have students, as a group, intentionally make a commitment to help a peer with special needs. This recently developed form of structured peer involvement has come to be known as a peer support group or “circle of friends” (Perske and Perske, 1988).

ASPECTS OF SUE’S ALIENATION

Behavioural Barriers

At the time of our involvement, Sue was a twelve-year-old girl in Grade 5. She attended a junior high school in a small, rural town. Sue was fortunate in many respects. She had been in an integrated school since kindergarten and she lived at home with her family. Her teachers made efforts to identify her individual needs and to provide supports and resources so that she could prosper within her classroom.

Still, Sue’s schooling had a history of challenges. Sue was known as a person who had an inclination to hurt others by matching, kicking or hitting. She was sometimes self-abusive and, at times, engaged in self-stimulating behaviours. Sue’s behaviours prevented her from taking part in meaningful social activities and real learning situations. They also got in the way of any natural interactions that Sue might have had with her peers or with adults.

Few people understood the communicative function of Sue’s behaviour. Her outbursts or temper tantrums were seen as the behaviour of a person who was different, or as a symptom of her disobedience or lack of control. Factors such as her behaviour, and the school’s fear of injury to other students and disruption to the class, led to measures which kept her from her peers.

In an attempt to help her cope, Sue was given an aide. She was often seen with her

aide, studying during class time or playing solitary games during recess or lunch. Someone was always close by keeping an eye on her. Sue was being looked after, but rarely was there any interaction between herself and her teacher or her neighbouring peers.

Having an aide for Sue was a mixed blessing. Over the short term, the aide was helping to deal with immediate concerns such as Sue's tutoring, general welfare and behaviour. But over the long term, the aide's presence seemed to further distance Sue from those around her.

A cyclical pattern began to emerge where Sue's behaviour required support, than the support alienated Sue further from her peers, which escalated the intensity of her outbursts, which required tighter measures, which further alienated her, and so on. It became evident that while Sue attended her neighbourhood school with her regular peers, she was alone; her life paralleled the lives of her peers but rarely intersected with them.

Factors in the School Structure

The school environment was also a factor in her lack of friendship. The school was perceived as a place where Sue was to learn new skills and demonstrate appropriate behaviour while in a learning environment. These are important objectives for all students. However, for Sue, these skills and behaviours were being taught without the benefit of friendships to provide the impetus, motivation or relevancy needed to make them seem important or desirable to her. When children work or play with one another, they imitate each other's behaviour and identify with friends possessing admired competencies or skills. As a result, they provide each other with powerful models of appropriate and inappropriate behaviour.

Our schools seem to play down the importance of peer relationships, which are mainly relegated to extracurricular activities. In most classrooms, students work alone, doing seatwork or listening to the teacher's instruction. Students' attempts to interact in groups are considered disruptive to the learning environment. Similarly, there is no instruction in the social skills necessary for interacting effectively with peers. These skills have not been considered pedagogically useful for learning.

Much of this can be attributed to the way our schools have been set up. Until quite recently schools have been institutions where skills were learned in a rigid, assembly-line fashion. The teachers role was to impart knowledge to the students. Similarly, there were clearly defined roles for other school personnel; for example, teacher's aides are clearly distinguished from attendants.

Current educational philosophy supports the need for interaction and collaboration — not only between students but between students and school personnel as well — in order for meaningful learning to occur. According to Skrtic (1988) the school is seen as an "adhocracy" where collaboration among all staff and students

results in students learning facts as well as social skills, problem solving and creative thinking.

SUE'S SUPPORT GROUP

Talking to Sue's Class

To include Sue as a member of her class required the acceptance and efforts of her homeroom teacher, classmates and school. Sue's teacher voiced the concern that his other students would lose out through their efforts to help Sue. He saw student involvement as something that would take away from their academic and extracurricular time. Also from a more traditional viewpoint, the need for student participation was considered unnecessary because the teacher's aide had been hired to fulfil the school's and Sue's needs.

We held a class meeting as the first step in involving Sue's peers. We began by sensitizing them to what integration is and why it is in everyone's best interest to include students with special needs in our classrooms, schools and communities. We discussed the fact that, only seven years ago, students with needs similar to Sue's were sent away from their families or were educated in separate classrooms or were given no education.

One student spoke up and said that she had "an uncle who was mentally handicapped — he's older now and harder to handle. That's why Sue needs our help now." It quickly became apparent that Sue's classmates already knew why they should include her.

We asked the students if they thought Sue now belonged to their class. Unanimously, they indicated that she did not, but that she was someone who spent a lot of time in the resource room. When asked how they thought they could start including Sue, one boy said, "Saying hello in the morning."

We asked, "What sort of things do you think Sue likes to do outside in the playground?" The children said, "Climbing, piggybacking, swinging, slidingng, playing with Puppets, having other people besides her aide or teacher with her."

We asked what things the students could do in the classroom with Sue. They said, "Learning her numbers and letters, cutting things out, crafts, picture cards, puzzles." We questioned them on activities Sue could do with them and they replied, "Read, help her with her work, read to her, draw with her, have one of us with her each day, write on the blackboard."

When invited to help Sue with these activities, all but two of the children volunteered to help. We stressed during the meeting that they were not to feel pressured into helping but that if they wanted to make the commitment, they should consider it to last the whole school year. We picked six students arbitrarily to help support Sue at school.

Within a few days of the meeting, it was apparent that these students had commitments which sometimes took them away from Sue. If students were going to help her, it would require all the children in the class.

We worried about initiating this process because, while we were committed to the group, we were responsible for maintaining safety and order in the school. Sue was known to strike out at those around her. With the other children in Sue's class, we discussed their ability to identify Sue's signs of anger. The students spoke of ways to deflate a potential incident and to minimize the chances of getting hurt, and of what to do if they felt things were getting out of hand.

Most of the students admitted that they found it upsetting when Sue got out of control. Twenty-one of the twenty-five students indicated that they were concerned about her anger but didn't want to change their commitment to Sue.

As a follow-up to our planning session, a note went to parents commending their child for supporting a student in their class. We had an ulterior motive for sending the note. We anticipated some resistance from parents, given Sue's history within the community. Moreover, we wanted to communicate that this was something which the school valued and which was important as part of the regular curriculum. In the note, parents were asked that if they had any concerns about their child's participation they should contact the school. Not one parent phoned to indicate that they had any concerns.

Later in the year, I asked a few students how their parents felt about them helping Sue when it was known that she could hurt others. They told me that their parents told them "to be careful" and "to just watch out."

As part of our support to the students we felt it important to give them an opportunity to discuss on a routine basis how things were going. We usually met in the cafeteria at lunchtime for these discussions and Sue usually joined us. The talk never focused on Sue unless the students were asked direct questions about how things were going. Right from the first meeting we could see that it was intuitive for the students to include Sue but it required leadership on our part to get it started.

Advocacy and Growth Among the Students

As groups usually do, this one took on a personality of its own over the weeks. One of the interesting developments was the emergence of leaders. Kerri Ann, even at her young age, made astute observations about Sue's program and seemed to instigate many positive changes. For example, Kerri noted that the aide or teachers didn't seem to be giving Sue enough independence. She said that as Sue's support group gained confidence they wanted to take more responsibility for Sue during certain classes such as gym, library or free time. They wanted to play with Sue alone in the school yard, or go to the library and read to her and see if she would reciprocate.

She asked why Sue could not take French, commenting that “all we do in French is repeat words — Sue can do that.” Her observations had an underlying truth which few adults could explain away or discount. Consequently, Sue had opportunities to participate in activities which adults would have considered irrelevant or in conflict with her program. For instance, Sue previously had to miss French so that she would have extra time to get ready to go home on the bus. Kerri felt that Sue was as able as any student to get ready in the allotted ten minutes. And, given the opportunity, Sue was able.

Another student, Scott, also became Sue’s advocate. He seemed to be more in tune with Sue’s needs than other peers. Over the year, he went from being a volunteer to being truly fond of Sue. His commitment to support Sue turned into a friendship. For Scott, the experiences around helping Sue enlarged his vision of friendship and expended his active contribution to the school community.

For some students, being in the support group provided them with a relationship which compensated for some absence in their lives. Each of us has primary relationships with parents or siblings which are a major source of nurturing, love and acceptance. Some students, because of divorce, alcohol abuse, or other situations, have had terrible experiences with some significant relationships. These students often become lonely and attention-seeking. This was the situation for some of the students in Sue’s peer group; they were eager to overcome their limited success with meaningful relationships and become involved again. This seemed to spark their interest in Sue’s group. Over time, other students found the group comfortable to be in.

The commitment made by students generally seen as loners and troublemakers surprised teachers. One teacher said, “I would never believe that this person would ever volunteer to help.”

Changes in Sue’s Life

Sue’s peers were not the only ones to change over the year. Sue’s life changed as well. She went from being alone to having a group of peers who cared about what she was doing every day and who actively participated in making her life better. Sue went from living without many meaningful social interactions to being involved in active friendships.

One student told a story about Sue sharing something she enjoyed. Sue had gone over to this particular student, put her arm around her, and directed her over to where she was listening to some music. The student said, “At the first of the year she did not want me around her. Now she actually enjoys seeing me.” Another student spoke of the changes in Sue. “She has calmed down. I knew her when she was in kindergarten. She has now learned how to treat other people.”

At the some time, there were difficulties over the year. Kevin spoke of Sue coming over to him and hitting him in the face. When we sat and talked about the incident, he

shrugged and said, “I was at the wrong place at the wrong time.” I had expected this experience to frighten him away but it didn’t seem to deter him from resolving to be with Sue. We learned later from his parents that because of Kevin’s acceptance of Sue they did not contact the school about the incident. Previously, this incident would have called into question whether or not Sue would have been allowed to stay in the school. Having a peer advocate for her changed the parent’s perception of the seriousness of the incident. In turn, the parents did not demand that the school mediate the situation. The bonds of friendship brought out Sue’s positive attributes which made the student want to mediate on her behalf. If she was identified only as a hitter or a kicker the student may have wanted the school to deal with the behaviour.

We came to realize that before the students became involved, Sue’s behaviour would have resulted in students staying away from her while adults intervened. It became obvious that peers, by becoming involved, looked past her behaviour to see her as a person who had a bad temper.

As the year progressed students, instead of moving away from Sue when she was angry, drew close. When Sue was frustrated with work, they would provide encouragement. When she was angry they would stand near her. They had learned that being close helped her and, as one student joked, “If she went to hit you, she couldn’t hit as hard in close.” Consequently, it was not unusual to see a group of kids around Sue as they walked the busy corridors to their next class.

At the end of the year, we interviewed some of the students who had been with Sue. From these discussions some common themes emerged:

1. The students liked making a commitment to Sue. Out of the twenty-five students who started, only two left the group. The students in the support group saw students who were not in the group as outsiders. When asked if they felt it was a job they had to do, students replied, “No, it wasn’t. We were doing something for her,” and “No, it was like being with anyone else in the class”.
2. They felt that they were contributors to Sue and their class. Students felt they were not asked often enough to help other students in school. “We could do a lot more if we were given the chance,” one student said. “My mother says that I am good with other kids. It’s something that I already have.”
3. Most of the students derived satisfaction from their relationship with Sue. Her peers described the experience as “fun because you get to laugh with Sue about things.” Another student drew satisfaction from the experience, saying, “It’s nice when she says your name.” Students commented on feeling bad when they were away from school or had other commitments which prevented them from being with Sue.
4. Students got to know others better. Initially, the group came together to help Sue but in the process they got to know each other better. For instance, at first Scott

described Eric as a goof and the class clown. But as they spent time together because of Sue, he came to see that Eric was actually quite serious.

GUIDELINE FOR DEVELOPING PEER GROUPS

Peer groups are as unique as the individual students in them. There is no one way of forming groups, but here are some points worth consideration:

1. Students need to be asked to participate in solving problematic situations. They quickly learn to become passive in an adult-centred world which tries to solve all their problems for them.
2. The class may need to be involved in discussions and reach a consensus that there is a problem for one of the students. For someone with special needs it could be an issue of inclusion. For the at-risk student it could be strategies to help the student attend classes. For the student who just moved to the school it can be how to make them feel welcome. By discussing and comparing prior experiences to the current problematic situations, students will come to see that they already know solutions. For example, students can be encouraged to examine how a stranger is made welcome in their home. In the process of decreasing the gap between the way things are and the way they should be, children come up with rich alternate strategies. This process brings out values of equity that the children know about but may never have acted on before. It provides the peer group with a rationale and may benefit all students who lack adequate peer support and inclusion, not just the student in question.
3. There should be a facilitator (generally a teacher) who helps coach students along. In building intentional communities, another term for support groups, John McNight (cited in O'Connell, 1988) calls this person a guide. This is the key person who helps pull things together. The guide is not a director and is not more important than other group members but is someone to help the group put their ideas into practice.
4. The group may need to meet regularly. This can be at lunch or at a special outing. The purpose of the meetings is to structure the group enough, at the beginning, to encourage a sense of unity and a spirit of interaction. The meetings are a forum where people get to know one another better; the group then provides an opportunity to break the rigidity of existing peer cliques and to form new relationships. When people become accustomed to meeting they will continue, generally with little encouragement or direction.

GENTLE TEACHING IN THE CLASSROOM

Total inclusion in Sue's school meant that, at some level, everyone in her school interacted with her. Students, through the peer group, were developing friendships

with Sue, but most adults were uncomfortable working directly with Sue because of her challenging behaviour. As a result, only a few people who had “ways of dealing with her” had developed a relationship with her. Given her challenging behaviour, they were perceived as having some special ability. We needed to give adults a way to develop good relationships with her.

We chose Gentle Teaching (McGee et al, 1987), which presented a set of common strategies to facilitate meaningful dialogue between Sue and those who worked with her in the school. It enabled people to work with Sue to control and redirect her challenging behaviour, which in turn improved their relationships with her.

Dr. John McGee proposed the use of Gentle Teaching as a non-aversive technique for dealing with people who exhibit challenging behaviours. He was brought to Canada by The Roeher Institute to provide alternative approaches to punishment used and accepted in the past to curtail aggressive and self-injurious behaviour. These included the use of cattle prods, noxious substances, and physical and mechanical restraints. Gentle Teaching focuses on three main assumptions:

1. A human being has inherent value that is not contingent upon productivity or behaviour;
2. A person's participation with another person has value that is not linked to, nor contingent upon, the person's ability to complete a structured task;
3. Human interaction is reciprocal in nature and people can be taught a process of reciprocity.

These assumptions are based upon the idea of bonding and friendship that is typified by trust and security. McGee sees bonding and friendship as the bases for a relationship between a person and the caregiver. It is through our relationships with others that we work past a person's challenging behaviour. Our desire for changing a person's behaviour is secondary to the care and respect we have to show for the individual. Developing a trusting relationship is specific to each person and the relationship is not transferable to other caregivers. Each caregiver must make his own bond with the person.

We attended a week-long workshop in Nova Scotia on Gentle Teaching and began to think that Sue could benefit from this alternative approach. It was our hope that by offering a workshop at the school, and by involving the people closely associated with Sue, we might be able to get beyond Sue's aggressive behaviour to a point where we could establish meaningful interactions with her.

Developing Techniques in a Workshop

Our workshop format was modelled after the one in Nova Scotia. A room was designated as the workshop room and for five days Sue, her mother, the teacher, the principal, the teacher's assistants, the collaborating teacher, next year's collaborating

teacher and two school district office consultants assembled and practised together. We began each day by discussing the theory and strategies that are an integral part of Gentle Teaching. Then we planned our agenda for the day, with objectives: how to teach Sue that she was safe with us; that being with us was rewarding and that interacting with us was more enjoyable than driving us away through physical aggression.

At first, the task seemed overwhelming. We needed to convince the teachers that we had something valuable to offer them in terms of changing Sue's situation at school. For the participants, it was difficult to imagine how people could work together when they had different responsibilities and different expectations of what Sue could do. In addition, they were asked to change the way in which they dealt with Sue. This group was not there strictly by choice; they were required to take part. They were being videotaped and assessed by their peers, a process unfamiliar and intimidating to most of them. The workshop would take a week and some people felt this was excessive and unfair to other students who also required attention. How could we justify spending so much time, energy and money on one student?

From the videotape of the first morning's session, during which time we asked people to interact with Sue as they would normally, we were able to discern some of the typical patterns of interaction. Foremost, those who worked with Sue focused on the successful completion of academic tasks. Verbal exchanges with her included encouragement and giving directions and praise for correct responses. Eye contact was minimal and very much task-oriented. Sue, on the other hand, almost always led the activity, doing what she wanted with a given task or material, or refusing to do a task by turning from it or the person, or by escaping to a far corner of the room.

She said, "No, thank you" or "Excuse me, please" to block attempts to engage her in an activity. When these attempts failed, Sue used physical aggression to avoid unwanted interactions.

When changing from one activity to another, Sue almost always ran away from her teachers, and bringing her back meant a physical struggle. Sue would often climb on furniture to the highest point she could reach so that interaction was almost impossible or became a confrontation. She also talked to interrupt and avoid the activity. Sue's attention span was perceived to be short, so that planned activities were usually simple, fast, and changed often.

Our first task, then, was to decide how we as a group were going to change the way we worked with Sue so as to bring about the change we wanted — her willingness to participate in a task. We made several decisions:

1. Tasks would be simple one- or two-step procedures that were not necessarily academic in nature;
2. Each task would encourage Sue to orient herself with the person helping her in

the activity;

3. Verbal praise and encouraging touches would begin as soon as the activity began and end only when the task was completed;
4. If Sue hesitated to engage in the activity, the adult would begin the activity and help Sue participate by placing the materials in her hand;
5. The materials used would be solid objects which could be passed easily from one person to another and which were available in large quantities;
6. The activity would take place wherever Sue happened to be. Having interaction with Sue was most important; where it took place in the classroom was secondary. Should she go to the other side of the room, the materials would be easily transported to her and that is where the teaching would take place;
7. If Sue should hit us as we attempted to engage her, we would protect ourselves by blocking the hits, but no outward attention would be given to the behaviour. We would continue to interact and resume the value-giving, the touches, and the praise with the activity;
8. It was not enough only to give value to Sue, it was important that she learn to reciprocate value to us. Interactions needed to be mutually rewarding. Therefore, gestures such as handshakes and “high fives” would be solicited from Sue periodically throughout the activity;
9. The room arrangement would be altered to cut down on places where Sue could get away from us, and to decrease the number of opportunities to escape interaction. We hoped that by altering the physical layout of the room we would increase the chances of interaction.

The main objectives were decided upon, based on all of the above strategies. Complex tasks which required a great deal of attention were simplified, as the attention required to complete these tasks precluded interaction between Sue and the person working with her. The rate and the animation of the praise given needed to be increased, to impress the message that she was safe and secure with us. The words spoken to her were to give her reason to look at us and anticipate our next action, which would keep the momentum of the interaction going. As previously mentioned, we had to arrange the classroom in a more organized fashion. Unused materials needed to be put away, the furniture needed to be arranged to inhibit her climbing, and we had to pay attention to her tendency to run out of the room.

These strategies were to enable caregivers to interact with Sue and avoid punishing her. They are not new strategies; they are time-tested approaches that have been used by caregivers for years.

The new approaches were tested and the group felt that they had accomplished what

they had set out to do.

They were able to establish a valuing relationship with Sue and decrease the frequency of her aggressive outbursts. In addition, the amount of time spent in positive interaction after the workshop.

Some concerns and questions arose during the workshop. A few people were concerned that we were pushing Sue beyond the limits of her endurance. Initially the valuing was too animated and therefore seemed artificial. The energy required to bring about participation was too great. In addition, the group asked: how meaningful were the activities? Had we eliminated her aggression to the degree hoped for? How would we do Gentle Teaching in the classroom?

The Transition to the Classroom

We had worked with Sue in a setting separate from the classroom, using normal voices and plenty of activity and enthusiasm. Some participants thought that using Gentle Teaching in the classroom would be disruptive and intrusive. However, others argued that past behaviour-management programs, such as taking Sue to time-out, had been disruptive. Despite the doubts, most participants felt that working preventively to establish relationships would, over the long term, lessen the likelihood of disruptions, as opposed to simply reacting and trying to control her outbursts.

Some attention was paid to the setup of the classroom. If classrooms were going to be controlled environments where students sat in rows facing the teacher and were quiet most of the time, then any intervention was going to be a distraction to the class. If classrooms were places where students interacted with each other, then disruption would be less obvious.

Activities during the workshop were geared to Sue's interests and abilities. After the workshop these or similar activities were adapted and used in the daily routine in class. The materials and methods in the training sessions were only a starting point for participation; novel and more complex materials needed to be introduced as soon as meaningful interactions were established.

Contrived activities had to be replaced by activities more academically suited and ageappropriate for the learning of particular students.

One example of how Gentle Teaching strategies could be used in natural situations was given by the methods and resource teacher, an in-school consultant to other teachers (see Chapter 8). When Sue began self-stimulating behaviours the teacher took Sue and two of her peers and began to throw a ball around in a simple game of catch. Sue was valued and redirected from her self-stimulation. This was Gentle Teaching, although at the time the teacher did not recognize it as such. It was a preventive approach rather than a reactionary one.

There is a danger that Gentle Teaching may be seen only as a response to inappropriate

behaviour if it is viewed narrowly as a behaviour modification technique. Gentle Teaching, however, is broader than this. It is an educational approach that should be embedded in the daily interactions between teacher and students.

In retrospect, a one-week investment in developing a new process to deal with students was not excessive, particularly considering the time and resources spent on Sue's challenging behaviour over the years. And if the process worked for Sue, there was a possibility that it would work for other students in her school.

The school developed a cadre of people who were familiar with the process and who could teach their colleagues. It was necessary and beneficial that the principal participated in the process for its continuation in the school. Principals are the educational leaders and typically have great influence on school practices.

A follow-up meeting was planned one week after the workshop. Knowing that this was the first time Gentle Teaching was presented in an educational setting, we felt a need to regroup and discuss how things were going and to address some concerns. The teachers reported that:

1. Sue was talking more in her daily interactions with the teacher;
2. Generally, there was more eye contact;
3. Sue was more interactions with her peers, and making efforts to share things with others;
4. Sue was trying to imitate other students;
5. Sue was smiling more often and more spontaneously than before;
6. The rate of aggression had not changed significantly, but the duration and the intensity of her aggressive behaviour had lessened;
7. Sue had a less glassy-eyed look when she interacted or worked at her lessons. She appeared to be more in touch with what was going on around her.

Sue's mother also pointed out that:

1. Sue was talking much more at home;
2. She participated in skiing, a sport that she was unfamiliar with, and enjoyed herself;
3. She was more cooperative and less belligerent around the house.

Although most observations reported at the meeting were positive, there were some concerns raised:

1. Sue was slapping at people even though this behaviour had not been exhibited for

a time prior to the Gentle Teaching workshop;

2. A month before the workshop, Sue refused to go to the cafeteria to ??est. At the time of the meeting Sue was still eating her lunch in the classroom, rather than in the cafeteria with her peers;
3. Sue had attempted to bite adults in the resource room.

CONCLUSION

There are many questions still to be addressed, but it is an ongoing process. We have learned to examine how we do things and discuss new strategies to cope with the situations that arise over the school year. This contrasts with our expectations of last year when we thought we would somehow fix Sue. We acknowledge that she has behaviours that might change, but will not disappear; on the other hand, the supports in place make her behaviours less frightening.

If we are to make changes that support the existence of a variety of learning styles and abilities within a single classroom, we have to be prepared to change our notions about what is and is not feasible within our classrooms. Gentle Teaching is one method of dispelling the mystique that surrounds problem behaviours. We feel that this strategy is compatible with our philosophy of equity and respect for all students.

Gentle Teaching is an attitudinal stance, but is deeply rooted in good teaching techniques, which involve ensuring success with each learning task as well as full participation and involvement. It is our contention that the process of integration, the changes in methodology needed to nurture it such as inclusion, collaboration, multi-level instruction, and cooperative learning, and the Gentle Teaching philosophy are naturally supportive of one another.

The two approaches used with Sue, Supportive Peer Relationships and Gentle Teaching, have fostered the social inclusion of this most challenging youngster in the regular classroom. They have given her the opportunity for interdependence with her peers and a richer lifestyle than most children like Sue have because of their actions. It is important for her to have friends, rather than being a lonely person defined solely in terms of her behaviour. Similarly, we have increased the network of people who can work with Sue and with each other — teachers, peers and parents. In return, Sue has empowered us by increasing our competency. She has shown us that change is possible and that schools can do more to embrace children regardless of their needs.

REFERENCES

Brendtro, L.K. and A.E. Ness. (1983). *Re-Educating Troubled Youth: Environments for teaching and treatment*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Brown, L., E. Long, A. Udvari-Solner, L. Davis, P. Van Deventer, C. Ahlgren, F. Johnson, L.

Gruenewald and J. Jorgenson. (1989). *The Home School: Why students with severe intellectual disabilities must attend the schools of their brothers, sisters, friends, and neighbours*. JASH, 14(1), pp. 1-7.

McGee, J.J., F.J. Menolascino, D.C. Hobbs and P.E. Menousek. (1987). *Gentle Teaching: non-aversive approach to helping persons with mental retardation*. New York: Human Services Press, Inc.

O'Connell, M. (1988, February). *The Gift of Hospitality: Opening the doors of community life to people with disabilities*. (Available from Mary O'Connell, Centre for Urban Affairs and Policy Research Northwestern University and Department of Rehabilitation Services, State of Illinois)

Perske, R. and M. Perske. (1988). *Circles of Friends*. Burlington, Ont.: Welch Publishing.

Skrtic, T.M. (1988). The organizational context of special education. In E.L. Meyen & T.M. Skrtic (Eds.). *Exceptional Children and Youth: An introduction*. Denver: Love Publishing Company, pp. 479-518.

Chapter 15

On Campus: Integrated Post-Secondary Education

by Melanie Panitch

The drive to develop integrated post-secondary education is part of a historical and continuing struggle to include people with disabilities in their natural communities with full rights of citizenship. They have the same needs as everyone else to further their education, to enhance their personal competencies and to contribute to society. Post-secondary education is one of the means by which their needs can be met.

However, in many ways both subtle and overt, some students have been told that they don't belong on campus. College and university courses and programs were, until very recently, completely overlooked as potential opportunities for persons with a mental handicap. This lack of expectation has repercussions. When the situation does arise that a person has an opportunity to select courses, the act of choosing becomes a problem because the person likely has never been asked to think about what he or she wants to do after high school. Career counselling is not available to all students in secondary school and certain students are not among the targeted group that colleges and universities work to attract.

Dr. Oliver Sachs, well known for his landmark work, *Awakenings* (1982), documented the 1988 students' strike at Gallaudet University in Washington, the world famous liberal arts college for the deaf. In March of that year, when the presidential vacancy was about to be filled, the students campaigned to have the first deaf president in the school's 124 year history. According to Sachs' eye-witness account, in selecting the only hearing candidate and ignoring the depth of conviction on this issue, the authorities were amused of being paternalistic, of holding values based on an implicit view of incompetence and of appearing to believe "that deaf people should be printers, or work in the post office, do 'humblejobs' and not aspire to higher education" (Sachs, 1989).

Despite these attitudes, inclusive post-secondary education is making headway in Canada. A community college in Toronto, a university in Edmonton and a CEGEP (community college) in Montreal have been including students with mental handicaps for several years now.

I was Coordinator of the Humber College Community Integration through Cooperative Education (CICE) program in Toronto, Ontario, from 1984 to 1990. The program was designed to support educational opportunities at college for individuals with a mental handicap — the people for whom the college doors had previously been shut.

As coordinator of the new program, I was immersed in the ideology and culture of the college, learning about its history and values, and listening to the language of education. I became convinced that these students truly belonged there.

THE HUMBER PROGRAM: A STEP ON THE CONTINUUM OF INTEGRATION

A walk through Humber College on any given day reveals a noisy, animated and colourful scene. Private conversations compete with aspiring DJs on the student radio station. A preponderance of denim, T-shirts and leather set the overall fashion tone. French fries and Diet Coke provide daily sustenance to many of the 9,000 full-time day students.

Simulated hospital wards, greenhouses, computer centres, a new technology wing, music practice studios, even a morgue leave a lasting impression of the opportunities for learning.

Very much a part of this activity are students supported by CICE every year. The fact that they are there is due to the efforts of one persistent parent who strongly believe that his son and all other children had the right to continue their education once they had completed high school. He lobbied, wrote proposals, convened meetings and eventually succeeded in wounding the college to test the waters in 1984.

Today, the eighteen students are supported by three faculty members, and by students on field placement, volunteers and peer tutors. As part of the admission procedure, applicants indicate their interests and are connected with the college program best representing what they would like to learn. A person who likes children could be linked with Early Childhood Education; a sports fan might find like-minded students in the Recreation Leadership Program; an interest in wood-working could lead to the Cabinet-Making Program. There is also an Audio-Visual Technicians program and a Cosmetic Management comes. One student who uses a small computer to communicate found a natural fit in the Journalism Program; another applicant said her goal in coming to college was to work as a volunteer in a hospital; she went into Nursing.

A Place for Acceptance

These students are integrated into the complete two-year program which they follow throughout their attendance at the college. They pay regular tuition fees for which they receive student cards, library privileges and access to the athletics centre.

They are students of Humber College in every sense. They identify themselves, as do all students, by program ("I'm taking Hospitality"), and their friends are the students engaged in the same pursuit, sharing timetables and deadline pressures.

They are so proud of being part of the school that trips to the book store to purchase binders, sweatshirts, and knapsacks bearing the Humber logo are as frequent as

finances will allow.

Being at a community college or university has multiple benefits to a person's self-esteem. Colleges and universities are socially valued environments because the pursuit of higher education is regarded so positively in our society. The power of belonging to a valued place in the community goes far beyond the support provided by a teacher or the knowledge gained in a course. It creates a positive mood for learning and the value of the environment is transmitted to students, who often convey an entirely new sense of personal bearing.

Adult education, particularly, is by nature an accepting environment. Society has a healthy respect for the experiences that have made up a person's life by the time they reach adulthood. The experience of life with a disability has a claim on that respect; and, while allowances are being made in adult education programs for disabilities, the challenges and expectations of the educational environment prepare students for life off-campus.

Teachers of adult education often see their profession as a continuum which incorporates all people who want to learn. The best teachers will argue that they are less interested in teaching content to students than in encouraging them to consider themselves as agents in the process of learning. The teachers impart to students that learning how to learn rather than devouring a body of text will better prepare them for life in a rapidly changing society.

More and more, teachers are using a combination of teaching strategies to accommodate students' different learning styles. Lecture style works best for those who like to take notes or record information for review purposes; audio visual aids help those who need to "see" the main points; group discussions are useful for those who need to exchange ideas to grasp them; and field trips or work placements are essential for those who need hands-on learning.

All these learning styles are effective for people who learn at a slower pace.

Adapting the System to the Student

Through CICE, there is considerable work done to modify and adapt the course to each student. And students are provided with support to go to class for as long as they want that support. Central to the role of the CICE faculty members is collaboration with other students and instructors so that major points of the course can be highlighted, assignments identified, and field placements arranged. The discussion then focuses on making this all happen for one particular student. For example, because Lorraine has difficulty reading and writing, it is necessary for someone to give her a copy of their class notes so they can be read onto a tape for her to review at home. A group assignment is adapted so Lorraine's group will be evaluated not only on their presentation but on how they involve her in completing the work. Instead of a book review, Lorraine will do a film review, spoken into a tape recorder rather than written

out. A field placement will be scaled to her confidence level; but it will take place on the same day, in the same setting, and under the same supervision as for everyone else.

Peer Education

Despite thorough planning, challenges arise along the way. For example, when the semester first began, a dilemma arose over how to elicit the support of students in Lorraine's class. Should Lorraine simply start class on the same day as everyone else, leaving them to follow their own instincts about how to be involved with her? She would, after all, be with a support person whose main role would be to introduce her to other students, initiate conversation and generally model a way of interacting. The alternative was to inform the students that Lorraine would be joining them before she was introduced to the class.

That meant going in on the first day, without Lorraine, to introduce the subject of integration and to engage the students immediately. The goal was to begin a forum for discussing the issues that would inevitably arise throughout the two-year program.

Both methods were tried and experience showed that the former option — having Lorraine start with other students — was philosophically easier to live with but did not allow for discussion of the program. It left the students generally perplexed and, as a consequence, unhelpful. While the other option meant that Lorraine was being discussed without being present, it worked best for the students.

It was not altogether surprising to learn that the students, having had very little exposure to people with mental handicaps (many recalled the special class at the end of the hall or the few students who took gym with them in high school), had many questions. Their comfort level was not very high. They wanted to ask basic questions such as "How do you say Hi?" and they wanted to ask them without inhibition and without worrying that they might hurt Lorraine's feelings. It is interesting, on the other hand, that the students themselves questioned the ethics of starting class without Lorraine.

Out of that first discussion on relations with Lorraine, a core of students came forward who were willing to meet once a month with Lorraine and someone from CICE to talk through problems, listen to her concerns and get to know one another better. Those group meetings provided an important outlet, especially for identifying potential difficulties before they became problems. Gradually, those students began to take on the responsibility of ensuring that Lorraine was getting the notes she needed and keeping her binders organized, and they made sure that she ordered the class sweatshirt before the deadline. Sensitive to her longing to feel connected, they began to extend invitations to lunch and to an aerobics class which coincided with their spare period. And they began to delight in her growing self-assuredness and accomplishments. Nor was Lorraine the only one benefitting from these group meetings.

They were becoming a fun and important part of other students' lives as conversations ranged from school-work to families and vacations to jobs.

Faculty's Creative Solutions

If the students were an important group to bring on side, so too were the faculty members, and they posed an entirely different set of challenges. Many were willing to have a student in their class; for example, the Chair of the Hospitality Program felt it would be valuable for his students' interpersonal skills, improving their ability to work with people with different backgrounds. Consequently, he advised all students that they would be evaluated, in part, on their capacity to support each other.

Other faculty members, however, claimed that, with no background in special education, they lacked the necessary expertise. Some were pleased to have a support person in class so that they could carry on with business as usual without fear of disruption; others were uncomfortable with what they saw, at first, as an intrusion.

Teachers at the college and university level who become involved with integration for the first time often look for direction from their institution in adapting and modifying curriculum. However, as is always the case, they are creative and inventive when left to their own devices. As in public and high schools, solutions to curriculum at the post-secondary level are found more through a shift in attitude — how one sees a person — than through technical approaches.

A certain teacher of advanced communications welcomed into his class a new student who had pleaded her own case before the Dean that very morning. She requested she be allowed in his class because “that’s where all my friends are”. In truth, given her eyesight and her difficulty reading, entry tests to the most basic communication courses would have served little practical purpose.

The teacher agreed to work with her and, as the term progressed, they developed the habit of spending a few minutes chatting after each class.

One afternoon, the student told him about the self-advocacy group, People First, which was protesting the following weekend against a controversial wage policy. Proposed by the previous provincial government, the policy would allow employers to pay people who had been labelled less than minimum wage. His student was certainly going to attend the rally, being an active member of the organization. The teacher was interested and engaged; when it came to the lesson on writing business letters, he suggested she write hers, with his help, to the provincial government about that very issue. She embraced the assignment whole-heartedly. Her finished product met the requisite specifications: she stated her case, and, having had access to the computer lab, presented a polished letter.

When a second student in an Effective Speaking course decided at the last minute to sing Christmas carols instead of playing the taped address which he and his peer tutor

had so diligently prepared for his presentation, only his tutor squirmed. All the other students applauded his efforts, and his instructor awarded him a resounding grade of seventy-one percent with a written congratulation for knowing better than anyone else in the class “how to really get into the act of presenting”.

Support Staff

The support staff at Humber proved to be unsung heroes, providing help on a regular basis. This was the case when one student, intending to take twenty dollars out of a bank machine, accidentally got the decimal point in the wrong place and ended up with significantly more money. She immediately received a lesson on making a deposit. The people at the library desk became well-acquainted with one student who, while searching for her library card in her wallet, would always fumble, dropping all the photographs of her family, her cat, and even one of herself “when she had short hair”. Reassembling her paraphernalia always took a few minutes, enough time to chat and to offer to show the photos around, again.

Cafeteria cashiers learned to slow the pace down to allow people time to count out their money. One cashier even ran a tab to accommodate a favourite student who loved the fish and chips platter but did not always have enough money to pay for it. How that till was balanced every night is still a mystery!

Parent Advocacy

Parents have been involved since the founding of the Humber program and they now play a pivotal role on the Advisory Committee. Some people question the appropriateness of involving parents, knowing how most college students are fairly independent of their families. Despite these doubts, parent support is essential, and communication between parents and faculty has become an accepted part of the daily routine.

Many parents, well on their way to burn-out after twenty or more years of advocacy and struggle, now watch their sons and daughters thrive in college. It brings them new energy and fresh resolve for facing the impending question of work. Somehow the possibilities for their children seem greater than before. They see improved self-confidence and motivation in their children. Several said this was the first time their son or daughter saw him or herself as someone who could make a contribution and have a place in society. One father, commenting on his son’s daily telephone conversation with a longstanding friend, said he could not get over the growth of his son’s vocabulary and how much more worldly he was in his conversation.

Student Involvement

Students supported by CICE certainly benefitted, and so did their peers, as is obvious in the testimonial of a human services student:

When I first learned I was going to do a placement with CICE I was not exactly excited. I'm not patient enough, I worried. What was I going to learn working with people with a disability, I wondered. I realize now how despite my image of myself as an open-minded person and someone with curiosity, I knew nothing about segregation. In fact I would never have even recognized it had I not been exposed to integration. Without realizing it, I had been taught, subconsciously, just to accept things the way they are. That in itself was a profound learning experience.

Ask students why they chose to go to college and they will invariably mention the possibility of making new friends. Some students might set a higher priority on getting a well-paying and secure job, others on getting a good education, but the social aspects are a very attractive feature of student life. Many life-long friendships trace their beginnings to meetings at concerts, lecture halls and cafeterias on campus. Other relationships fade when the college years are over but are long remembered as part of an important stage of personal growth and discovery.

As students pursue their own interests, there are endless possibilities for meeting other students with similar interests: dancing at the monthly pubs; attending poetry readings in the library; setting up the sound system for a concert or jam session; at a quiet magazine rack in the library or a music listening corner. Whole sections of the cafeteria are devoted to card games and homework; these are places where camaraderie and collaboration on assignments are encouraged. Organized opportunities to socialize also abound: at student council fund-raising barbecues, aerobathons, and morale-boating mid-winter madness escapades. The opportunities for personal development are an important part of the culture of colleges and universities.

One particular young man comes to mind. His parents withdrew him from the sheltered workshop he had been attending for a number of years and applied to Humber on his behalf.

Justifiably suspicious that he was in for something completely different, he arrived the first day with his Walkman. He kept the earphones plugged in for several weeks while he assessed his new situation. It must have been bewildering returning to school after having been in the "workplace", and suddenly having to learn what was considered acceptable behaviour in a college setting, and having to assimilate the dress code and the constant socializing. Gradually he became more comfortable as the students got to know him. Some said "Hi", others helped him write letters to his favourite uncle, still others talked hockey scores with him. A few insisted he improve his math skills by joining them at cards. Not immune to the flirting and sexuality so much apart of the atmosphere, his first year was replete with crushes and frustration at unrequited love.

For a time he chose to work in the parking lot with the attendant. Between accepting parking fees and waving through people with permits he and the attendant chatted

about the weather, the latest politician involved in a scandal, sporting highlights and weekends. When both men left the college they saw no good reason for these conversations to end and they have been friends since.

The Transition to the Workplace

The training, skills and personal contacts that come with a quality integrated educational experience lead to greater employment opportunities. Post-secondary settings are natural places for students to make the transition from school to the workplace. Students everywhere leave high school and decide to further their education, thereby gaining some time to mature, broaden their base of experience, and make decisions about their interests before considering the issue of work.

Evaluating Success

As the Humber program moves towards stability and permanence, administrators and faculty members have expressed interest in what the students are actually learning in class; they claim to see the social value of integration, but they can't always be certain about the educational value.

Standards for student evaluation and success will need to be developed but the challenge is to make them particular to each student and each individual program.

That raises another looming issue: grades. All students want to be graded on their work. But when support is given to some students on all their assignments and tests, and the task themselves are tangibly altered, questions about the validity and comparability of grades inevitably arise. The instructor who gives a student sixty-five per cent on a photography assignment but who admits that he helped the student load the film and adjust the camera, gets full marks in my books for appropriate support; other people allege bias.

Perhaps evaluations could be comprised of written comments only, applauding accomplishment and pointing out areas yet to be mastered. Or they could be a numerical grade measuring the distance between where the student started from and where they have reached.

Another challenge is graduation. Eventually, the college may choose to hold a ceremony in which students graduate with their peers and receive a modified diploma indicating their participation and achievements.

There is always a sense of urgency in overcoming these obstacles for people with disabilities because so much time has already been wasted. Dr. Robert Gordon, president of Humber, reflected after six years of integration:

It is good for the college because in a funny sort of way we are a disparate group of departments and specializations. This program, in its own way, has forced an interaction and integration of our own people in a way that was never happening before. There is a mutual topic of discussion and a very rewarding one at that. So I think that in its unique fashion, in its own way, it has contributed a great deal to the college.

— **Gordon, 1990**

Today's students become tomorrow's neighbours, co-workers, journalists, law-makers, public servants, teachers and employers. The values inculcated in them by a truly inclusive educational environment will shape future communities. These people will advance the efforts of the community living movement in seeking opportunities for people with mental handicaps. When institutes of higher education make a welldefined commitment to becoming more inclusive, at a time when issues of equality and rights are high on Canadians' agendas, they will ensure that their own fixture is both relevant and socially responsible.

REFERENCES

Gordon, Dr. Robert (President, Humber College). (June 1990).
From an address to faculty and staff.

Sachs, Oliver. (1989). *Seeing Voices: A journey into the world of the deaf*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sachs, Oliver. (1982). *Awakenings*. (Revised edition). London: Pimdor, Pan Books Ltd.

The Roeher Institute Information Services Annotated Bibliography on Integrated Education

This annotated bibliography was compiled by Mary Ellen Mulligan for The Roeher Institute. It contains a selection of additional resources regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classes in regular schools. The first section of the bibliography contains material on the philosophical underpinnings of integration, the legal and historical framework, and the human rights and advocacy issues. The second part of the bibliography deals primarily with the “howto’s” of integration including administrative issues, teacher preparation and practical strategies and models.

In compiling this bibliography an effort was made to include the most recent publications available on the subject: most of the books and journal articles were published within the past five years. Special consideration was given to highlight the situation in Canada in regard to innovative policy and practice. Much of the material listed in the bibliography was drawn from the library of The Roeher Institute. Many of the journals and monographs are also available from educational institutions across the country.

Miriam Ticoll
Manager of Information Services
The Roeher Institute

1. PHILOSOPHICAL, LEGAL AND HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

1.1 Principles and Philosophy

Biklen, Douglas. (1985). Integration in school and society. In Biklen, Douglas (Ed). *Achieving the Complete School: Strategies for effective mainstreaming*. New York: Teachers’ College Press, Columbia University, pp. 174-186.

“Success with integration in schools depends on and also fuels integration in society at large”. This chapter suggests five principles upon which to base the social transformation which must accompany successful integration.

Booth, T. (1988). Challenging conceptions of integration. In L. Barton (Ed). *The Politics of Special Educational Needs*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 97-122.

The author suggests that the goals of integration are to redefine “normality” to include diversity and to support people to identify their own aspirations and opportunities. He looks critically at the different ways in which the concept of integration has been

interpreted in literature. The concept of integration should prompt teachers and others to challenge the social relations and curricula of schools and link these to the ways in which inequalities are maintained.

Brown, Bill. (1990). *La dolce vita: Integrated schools in Italy make it possible for everyone. *entourage*, 5(2&3), pp. 15-17, 20.*

In 1971, integrated schooling was mandated by Italian law for all students aged six to fourteen years. This article describes the continuing struggle with issues of labelling, time individualization and appropriate supports, after almost twenty years of experience with an integrated system.

The author notes that the importance of Italy's experience is that "they have done it ... They have made and continue to make systemic changes that encourage the valuing of all young people ... that make it possible to simply stop separating people and then work on the problems as they arise." In this way, integration is presented, not as a singular event, but as an effort that "will never be finished."

Brown, Freda and Donna H. Lehr (Eds.). (1989). *Integration for students with profound disabilities. In *Persons with Profound Disabilities: Issues and practices*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.*

This chapter presents a rationale for the integration of students with handicaps into the regular school, listing benefits for the integrated child, the family, students without disabilities, and professional staff. The authors maintain that, in the United States, integration practice lags behind federal law and that a major barrier is "philosophical inertia".

They conclude that, "While students with the most profound disabilities may pose particular integration challenges for schools and parents, their inclusion is not less possible nor less important than that of students with milder disabilities being placed into regular public school."

Kunc, Norman. (1984). *Integration: Being realistic isn't realistic. *Canadian Journal for Exceptional Children*, 1(1), pp. 4-8.*

This article challenges the usefulness of the integration vs. segregation debate. Ideological arguments which themselves constitute barriers to integration include manipulation of the phrase "best interests of the child", an attitude of defeatism, the "limited time and energy" argument, fear of social rejection on behalf of students with handicaps, and a "handicapped school system."

Little, Donald M. (1988). *The redefinition of special education: Special-ordinary education ... individualized and personalized in the regular class, *Education Canada*, 28(1), pp. 36-43.*

The author defines "special-ordinary education" as "individualized education" and notes that "teachers in the regular classroom have been making modifications and allowances for years in order to accommodate individual needs." He changes the focus

from learning problems to problems of instruction, suggesting that, with support, teachers can modify and individualize the curriculum for any student, especially if they regard every student in the class as a potential co-teacher.

Little, Donald M. (1985). A crime against childhood — Uniform curriculum at a uniform rate: Mainstreaming re-examined and redefined. *Canadian Journal of Special Education*, 2(1), pp. 91-107.

The author challenges ten often-heard objections to mainstreaming. Attitudes detrimental to mainstreaming include a tendency to think in terms of a unified prescribed curriculum and a focus on the disability rather than on the person and the person's abilities, "hence building a case against the child, rather than for the child's inclusion in the regular classroom."

He further states that there is a need for regular classroom teachers to accept responsibility for all students and to accept a wider range of individual differences. The corollary to this is the provision of appropriate support, information and resources to teachers. He concludes that, "It is not that mainstreaming has been tried and found wanting; it has been found difficult and not tried."

Lipsky, Dorothy K. and Alan Gartner. (1989). *Beyond Separate Education: Quality education for all*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

As the title implies, the chapters of this book are framed in the context of the broader school reform movement. The chapters address the question of how to create exemplary programs for all students. This starting point poses a basic challenge to the conception and design of education programs in general.

The models discussed here have two major factors in common: 1) the acceptance of responsibility by the classroom teacher for a diverse group of students; and 2) an understanding of such diversity as meeting opportunity and not difficulty. Included are chapters on accommodating student diversity through the curriculum, peer relations in the classroom, teacher preparation, degrees of disability, and parental roles.

New Brunswick Department of Education. (1987). *Integration Means All our Children Belong*. Fredericton, NB: New Brunswick Department of Education, Student Services Branch.

This document begins with an unequivocal value position in favour of integrated education. It illustrates the positive experiences that resulted when a provincial Ministry of Education officially adopted a policy of full integration for all children in regular classrooms. Photographs are combined with the comments of teachers, students and parents.

Sailor, W., J.L. Anderson, A.T. Halvorsen, K. Doering, J. Filler and L. Goetz. (1989). *The Comprehensive Local School: Regular education for all students with disabilities*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

This book focuses on the ability of the local neighbourhood school to educate children

with severe handicaps. It is based on literature reviews and on research comparing integrated to segregated educational models.

Sections are organized by age and school level — primary, elementary, secondary, transition and post-school years.

The authors maintain that all children with disabilities should be able to receive their education at their local school and that some of this education should take place in the regular classroom.

Sobsey, Richard. (1986). Emerging issues in social integration. *American Association on Mental Deficiency (AAMD): Education Update*, 11, p. 2

Three issues in the social integration of students with handicaps are highlighted. First, the author argues that full integration is the only acceptable route for the education system. Second, he points out the difficulties in defining and promoting the development of friendships as distinct from helper-helped relationships between children without and with handicaps. Third, he raises the issue of how students' relationships at school carry over to their relationships outside of school.

Stainback, William and Susan Stainback. (1986). One system. one purpose: The integration of special and regular education. *entourage*, 1(3). pp. 12-16.

The authors maintain that operating a “dual system of education” is unfair, inefficient, and expensive. They argue for the incorporation of all the resources and services (funding, curriculum, personnel) from both regular and special education into a single unified educational system.

Stainback, Susan, William Stainback and Marsha Forest (Eds.). (1989). *Educating All Students in the Mainstream of regular Education*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

This comprehensive textbook builds from a historical overview of education integration and explores the rationale behind the movement toward a merger of regular and special education. Practical strategies show how all students — whether labelled gifted, non-disabled or disabled — can excel educationally and socially within a regular classroom. Chapters are organized around key themes including educational equality in practice, strategies to promote merging systems, how to meet diverse student needs, and family and community support.

1.2 Advocacy, Legislation and Human Rights

Centre for Research and Education in Human Services. (1985). *Special Education Legislation: Implications for children, parents, and school boards. The case of Bill 82 in Ontario*. Kitchener, Ont; CRESH.

In this policy analysis paper, education legislation in Ontario is analyzed from several perspectives including its mandate and authority, underlying values, and issues of

implementation and outcomes. The paper concludes that new policy options need to be considered which are strongly grounded in the principles of the rights of the child, integration of all children, and equality of access to educational opportunity.

Forest, Marsha. (1987). Keys to integration: Common sense ideas and hard work. *entourage*, 2(1), pp. 16-19.

Noting that “integrated settings are on the increase all across the country,” this article promotes individualized programs and the discontinuation of a special, segregated education system. Three school boards in Ontario are identified as implementors of fully integrated systems and their success is largely attributed to committed administrators. Problems with integration are characterized as ones of injustice which belong to school boards and not to individual children.

Frigon, Odette. (1988). Stopping segregation. *entourage*, 3(1), pp. 35-39

This article documents the experience of a francophone school board with a board-wide integration project “based on principles of justice and equality.” It had a previous history of special, segregated services. The author describes the practical steps taken to fulfil integration goals, noting that the most important step is mustering the necessary political will.

Gilbert, Francoise. (1986). Integrated education in Québec: Breaking the barriers. *entourage*, 1(4)., pp. 6-10.

This article briefly documents how Québec education services grew in a segregated fashion and how “experts” in special education came to be relied upon. The author describes successful but prolonged individual battles of parents to integrate their children and claims, “The time for a case-by-case approach is long gone. The Minister of Education must now consider an overall policy.”

1.3 Parent Advocacy

Endicott, Orville. (1986). Education rights: Parents put on the pressure. *entourage*, 1(3), pp. 34-37.

Across Canada, school boards, placement committees, appeal tribunals, human rights commissions and courts are hearing cases in which parents are claiming that it is inappropriate and discriminatory to segregate school children who have mental handicap from their peers. With reference to the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and to particular legal cases in Canada, this article acknowledges the courage and determination of the parents involved as key factors in the struggle for educational integration.

Endicott, Orville. (1987). The Elwood Settlement Agreement: What does it mean? *entourage*, 2(3), pp. 36-37, 42.

This article recounts the legal struggle of one family to obtain integrated education for their son, Luke. It attributes the capitulation of the school board, before court action, to a foundation of claims under the *Charter of Rights*, expert testimony regarding

integrated programming, the principles of Luke's parents, and Luke himself, who "blossomed and grew" during his one year of integrated schooling.

While it did not lead to a binding judicial agreement, this case will provide valuable evidence in subsequent cases regarding education integration as a right.

Greey, Madeleine. (1991). We all belong: Welcoming children with special needs. *Today's Parent*, April, pp.34-40.

Casting the issue as a civil rights battle and a fight for the right to belong, this article presents the struggles of a number of parents fighting for community integration for their children. Successful integration experiences at camp, at school and with other families are contested with experiences of exclusion.

The author notes that, while some school boards in Ontario follow a policy of full integration, only in New Brunswick is integration mandated by law and practised province-wide.

Some Canadian resources for parents (organizations, videos, and books) are listed at the end of the article.

Huber, Marc. (1990). Becky: A story about courage, human rights and a national dilemma. *Homemakers' Magazine*, May, pp. 11-20. This is the story of an Ontario family's legal battle to obtain integrated school placement for their adopted daughter. The article presents the views of those advocating Becky's inclusion in her neighbourhood school and the opposing views of school board officials and others who believed that her needs would best be met in a segregated school with special staff and resources.

The author notes that although "the integration of disabled people is accepted in principle in today's society, entrenched in the *Charter of rights and Freedoms*, and championed by human rights organizations," it is not always practised.

McCallum, S. Dulcie. (1987). A giant step for all kids. *entourage*, 2(3),pp. 38-39. This article describes the case of *Elwood et. cl. versus the Halifax-County Bedford District School Board*. One family, through legal counsel, achieved integrated class placement for their son, Luke. The author outlines the main terms of the Settlement Agreement which addressed all parental concerns and forestalled a court action based on the *Charter of Rights*. The enthusiasm of Luke's classmates and their parents for his integrated placement reflects growing community support for educational integration.

2. INNOVATIONS AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

2.1 Administrative Issues

Biklen, Douglas, and Steven J. Taylor. (1985). School district administrators: Leadership strategies. In Biklen Douglas (Ed.). *Achieving the Complete School: Strategies for effective mainstreaming*. New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University. pp. 104-149.

This chapter suggests effective strategies which can be employed by principals, superintendents, and school board personnel to promote integration. In order to act, the administrator must identify decision-makers and mobilize leadership within the system.

Of particular interest is a section on eleven barriers to integration (such as attitudinal, jurisdictional, administrative, political) and the promising practices which address these barriers.

Reidiger, Edwin, Alex Hillyard and Richard Sobsey. (1986). Integration of handicapped children: Administrative strategies. *Canadian Journal for Exceptional Children*, 2(3). pp. 90-96.

One of the keys to a successful integration program is a strong administrative commitment to integration together with effectively mobilized support at the classroom level. This article offers ten important considerations for school principals who are planning for integration.

Stainback, G.H., W.C. Stainback and S.B. Stainback. (1988). Superintendents' attitudes toward integration. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, 23, pp. 92-95.

This is a survey of attitudes of superintendents of schools toward educating students labelled as severely or profoundly handicapped in regular neighbourhood schools. Of those surveyed, 34 per cent were uncertain of their attitude, 15.5 per cent held negative views, and 50.5 per cent had positive views.

Tanguay, S. (1985). *Mainstreaming: Some issues for school boards*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association.

Based on a cross-Canada survey, this paper discusses many of the issues facing school boards in developing and maintaining integrated programs. Respondents noted trends toward services based on specific needs rather than on category of handicap, and toward full rather than partial integration. Major concerns about integration centred around issues of teacher preparation, teacher confidence, and the provision of adequate support services to teachers.

Wilson, William C. (1989). Administrative strategies for integration. In Gaylord-Ross, R. (Ed.). *Integration Strategies for Students with Handicaps*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., pp. 299-319.

This author describes a new integration, namely, the integration of the special education service system into a new, total education service system. He summarizes

the legal basis for school integration in the United States and makes a distinction between following the spirit and following the letter of the law. Eight key administrative strategies are outlined for facilitating a high quality education system for all students, regardless of the presence or severity of handicap.

2.2 Teacher Preparation and Teacher Attitudes

Csapo, M. and D. Baine. (1985). Teachers of students with severe handicaps. *Canadian Journal of Exceptional Children*, 1, pp. 130-135.

The authors describe the demands that deinstitutionalization has placed on regular and special education teachers and administrators. They also present the results of a recent Canada-wide survey of programs which prepare teachers and others to work with students who have severe and multiple handicaps.

Darvill, C.E. (1989). Teacher attitudes to mainstreaming. *Canadian Journal of Special Education*, 5(1), pp. 1-14.

This author suggests that, while teacher attitudes are one of the most powerful factors affecting the success of mainstreaming, much of the existing research in this area is conflicting or inconclusive. More work is needed around the implications of labels used for students with handicaps, and around mainstreaming practices, instruments for measuring attitudes, and the degree to which research on attitudes can be generalized.

Hill, J.L. (1988). Integration in Canada: Implications for the certification of regular education teachers (RETS). *Canadian Journal of Special Education*, 4, pp. 123-131.

The author presents the results of a survey of deputy ministers of education and directors of special education across Canada regarding certification requirements for teachers to work with children with special needs. Two jurisdictions required completion of a course in special education by regular teachers. No province or territory required practicum experience with students with special needs.

Since regular teachers increasingly provide educational programs to children with more diverse needs, this article points up possible training and certification implications based on the trend toward education integration in Canada.

Hummel, Jeffrey W., Donald Dworet and Mariam Walsh. (1986). Exceptional students in regular classrooms: Teacher attitudes and teacher in-service needs. *Canadian Journal for Exceptional Children*, 2(1), pp. 14-17.

Based on a survey of teachers in two southern Ontario school boards, as well as on the conclusions of other related research studies, this author calls for an increase in the variety and intensity of in-service education options for teachers. Quality in-service education can facilitate teacher confidence, sense of support, and knowledge regarding the classroom integration of exceptional students.

Lilly, Stephen M. (1989). Teacher preparation. In Lipsky, Dorothy K. and Alan

Gartner. *Beyond Separate Education: Quality education for all*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., pp. 143-157.

American teacher preparation programs continue to be linked to specific handicaps and based on assumptions of student deficit rather than teacher ability. This chapter describes one vision for the future in which “special” teacher preparation programs will disappear and one system will prepare all teachers.

The author sees this structural change in teacher education as a difficult but inevitable and exciting development which has already begun and which will parallel the growth of student integration in the schools.

Powers, M.D. (1983). *Mainstreaming and the in-service education of teachers. Exceptional Children*, 49, pp. 432-439.

This article asserts the importance of in-service training for regular classroom teachers as an important component for successful mainstreaming. It also points out the need for more data collection and research on this topic. Guidelines are presented for in-service training methods, format, content, needs assessment, goals and objectives, scheduling, evaluation, school administration and instructional materials.

Reynolds, M.C. and J .W. Birch. (1988). *Adaptive Mainstreaming: A primer for teachers and principals*. White Plains, NY: Longman. Techniques are presented for responding to the needs of a wide range of children with handicaps in the regular classroom. Sections address assessment, teaching and teamwork, cognitive development, language and speech, sensory and physical handicaps and severe and profound disabilities. The authors encourage a non-categorical approach to the provision of special education services in an integrated environment.

Salend, S.J. (1984). *Factors contributing to the development of successful mainstreaming programs. Exceptional Children*, 50, pp. 409-416.

The success of mainstreaming programs can be enhanced by attention to: criteria for mainstreaming; preparing students with and without handicaps; promoting communication among educators; evaluating student progress; and providing in-service training.

Searl, Stanford J., Dianne L. Ferguson and Doug Biklen. (1985). *The front line ... teachers*. In Biklen, Douglas (Ed.). *Achieving the Complete School: Strategies for effective mainstreaming*. New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, pp. 52-103.

Teachers can play a critical role in making integration work if they have support from administrators, teachers and parents. They also need practical strategies and principles with which to work.

This chapter outlines three basic principles which can provide the foundation for successful integration: 1) a commitment to integration as a value; 2) use of a functional

curriculum model; and 3) community referenced instruction.

Stainback, William and Susan Stainhack. (1989). Facilitating merger through personnel preparation. In Stainback, Susan, William Stainback and Marsha Forest (Eds). *Educating all Students in the Mainstream of Regular Education*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

By integrating personnel, programs and resources in special and regular education departments, colleges and universities can set the stage for a unified regular education system for elementary and secondary schools. This chapter suggests steps for doing it, including a “common professional core of courses for all educators” and “community referenced curricular content.”

Stainback, S.B. and W.C. Stainback. (1983). Preparing regular classroom teachers for the integration of severely handicapped students: An experimental study. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, 18, pp. 204-209.

Thirty-seven teachers read and discussed information related to the integration of students with severe handicaps into regular schools. The results of this study indicate that teachers’ attitudes and behavioural intentions regarding this issue can be significantly influenced by such a program of reading and discussion.

Whitehouse, Carlene. (1988). Integration — a personal perspective. *New Brunswick Teacher’s Association News*, 30(10), pp. 12-13.

This article is written by a teacher who, with no special training, integrated Susan, a student with handicaps, into her Grade 5 classroom. She documents her initial fears and worries about her ability to meet Susan’s various needs, and about the increased work load and the possible impact on the academic progress of other students. Yet what originally seemed a daunting task evolves into a mutual learning process for all. The author learns to involve Susan in the general program, make small adaptations to the curriculum, and allow and encourage natural interactions with peers.

Wang, Margaret C., Eva D. Vaughan and Joan A. Dytman (1985). Staff development: A key ingredient of effective mainstreaming. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 17(2), pp. 112-121.

An Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM) was implemented in five schools of a large urban school system as a full-time mainstreaming program. It was designed for students with mild handicaps who had previously been served in self-contained special education programs. While many general education teachers had expected problems in dealing with students with mental handicaps, difficulties were rare. Staff development was identified by participating teachers as a key factor in the program’s success.

The authors call for renegotiation of the roles of both general and special education staff. They see general education teachers acting as the primary instructors for all students and special education teachers providing consultation and special instruction as needed in the classroom.

Winner, M. (1984). Mainstreaming the handicapped child: Attitudes of teachers and non-teachers. *Canadian Journal for Exceptional Children*, 1(1), pp. 23-26.*

An attitude survey reveals that regular classroom teachers question their own competence to teach a child with special needs. They also fear increased time demands and worry about dilution of the academic content of their programs. This article calls for a continued focus on staff development on integration issues, since the regular classroom teacher “is the indispensable professional who will carry the primary responsibility for integrating the exceptional child.”

2.3 Practical Strategies

Baker, C. and G. Baker. (1982) Suggestions on how to more effectively mainstream special education students. *Special Education in Canada*, 57(3). pp. 16-18.

Ideas to assist teachers in facilitating integration address placement in the classroom, preparation of the regular teacher, preparation of all the students, and follow-up.

Berres, Michael S. and Peter Knoblock (Eds.). (1986). *Program Models for Mainstreaming: Integrating students with moderate to severe disabilities*.

Rockville, MD: Aspen Publishers. This book begins with the assumption that integrating children with moderate to severe disabilities depends more upon the attitudes and problem-solving skills of the educators than on the skills of the students. The first section focuses on the values and philosophy of integration and discusses models for change within the school system. The second section describes integration efforts in school systems across the U.S.. These include accounts of innovative practices, successes, failures and the particular challenges presented by different disabilities.

Biklen, Douglas (Ed.). (1985). *Achieving the Complete School: Strategies for effective mainstreaming*. New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University.

This highly readable text focuses on specific strategies that people employ to promote successful integration. When does integration work well, why, and how? Specific chapters address the roles of the principal, teachers, school administrators and parents in contributing to successful integration.

Bishop, V. E. (1986). Identifying the components of success in mainstreaming. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, 80, pp. 939-946.

The author collected opinions of teachers, students, parents and principals concerning the most important factors in successful mainstreaming for students with visual handicap. Factors identified included peer acceptance and interaction, flexibility of the teacher, academic achievement, positive self-image, independence and inner motivation in the student, family acceptance, available school support personnel and adequate supplies and equipment.

Booth, T. and P. Potts (Eds.). (1983). *Integrating Special Education*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

This text presents viewpoints on how integration should be implemented in Great Britain. Methods and issues include cooperative teaching, the use of itinerant remedial teachers, resource bases within ordinary schools, out-of-class activities, administrative changes, behaviour modification, and support services. While contributors differ somewhat in their strategies, all start from the position that educational integration is a proper and viable goal.

Brady, Michael P. and Philip L. Gunter (Eds.). (1985). *Integrating Moderately and Severely Handicapped Learners: Strategies that work*. Springfield, ILL: Charles C. Thomas.

This practical guide does not ask, “Does integration work?” or “Who can be integrated?” Instead it addresses the question, “How can we make integration efforts successful?” It places educational integration within the larger context of overall community inclusion.

Sections cover strategies for administration, service delivery, and planning and implementation of individualized plans. Included are how-to ideas and checklists of ways to involve students with severe handicaps in regular programs.

The authors conclude that “Integrated school experiences can be provided for all severely handicapped students across a variety of school settings.”

Forest, Marsha (Ed.). (1984). *Education/Integration: A collection of readings on the integration of children with mental handicaps into regular school systems*. Downsview, Ont.: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

Twelve short and readable articles reflect on the philosophical underpinnings of integrated education. They relate the philosophy to implementation, and describe a variety of real-life examples of integration in action in Canadian classrooms.

Forest, Marsha (Ed.). (1987). *More Education/Integration: A further collection of readings on the integration of children with mental handicaps into regular school systems*. Downsview, Ont.: The G. Allan Roeher Institute.

Twenty-three articles cover a wide variety of education and integration topics including: the philosophy and characteristics of an integrated system, a variety of Canadian program examples, roles of teachers and the importance of peers and friends.

Gaylord-Ross R. (Ed.). (1989). *Integration Strategies for Students with Handicaps*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Emphasizing actual teaching techniques, this book is of interest to teachers, administrators, and parents. Section I includes seven chapters about specific disabilities and integration. Section II focuses on innovative techniques and Section III outlines changes needed in the education system.

The forms of integration described and advocated for cannot be achieved by special

education alone. "It will be necessary for 'regular' teachers to join in the process of creating new and more inclusive programs that encompass literally all students."

Hodgson, A., L. Clunies-Ross and S. Hegarty. (1984). *Learning Together: Teaching pupils with special educational needs in the ordinary school*. Windsor, Berks., ENG: NFER-Nelson.

Educational integration in Britain is prompting the need for curriculum modification to meet a range of learning needs in the ordinary classroom. This book addresses modifications to the academic curriculum, staffing issues, and teaching strategies including classroom organization, monitoring pupils' progress and the use of adult and peer tutors.

Homer, R.H., L.H. Meyer and H.D. Fredericks (Eds.). (1986). *Education of learners with Severe Handicaps: Exemplary service strategies*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Based on values of normalization and integration, chapters in this volume offer technological innovations to assist effective teaching in the integrated classroom. Sections present five exemplary service models, three major advances in curriculum development, and four specific instructional procedures.

This text has immediate practical relevance for teachers, administrators, parents and service providers.

Larivee, B. (1985). *Effective Teaching for Successful Mainstreaming*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Teacher effectiveness in fostering achievement and personal and social adjustment of integrated students with mild handicaps is shown to be part of overall teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

O'Brien, John and Marsha Forest. (1989). *Action for Inclusion: How to improve schools by welcoming children with special needs into regular classrooms*. Toronto: Frontier College Press.

An action-oriented manual, this text is based on a strong ideological commitment to the unconditional inclusion of all children in the regular classroom and the provision of appropriate individualized supports.

Common misunderstandings, goals and practical steps for integration are outlined in five sections: 1) the family's expectations; 2) enlisting the help of the neighbourhood school principal; 3) enrolling the teacher; 4) involving classmates; and 5) the making of action plans (MAPs). The placement of an integration consultant or facilitator in the school is advocated.

Snell, Martha E. and Stanley J. Eichner. (1989). *Integration for students with profound disabilities*. In Brown, Freda and Donna H. Lehr. *Persons with Profound Disabilities: Issues and practices*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes

Publishing Co., pp. 109-138.

The chapter discusses the rationale for integration in terms of the benefits for all concerned: students with severe and profound disabilities (including those with multiple handicaps and medically fragile conditions), their families, students without disabilities and professional staff. Sections also focus on strategies for obtaining integrated programs and barriers to their implementation.

Stainback, S.B. and W.C. Stainbeck. (1988). Educating students with severe disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 21, pp. 16-19.

The authors provide an overview of strategies for integrating students with severe disabilities into regular classes. Strategies include: designating a support facilitator; developing networks; encouraging respect for all students; and using special education resources in regular, integrated classrooms.

Stainback, S.B. and W.C. Stainback. (1985). *Integration of Students with Severe Handicaps into Regular Schools*. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

This introduction for classroom teachers provides information on how to educate all students about individual differences and how to promote interaction between students with and without handicaps. Two chapters focus on teaching students with severe handicaps the social and related skills needed to facilitate integration. The authors make positive suggestions about how to promote the integration of students with severe handicaps into regular school programs and activities.

Stainback, W.C., S.B. Stainback, L. Courtnage and T. Jaben. (1985). Facilitating mainstreaming by modifying the mainstreaming. *Exceptional Children*, 52, pp. 144-152.

This article examines some of the problems in the current organizational structure of schools that hinder regular classroom teachers from being able to adapt their instruction to meet diverse student needs. They suggest a framework for finding a solution.

Taylor, S.J. (1982). From segregation to integration: Strategies for integrating severely handicapped students in normal school and community settings. *The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 7(3). pp. 42-49.

Practical strategies to facilitate integration are presented: dispersal of students; planned interaction; provision of program support; and support for regular teachers. The author also underlines the need for staff integration, parental support, and positive attitudes.

Thousand, Jacqueline, S.T. Fox, R. Reid, J. Godek, W. Williams and W. Fox. (1986). *The Homecoming Model: Educating students who present intensive educational challenges within regular education environments*. University of Vermont: Center for Developmental Disabilities.

This integration model is based on a plan to bring students "home" from special education programs and prevent others from ever being placed in them. Based on the

concept of individualized education for all, this model enabled Vermont school districts to integrate students who present some of the most intensive educational challenges within regular classrooms. Participating teachers felt they had more say, were more comfortable and had better access to special education consultation than expected.

This resource includes many “how-to” strategies relating to administrative commitment, building the staff team, using consultative support, addressing common fears, and specific classroom-level integration strategies. A set of six appendices includes illustrative daily schedules and class activity guides.

Thousand, J. and R.A. Villa. (1988). *Enhancing Success in Heterogenous Classrooms and Schools*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.

Certain practices appear to be associated with successful schooling of students in heterogenous (mixed ability) groupings. These include: outcome-based instructional models; creative use of peers; multi-age groupings and in-service training which consciously promotes common conceptual frameworks, knowledge and language among school staff.

York, Jennifer and Terri Vandercook. (1990). *Strategies for achieving an integrated education for middle school students with severe disabilities. Remedial and Special Education*, 11(5). pp. 6-16.

This article places integration issues in the context of overall school reform by asking the critical question, “Are schools organized in a way to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population?”

The authors promote a change from a self-contained special education classroom model of service delivery to a more integrated approach in which special education is a service and support provided in general education environments. To achieve overall change, integration should adhere to natural proportions, identify and use natural supports, use a participation approach and demonstrate success locally. School-level strategists should identify all collaborators, communicate with all members of the school community, and share space.

York, J., T. Vandercook, C. Macdonald and C. Wolff. (Eds.). (1989). *Strategies for Full Inclusion*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

This is a compilation of seven papers related to designing and implementing integration in education.

Topics include the McGill Action Planning System (MAPS) for developing and implementing a vision of integrated education for a student; the process of creating an individual education plan (IEP) and developing instructional programs for use in an integrated classroom, and advantages and disadvantages of having an extra staff person present in the classroom.

One paper outlines four learning opportunities available to students with handicaps in integrated regular classes: 1) learning to interact with peers; 2) learning to participate in typical routines; 3) learning lifelong skills; and 4) learning about subjects not related to functional life skills.

2.4 Exemplary Practice in Canada

Forest, Marsha. (1986). Education integration. *entourage*, 1(1), pp. 19-23.

These are the stories of two children, one in Grade 2 and one in Grade 8, who are in fully integrated, individualized programs in schools in Hamilton, Ontario. The cooperative roles of the regular classroom teacher and special education resource teachers and aides are discussed. Forest maintains that the key issue in integration implementation is the “desire to do so” and not the need for money, resources or special equipment.

Forest, Marsha. (1986). Just one of the kids. *entourage*, 1(2), pp. 20-23.

Two children with severe handicaps are successfully integrated into a primary classroom. Their teacher describes her own learning process that led her to conclude that “their needs were the needs of all children” and “my own fear was the major problem.”

Forest, Marsha. (1987). Start with the right attitude. *entourage*, 2(2). pp. 11-13.

Although nine-year-old Sabrina was labelled autistic and severely to profoundly retarded, she experienced remarkable progress in an individualized program within a regular Grade 4/5 classroom. A major concern of staff was the possible rejection of Sabrina because of her anti-social behaviour. However, they found that a consistent approach and the natural acceptance of her peers led to significant growth. This article supports the view that school systems can and will change as they see integration working.

Forest, Marsha and Mary Mayer. (1987). Education Waterloo-style. *entourage*, 2(4). pp. 20-25.

This article documents the experience of one school board in Ontario which made a policy commitment to “move all children into their neighbourhood schools with appropriate services.” Four schools — two elementary and two secondary — initially served as models for the entire system. The experiences of two students and their teacher/integration facilitator are described. The authors pose the question, “If one board can do it why can’t they all?”

Giangreco, M.F. and M. Meyer. (1988). Expanding service delivery options in regular schools and classrooms for students with severe disabilities. In J.L. Graden, J.E. Sims and M.J. Curtis (Eds.). *Alternative Educational Delivery Systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students*. Kent, OH: National Association of School Psychologists, pp. 21-47.

This chapter presents an overview of the principles and practices of integrated

educational programs for students with severe disabilities. “Most promising practices” in general and innovative programs in Canada and the United States are identified. The ways in which the school psychologist can help to support integration are discussed.

Penner, Irma and Peter Penner. (1987). Friends forever. *entourage*, 2(8), pp. 32-35.

The positive experience of partial integration in Grade 7 led the parents of Yvonne Penner to request a totally integrated Grade 8 program at her St. John's, Newfoundland school. This article describes Yvonne's accomplishments in communication skills, interpersonal relationships, and educational goals.

Her parents conclude, “We commend the school board for taking the courageous step of total integration and not falling into the readiness trap. Children are always ready — they just need the appropriate supports.”

Pivato, Emma and Sandra Chomicki. (1986). The G.R.I.T. kids start school. *entourage*, 1(3), pp. 6-10.

This article follows five children whose preschool years included intensive developmental programming in their own homes as part of the Gateway Residential Intensive Training (G.R.I.T.) program in Edmonton, Alberta. The children, who have severe handicaps, are successfully integrated into regular primary school classes. The article notes that, “As long as adequate supports are provided, the viability of such an educational option is no longer in question.”

2.5 Integrated Classroom Versus Resource Model

Affleck, James Q., S. Madge, A. Adams and S. Lowenbraun. (1988). Integrated classroom versus resource model: Academic viability and effectiveness. *Exceptional Children*, 54(4), pp. 339-348.

The integrated classroom model described in this article has eight mildly handicapped students (labelled as learning disabled, mildly mentally retarded, and seriously behaviourally disabled) in a class of twenty-four.

Such integrated classrooms are shown to be more cost-effective than resource room programs while they also enable students to achieve similar academic results. This article gives evidence that providing special education in a regular classroom setting is an attractive and achievable option to the resource room withdrawal model.

Jenkins, Joseph R. and Amy Heinen. (1989). Students' preferences for service delivery: Pull-out, in-class, or integrated models. *Exceptional Children*, 55(6), pp. 516-523.

This study attempted to fill a gap in literature by investigating students' perceptions and preferences about where and from whom they receive special help. Children with mild handicaps in Grades 2, 4 and 5 were interviewed. The fact that students had different levels of knowledge and experiences of different models makes the results complicated. The authors conclude that most students prefer to obtain additional help

within the general education classroom from their classroom teacher or from other non-specialists who are familiar with them and their classroom curriculum.

Lowenbraun, Sheila, Sally Madge and James Affleck. (1990). Parental satisfaction with integrated class placements of special education and general education students. *Remedial and Special Education*, 11(4), pp. 37-40.

This survey compared satisfaction of parents of special education students and parents of general education students whose children were all placed in integrated elementary classrooms. Both groups of parents were equally satisfied with the integrated classroom model.

Parents who had previously experienced a resource room approach indicated that they were satisfied with both integrated placement or resource room placement for academic progress but were significantly more satisfied with the integration option for their child's self-esteem and opportunity to make friends.

Madge, Sally, James Affleck and Sheila Lowenbraun. (1990). Social effects of integrated classrooms and resource room/regular class placements on elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 23(7), pp. 439-445.

This study tentatively concludes that children served by an integrated classroom model have a better opportunity to blend successfully into the classroom than children who go out to a resource room.

Wang, Margaret C. and Jack W. Birch. (1984). comparison of a full-time mainstreaming program and a resource room approach. *Exceptional Children*, 51(1), pp. 33-40.

This is a report of a study comparing the effects of a full-time mainstreaming approach for handicapped students with a resource room approach for similar students. Results suggest that the full-time mainstreaming approach, known as the Adaptive Learning Environments Model, exceeds the resource room approach in attaining desirable classroom processes, and in enhancing student attitudes and achievement in basic skills.

This article supports the feasibility of restructuring regular education programs to much more adequately serve students with diverse learning characteristics and needs. Many of the students in question are currently served by compensatory and special education pull-out programs.

2.6 More Resources

Dreimanus, M., D. Sobsey, S. Gray, B. Hamaha. B. Uditsky and D. Wells. (1990). *Integration and Individuals with Moderate to Profound Intellectual Impairments: An annotated bibliography*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Severe Disabilities Program.

Four hundred and forty-six books, reports and journal articles are reviewed and arranged by topic. The ratio of empirical research studies supporting integration to research opposing it is more than eighteen to one. But the ratio of position papers supporting integration to research opposing it is only 1.6 to one. The authors interpret this to mean that integrating practices are proving successful but that attitudes generally lag behind research in this area.

Twenty-seven Canadian articles are reviewed; thirty-two articles are listed under the topic of elementary school integration. Of these, one is cross-listed.

Howarth, Mary. (1983). *A Search of the Literature on Mainstreaming*. Toronto: Federation of Women Teachers' Associations of Ontario.

This comprehensive review was motivated by "concern for the extent to which mainstreaming is being done in Ontario, the way in which it is being done, and the acceptance of the underlying philosophical assumptions." Resources are well organized into sections including reasons for mainstreaming, models of mainstreaming, legislative bases and teacher inservice training. The author presents seventy-three research conclusions and notes, "If there is one overwhelming conclusion it must be that mainstreaming is being poorly done in many cases."

This review reveals the emphasis in literature on categorizing handicaps and maintaining different environments for different degrees of integration. It is a useful compilation of resources with high Canadian content, giving an overview of attitudes and degrees of implementation of mainstreaming at the time it was compiled.

Jenkinson, J.C. (1987). *School and disability: Research and practice in integration*. *Australian and Education Review*, 26.

A broad review of literature on integration issues, this study attempts to identify various approaches and the factors that lead to success. It contains a number of descriptive studies of integration programs as well as a review of American and Australian research and practice. The book contains an extensive critique of research aimed at solving the integration-segregation debate. Problems in the application of traditional and alternative research methodologies are also discussed. An extensive bibliography of research and policy literature is included.

Vandercook, Terri, Jennifer York and Patricia Mutuszik. (1988). *Integrated Education for Learners with Severe Disabilities: Print and media resources*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

This selected list of resources focuses on the educational needs of students with particularly challenging handicaps. Broader than many bibliographies, this list includes journal articles, books and book chapters, manuals, reports, papers, newsletters and audio- and videotapes. A source and a content summary is provided for each item.

EDITORS

Gordon L. Porter is the Director of Student Services for School Districts 28 and 29 in Woodstock, New Brunswick, and the Past President of the Canadian Association for Community Living. He was a Visiting Fellow at the New Zealand Institute on Mental Retardation and was awarded an Honourary Doctor of Civil Laws degree by the University of New Brunswick in recognition of his work to promote school and community integration.

Diane Richler is the Executive Vice President of the Canadian Association for Community Living. She has worked for twenty years supporting people who have been labelled mentally handicapped and their families, and has a special interest in how advocacy organizations can effect social change.

CONTRIBUTORS

Charlotte Campbell is a methods and resource teacher at Nackawic High School, School District 28, New Brunswick. She previously worked as a School Supervisor supporting the implementation of integrated school programs in five school districts in the region surrounding Fredericton, New Brunswick.

Jean Collicott is a Student Services Consultant for School Districts 28 and 29, Woodstock, New Brunswick. She previously worked as a classroom teacher and school-based methods and resource teacher at the junior high school level.

David Jory is the parent of a young man who has been labelled mentally handicapped and a Professor of French at the University of New Brunswick in Saint John, New Brunswick.

Brian Kelly is a School Psychologist for School Districts 28 and 29 in Woodstock, New Brunswick.

Marcia Marcaccio is a self-advocate, an employee of the Hamilton Separate School Board and the President of People First in Hamilton, Ontario; a self-advocacy organization.

S. Dulcie McCallum is a lawyer in Victoria, British Columbia, and is the government and legal affairs consultant for the Canadian Association for Community Living.

Margaret Murray is a classroom teacher in Woodstock, New Brunswick. She has included students with a disability in her class.

Jeff den Otter is a School Social Worker serving schools in Districts 28 and 29, Woodstock, New Brunswick.

Melanie Panitch is currently a Research Consultant at The Roeher Institute in Toronto,

Ontario. She is on leave from Humber College in Toronto, where she is the Coordinator of the Humber College Community Integration through Cooperative Education program.

Darlene E. Perner is a Consultant in Student Services for the Department of Education in New Brunswick. She has been responsible for implementing strategies to support school integration on a provincial basis including staff development and training.

Marcia H. Rioux is the Director of The Roeher Institute sponsored by the Canadian Association for Community Living. She is completing her doctorate in jurisprudence from the University of California, Berkeley. She is the author of a forthcoming book on equality issues entitled *The Equality-Disability Nexus*.

Alene Steinbach is a parent of a young woman who has been labelled mentally handicapped. She is the co-author of the Children Service Review Project of the New Brunswick Association for Community Living and has been an active advocate for school integration in her community and province.

Julie Stone is a School Supervisor based in Woodstock, New Brunswick. She supports the implementation of integrated school programs in six school districts and previously worked as a methods and resource teacher at the elementary school level. She is a Past President of the New Brunswick Association for Community Living.

Mary Wilson is a Student Services Consultant for School Districts 28 and 29 in Woodstock, New Brunswick. She previously worked as a classroom teacher and as a methods and resources teacher at the high school level.

Selected Publications of The Roeher Institute

entourage is a quarterly bilingual magazine that looks at how people with mental handicaps can be supported by the community to live, learn, work, and have fun in the community. **entourage** includes the most current information on issues and upcoming events, and provides the most comprehensive way of keeping in touch with what's happening in the lives of individuals with a mental handicap.

Subscriptions:	\$18 Canadian \$20 foreign (1 year)
	\$32 Canadian \$36 foreign (2 years)
	\$48 Canadian \$52 foreign (3 years)

The Language of Pain: Perspectives on Challenging Behaviour, 1988

Community Living 2000, 1987

Income Insecurity: The Disability Income System in Canada, 1988

Righting Wrongs: Disability, Your Ombudsperson and You, 1989

Poor Places: Disability-Related Residential and Support Services, 1990

Vulnerable: Sexual Abuse and People With An Intellectual Handicap, 1988

Making Friends: Developing Relationships Between People With Disabilities and Other Members Of The Community, 1990

Service Brokerage: Individual Empowerment and Social Service Accountability, 1990

Literacy and Labels: A Look at Literacy Policy and People With Mental Handicaps, 1990

The Power to Choose: An Examination of Service Brokerage and Individualized Funding as Implemented by the Community Living Society, 1990

For more information, please contact:

The Roeher Institute
Kinsmen Building, York University Campus
4700 Keele Street, North York, Ontario M3J 1P3
Telephone: (416) 661-9611
Fax: (416) 661-5701