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This study is concerned with In-Service Education and its effect upon teacher change.

The program under study is sponsored by the Los Angeles Unified School District, through its Special Education Branch, at Salvin School. The Los Angeles Unified School District has received a grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, under P.L. 90-230, EHA VI-C to develop a program to integrate handicapped and non-handicapped children in a model early childhood program.

The program Dual Educational Approach to Learning (DEAL), integrates handicapped and non-handicapped children aged three through eight in an early childhood program. It is an open structure program providing a divided day between a formal period and an option period. The approach is based upon the concept that children, though different
individually, have common needs whether they are handicapped or non-handicapped.

The in-service class for teachers was a workshop which combined observation with participation and involved an in-depth exploration of many facets of the model early childhood program. The program objective was to encourage teachers to use whatever portion of the DEAL approach which was feasible in their own schools and to interest other teachers at each school in the curricular approach. The class represented also a pilot effort at dissemination of program information, an effort which is to be implemented in 1975.

The writer was a participant both in the classroom with the children and, later, in the in-service class with teachers; the project is a follow-up study on the results of the in-service class. Questions were directed at the teacher's view of the results of the program and the extent to which they, subsequently initiated and became involved with some aspects of the DEAL Program in their own schools.
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THE PROBLEM

This study is concerned with In-Service Education and its effect upon teacher change. Is in-service education an effective means of staff development?

The Early Childhood Education proposal sponsored by Wilson Riles, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, is part of a master plan to redesign education in California. It is based on a recommendation of a Citizen Task Force on Early Childhood Education. Senate Bill 1302, authored by Senator Mervin Dymally, (D, Los Angeles), was signed by Governor Ronald Reagan and became law on November 27, 1972. It requires that the State Board of Education establish a comprehensive program for early childhood education for children ages three years and nine months to the completion of grade three or its equivalent. (1972) The four-year-old children are not presently included.

In SB 1302, the early childhood education program emphasizes:

-Individualized programs
-Diagnostic, prescriptive teaching
-Small groups
-Groups based on needs and interests
-Attention given to special needs of bilingual-bicultural children
-More qualified adults to work under teacher's direction
-Parent involvement in planning, classroom activities and evaluation
-Opportunities for parent education
-Greater school-community involvement
-Wider variety and more appropriate materials and methods
- Staff development and training for aides, teachers, volunteers, and administrators
- Multi-age family-type mix (siblings helping each other)

The Early Childhood Education Act provides for staff development to meet the goals of the early childhood program. The California Master Plan for Special Education pilot program also provides for in-service programs. However, legislation for state funding for the Special Education program is still in progress, and the plan is not being implemented at present.

In both the Early Childhood Education and Special Education plans the content of in-service programs is left to the discretion of school districts. The Los Angeles Unified School District policy does not make in-service education mandatory. There is no provision in the California Education Code requiring continuing teacher education. An administrator may suggest that his staff or a particular teacher attend an in-service class. In some instances, a teacher may be released from school to attend. Salary points may be obtained for attending in-service or other classes. Continuing teacher education, once a teacher is in the classroom is not required by law or by custom.

Charles Silberman, (1971) in Crisis in the Classroom, explores some problems in American education and suggests the remaking of American education, of the teachers and of the schools. He suggests that teacher education should provide teachers with a sense of purpose and with a philosophy of education. The teacher must grow. To do this, Silberman says, the teacher must be a student of teaching. He must continue to explore new ideas and be open to change. In-service education classes are just one avenue of exploration open to teachers.
Education involves active learning. There is a time for books and a time for listening, but together with the reading and listening, there is a need for interaction. These are the proving grounds where questions can be asked and answered, where new ideas can be tested, and where alternatives can be explored. A teacher in the classroom alone has limited opportunity to communicate with other professionals. (Sarason, et al, 1966)

The history of in-service education, according to Ralph Tyler, (1971) dates back to about 1850. At that time, teacher in-service classes helped teachers bridge the gap between what they knew and what they needed to know. Not until the Land Grant College Act of 1862 was attention given to a need for educational institutions for teachers. From 1880 until the First World War, summer courses at normal schools provided in-service education. During this time, the United States population was increased greatly by immigration from Europe. Children who spoke no English and who had attitudes, habits, and values different from those taken for granted by the majority population, enrolled in public schools. It was at this time, too, that the ideas of Darwin and other modern scientists were influencing some educators. John Dewey influenced writers and speakers lecturing at summer schools. Tyler (1971) names Francis W. Parker and describes how he tried to change the schools from institutions that "imprison man in the cells of custom" to those that "free the human spirit" and help children develop to their potential. Tyler (1971) also praises Frederick Burke, from San Francisco Normal, for his lectures on individual differences among pupils, and for his innovations in a demonstration
school of a curriculum and procedures for individualizing instruction.

After the First World War and until the Great Depression of the 1930's, in-service education was greatly affected by the establishment of quantitative standards for teaching certificates. Teachers felt that major improvement in the quality of teaching in the public schools could be attained by requiring all teachers to have a bachelor's degree. During this period the in-service programs were primarily aimed at helping teachers meet college degree requirements.

The Depression brought new problems to the schools. There was high unemployment. Young people were unable to get jobs and so stayed in school, greatly increasing the number of high school students. Many high school students were not planning to attend college; they often found the school curriculum irrelevant for their needs. This student unrest stimulated educational leaders to re-examine the curriculum and to try new ideas.

The Progressive Education Association was involved in the Eight-Year Study which began in 1933 and involved thirty school systems. (Tyler, 1971) Under an agreement with the colleges and universities, The American Council on Education was made responsible for developing and implementing new educational programs designed to reach all high school students. The American Council on Education established the Commission on Teacher Education and aided a selected group of schools to develop new programs in teacher education and new ways of working with schools and teachers.

In-service education changed, too. The direction of the change was toward building curriculum, developing new instructional materials,
discovering new teaching-learning procedures, and helping teachers understand and conduct the new programs effectively.

During the summer of 1936, Ohio State University, as part of the Eight-Year Study, held what was to be the first workshop. According to Tyler (1971), its purpose was to remedy teachers' inability to do new things in schools when they did not understand either the needs for new approaches, the bases of the new proposals, or the ways in which new ideas could be effectively employed. The most significant contribution of the Eight-Year Study was the training it provided in developing attitudes toward and skills of problem solving. Tyler (1971) said also that, "constructive involvement of teachers in attacking real educational problems that they face is a powerful instrument of continuing education."

The problems involved with questionable school success continued to be central issues. Jacques Barzun, Teacher in America (1945), states that for the past three years people have been making known their dissatisfaction with the schools. The problems under investigation by the Eight-Year Study (1933), involved dissatisfied people. Now in 1974, dissatisfaction is spotlighted by low achievement test results in Los Angeles City Schools, as based on national norms. It appears that teacher success is measured by the parent in terms of their child's success. In turn, the administrator's success is dependent on the teacher's success. The pressure appears to be exerted up the ladder to the superintendent and the school system in its entirety. Change is a slow and arduous process. Perhaps teachers, too, need to examine what the aim of education is and what kinds of programs lead to this end?
In the Los Angeles Unified School District, there is a degree of school autonomy, in the options available to individual school administrators, to choose among many approaches to learning. Hopefully, this can be a faculty and administrative decision. Such decision-making would involve exploration of alternative programs, continuing teacher education, and the continuing need for experimentation, as well as continuing evaluation of results. This could help to overcome some of what is ineffective or obsolete in education.

The need for research in the field of staff development inspired the writer to examine more closely one type of staff development program. This was accomplished through a follow-up study of the carry-over results of teacher participation in a one-week in-service education program. A letter and questionnaire approach was used to identify whether teachers had in fact adopted all or any part of the Dual Educational Approach to Learning in their own classroom.
CHAPTER II

DESCRIPTION OF THE CHILDREN'S PROGRAM

Salvin School is a school for handicapped children. It is one of twenty-one such schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District. It is a mid-city school serving a cross section of the population, ethnically, economically, and socially. It is the site of "DEAL--An Early Childhood Education Project" and serves as a model and training site integrating handicapped and non-handicapped children into a public school setting.

The Los Angeles Unified School District's Special Education Branch has a grant through the United States Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, under P.L. 90-230, EHA VI-C, to develop a program integrating handicapped and non-handicapped children in the same programs. The program is in its third year and will be renewed for thirty-six months beginning June 30, 1974. Patrick F. Estes is the Project Director, and Beatrice M. Gold is the Project Coordinator. Rose Engel is the principal at Sophia T. Salvin School, the site of the Model Early Education Project.

The Dual Educational Approach to Learning (DEAL), a Model Early Education Program, is the result of studies of the needs of children. It is based upon the concept that children are children with common
needs and individual differences, whether they are handicapped or non-handicapped. These commonalities, along with the concern that children need to become self directing individuals provided the impetus for the Salvin School Program.

The Model Early Education Program proposal was initiated by the Special Education Division of the Los Angeles Unified School District. Five major areas of need provided the impetus to plan and develop the Salvin Model Early Childhood Unit. These are:

1. Young handicapped children need an educational environment which will provide opportunities for development and for positive self-concepts, independence, communication creativity and cognitive growth. In addition, there is need for specific skills development, such as reading, math, language and physical education.

2. Integration of handicapped children into the mainstream of education is a goal of the Los Angeles Unified School District. A program demonstrating that handicapped and non-handicapped children benefit from being schooled together in a dual educational program is needed to serve as a model.

3. Most teachers of young children receive training only in elementary or specialized areas of exceptionality. A model is needed to demonstrate to teachers and student teachers the program components of a Dual Education Approach to Learning, as well as the commonalities and special needs of handicapped and non-handicapped young children.

4. Secondary handicapped students often are unable to find employment after completion of formal education. Early childhood education programs, both public and private, are a potential community resource for employment. There is a need to train handicapped students to become teacher helpers and to demonstrate their capabilities in this work.

5. Parents of young handicapped children demonstrate a variety of needs which our public schools have been unable to meet. There is a need to develop a model parent education and counseling program to serve these needs.
The current program at Salvin is made up of two Early Childhood Units, one of children ages three-to-five-years-old and the other of children five-to-eight-years-old. In 1973, there were seventy-two handicapped children and twenty-one non-handicapped children in the two units. The handicapping condition varies widely from severe to minimal. The physically handicapped children include the cerebral palsied, the crippled, and the other health-impaired, as well as severely retarded children. The non-handicapped children are three-to-eight years-old and were integrated in the program to demonstrate that handicapped and non-handicapped children benefit from sharing educational experiences.

The DEAL Program provides an open structured classroom environment known as the Option Period. At this time, each child may choose the learning experience in which he wishes to participate. There is also a formal Period, a time when there is teacher-selected instruction.

The Option Period provides activity centers in which each child interacts with teachers and with other children. The choices are varied and numerous and include indoor as well as outdoor activities. In the room, the child may choose to work with puzzles, manipulative games, books, blocks, dramatic play materials, or watch television. In the outside yard, choices can be made between painting, craft materials, wheel toys, and climbing equipment.

One person is responsible for maintaining a free flowing environment, as well as helping individual children to use time and materials productively. The teacher and the teacher's aides provide
guidance in each area during option time. All the teachers plan and execute the program collectively.

During formal time, each child is in his assigned classroom with his teacher. The main difference between the Option Period and the Formal Period is whether the choice of the learning experience is that of the child or of the teacher. The formal portion of the program makes use of learning centers, as well as of individual and small group experiences. The program includes sequenced learning materials, personalized instruction, programmed instruction, British Infant School approach, and contingency management. System FORE, an individualized program based on sequenced curricula, was developed by the Los Angeles Unified School District, Special Education Division, and is used during Formal Period.

Goals for both the formal and option time overlap. The major goal of option time is to provide each child opportunities to make decisions that will help him gain a positive self-concept, a feeling of self-worth. The goal of the formal time is to build basic skills and thus increase achievement.

In addition to the children's program, a parent program was established to meet a variety of family needs. Families of exceptional children have many additional needs relating to special problems. The parent group is under the supervision of a Parent Coordinator and includes:

1. Home/School Relationships, with activities ranging from home visits and telephone contacts to parent participation in the school program.

2. Parent Education, with activities ranging from
material workshops and informal discussion groups to large formal lecture meetings.

3. Community Liason, with the parent coordinator assisting families in obtaining services needed for children. These range from clarifying problems with the "brace" man to working with an agency in providing services to Spanish-speaking families who need hospital orientation.

4. Heart Line, for parents who are in immediate need of a listening ear or a referral service. The telephone, for both Spanish and English-speaking parents, becomes a way of breaking through the isolation experienced by many parents of handicapped children.

Teacher and staff meetings (aides) are an important part of the Salvin program. Each day after the children leave there is a brief meeting to discuss the program and needs of individual children. It is here that problems can be discussed and actions taken. The teachers are a closely knit group of people with a common view of the needs of children.

An additional facet of the program at Salvin involves the training of eight secondary trainable mentally retarded students who work as teacher aides in the DEAL program. These teenagers are bused from a neighboring school and learn through doing; they have become effective members of the school program.

Physical therapy is included as part of the daily routine in this special education school setting. This requires a staff of doctors, nurses, and therapists. In addition, parents and other professionals serve the DEAL program in an advisory capacity. Volunteers are directly involved also in the children's program.

The overall goal of the program is to "Help children grow toward feeling valued as human beings."
CHAPTER III

THE LOG

It might be helpful to give a brief background of the writer's teaching experience with children. She began working informally with children for four years as a parent in a cooperative nursery school. Years later, she was for two years an assistant teacher at what was then San Fernando Valley State College Preschool Laboratory. She went on to plan and to open a temple nursery school and remained there for five years as a director. At present she is teacher-director of a parent participation nursery school.

As a participant in the summer program at Salvin, the writer spent all but one week of the program working with children. The one week was spent as a participant in the in-service education program. As a participant in a field work class, the writer was to keep a log. It was not to be a daily description of the program but to record reaction and thoughts of the experience at Salvin.

The log is included here so it may serve as background material for the writer's impressions of the model early childhood unit. The writer believes that Salvin is a good example of what can be observed and learned during an experience that involves children. Only too often classes about children have only second-hand information on how
children behave. The actual involvement with children adds another dimension. It is the writer's opinion that the dimension that made Salvin in-service program unique was the presence of the children. Throughout the log, the reader will note that references have been made to the literature in the field. Integrating the theoretical background with the anecdotal reports substantiates the structure and character of the program. Such an integrated approach reflects also the values of the in-service program as the writer observed them.

The following excerpts are from the log. The questions, observations, feelings, and description are of the activities in the weeks that followed.

The daily time schedule of the Early Childhood Unit:

8:30 - Children arrive, some by bus, others by family transportation. Each child goes to his assigned room. After all the children arrive, attendance is taken, name tags are passed out, and necessary business is completed.

8:50 - The children, teachers, and aides gather for music time and group singing.

9:10 - Option I - Choices are made by the child among the many activities available. He may choose to work in one or more areas during the period.

10:00 - Nutrition

10:20 - Formal Time - The children are in their assigned rooms and there is teacher-selected activity.

11:05 - Option II - Same as Option I.

11:55 - Physical Education. Designed to include therapy. The children are divided into two groups according to their needs.

12:20 - The end of the day. The children leave for home.
The writer is assigned to a young man, the only male teacher in the early childhood program. The children in his group are between five-and-eight-years-old. Four of the twelve children are from a non-handicapped class. Of the eight handicapped children, there is a wide range of differences, from severe to non-observable disabilities.

One child is severely handicapped. He has no language and no mobility. When he is spoken to or given some attention, he responds with a smile. How can you help a child like Peter? What can you do to help him be a participant? During music time he seems to join in with sounds and a smile. Given the opportunity, he gets involved. I am concerned that people, teachers and aides will remember to include him visually, and, where possible, physically in activities. (He is able to grasp something in his hands.) It's too easy to forget him in the press of seeing to the needs of so many children. Adults as well as children may have moved from the area, forgetting to take Peter along or to move him to an area where he may at least observe and listen.

Before the regular school year ended in June, the writer visited Salvin for a day. I came fearful of my own reaction to the handicapped. I was concerned that my feelings of pity would make it a difficult day, but I very quickly realized that it was the child whom I saw and to whom I related. I came to school on Monday confident that, for me, being with children is what is important.

Together with Whit, the teacher, we met the children at the bus. We welcomed them to school and walked them to the classroom. Some of the children were new to the group. The summer program involved a new routine with a shortened day.

The traditional program for the handicapped separates the physically handicapped and the deaf into separate groups. It also divides children by age and grade. Here at Salvin the children are given the opportunity to learn together, work together, and help one another. It is my understanding that the traditional elementary program for handicapped children expects children to behave in ways
children too young to take any responsibility or to make their own choices. They are treated like infants and, because of their handicap, thought to be less capable than they really are.

In Educating Exceptional Children, Samuel A. Kirk (1962) describes the exceptional child as having "discrepancies in growth." This accompanies the premise that the exceptional child is a normal child who has exceptionalities or deviations in only some characteristics. The similarities far exceed the differences.

The trend today is toward integration of handicapped and non-handicapped children. Lillian Weber (1971) in The English Infant School and Informal Education tells us that there were a few handicapped children to be seen in the British Infant School, one or two in a class. Other children would be helpful to these children, helpfulness being a goal of the accepted program. Children helped children, and there were often babies present since mothers came and stayed while a new child was "settling in" to school.

I have good feelings about the Salvin program. The group must really function as a team. It requires a select group of aides, as well as teachers, to make the program run smoothly and effectively. Each adult must be sensitive to the needs of individual children, as to the children as a group. The integration of handicapped and non-handicapped children is unique to this setting. Many of the children are unable to make their needs known through verbal expression. The child who is incapable of self-expression must not be forgotten or neglected. He, too, deserves the greatest possible opportunity to grow.

Small things that happen can give great pleasure. Two things stand out this week for me. One little boy, Evan, who is a cerebral palsied child, was at the craft table with me during option time. I was printing names on work so the work could be distributed later to the owner. The project was sponge painting. I gave Evan a piece of paper with his name on it and, as it often happens, he covered his name with paint. I chose to print it in another
place, and so began a game and a friendship. As quickly as I wrote his name, he covered it with paint. All of this went on without words but with a great sense of fun and laughter.

The other incident concerned a severely handicapped child, Elaine, who had very limited use of her hands and no use of her limbs. In fact, her limbs are rigid and, as a result, I questioned the method necessary to remove her from the walker. It proved necessary gently to force her legs to get her in or out of the apparatus. Thursday, Elaine was at the craft table, the area I covered during this week with Whit. Elaine seemed to have tired of the craft table and appeared to be watching the children on the tricycles. She was unable to ask for help. If someone talks to her, she would respond with a smile to show her approval or let you know by a whine to show disapproval. I offered to move her to watch the bikes. Since the craft table was adequately covered, I was able to stay with her. She turned her head toward me and said, "Bike." I repeated the word, bike, and added, "Bikes are fun." The repetition of "bike" each time was accompanied by a big smile by Elaine. She was a happy observer. I later asked if there wasn't something Elaine could ride? The next time I brought her to the bike yard we were able to lift her into a wagon for a ride.

So many exciting things. The teacher of the deaf sits with the teacher who leads the singing at music time. She signs as she sings along. One day she showed us all how to sign, "Good morning." Anne would like to help her group mingle with the other children and perhaps have some added means of communication. Teachers, too, learned a few words. The use of signing is accompanied by the words, but facial expression is an equally important part of the experience.

One of the most exciting things that can be observed is children helping children. One will often see one child pushing another who is confined to a wheelchair. Someone may be holding a friend's hand or carrying something for him. Often a child will ask a teacher's assistance for a friend in need. It is not uncommon to observe a child observing another child.
This day's task involved the use of eye droppers with colored water, taking the water from one container to another. This was a difficult task for my friend Evan. He started pouring from one container to another. The result was a shade of muddy brown. I labeled it an "icky brown." This was quickly taken in by Charles, a black child. He accused me of not liking brown people. I was shocked and hurt by his statement and defended myself by saying that it was not true and asking why he said that. He just dropped the subject. My own discomfort made me relate it later and I was told that Charles' accusation would make me more sensitive in my use of words.

So much was happening to me at once, but this was really threatening to me. I wondered whether something else had made Charles feel this way about me. He is one of the children in whose group I am. The two most disabled children in the group are Caucasian and seem to need more personal attention. Does Charles see this as a preference for particular children? It bothers me to think that there is any reason to need to prove myself in Charles' eyes.

Today, July 3, we had some flags out with the rhythm instruments. With the help of marching music, we marched in and out of the rooms, through the halls, and up and down the stairs. Irwin attached himself to me. He is a trainable mentally retarded child who, I was told, was "mothered" too much. What does that mean to me? What is it reasonable to expect him to do? He enjoyed the marching as he clung tightly to my arm. He would not carry a flag or play an instrument. I walked him up the stairs, about five up and five down. He did this with difficulty. He threw the instrument on the ground. The motion of marching was all he seemed to want. At the second option time he came back to the music yard clapping his hands and moving his feet. He wanted more of the marching. As various things occur, I need more information. I need more information about Irwin.

I played a game with four children during formal time. It involved matching consonants and knowing the beginning sounds of words, but in addition, it involved knowing the names of
things. Allan is a Spanish-speaking child who often mispronounces words and may not know the English name of things. I began the game by having the pictures named on the lotto board. We helped each other identify pictures and sounds. The children were more interested in playing the game than being the first person to win.

Salvin is truly an integrated school. The children are handicapped and non-handicapped. The ethnic mixture includes Anglo, black, Chicano, Oriental, and others. The children come from homes at poverty level to upper middle class. They may range in ability from retarded to gifted. In addition, the early childhood program has children ranging in age from three to eight years old.

I like what I see at Salvin. There is concern for the individual differences and individual needs. The open structure program provides opportunities for making choices and encourages decision making. Children are able to take risks and to find support from other children and from adults, as it is needed. There is exploration and experimentation with materials and equipment. There are people ready to listen as well as to answer questions, people helping each other.


"Informal, as I understand it, refers to the setting, the arrangements, the teacher-child and the child-child relationships that maintain, restimulate if necessary, and extend what is considered to be the most intense form of learning, the already existing child's way of learning through play through the experiences he seeks out for himself.

The active force of such learning is considered to be curiosity, interest, and the needs of a child's own search for definition and relevance. The school setting or environment must be rich enough to foster and maintain this curiosity; it must be free
enough to allow and even to help each individual follow the path indicated by his curiosity. Entwined with the experience gained through a child's own use of the school environment is the learning of skills because skills are needed in the process. How a child would learn in his own way, at his own pace, exploring his own interest, for his own purpose.

Piaget (1969) describes cognitive development as a sequential process of phases. This is a process of maturation and experience through social transmission and the process of equilibrium. Man is always becoming. Dewey (1938) emphasizes growth and experience; Piaget elaborated on it, and Rogers (1961) explored the psychological process of becoming. Each emphasizes the value and the importance of the experience of growing.

Madame Montessori (1966) in her work with disadvantaged children of her era emphasized the experience, but in her eagerness to order the environment, she limited the child. For her, each material had a right way to be used, the Montessori way. There was little room left for experimentation and for being different. The "naughtiness" must be overcome and result in "success" or order.

In their eagerness to "teach," the writer wonders if teachers deny children the opportunity to explore alternatives and to find their own path of learning by following their own interests.

Charles, the child who accused me of not liking brown people, is very friendly and verbal with adults. Observing him for some time, I learned that he almost never is involved in activities during option time, is never involved with other children, but spends a great deal of time watching. In one incident last week he told one of the boys who was pushing another child to stop, a direction I have heard him give on a number of other occasions. But then when Charles got pushed and I saw it happen, he told me I should have told the other child to stop. I suggested that he tell the child how he felt, just as he had helped the child that was hit earlier.

During formal time Charles was reading. Instead of following the words, he read a word and
looked up at me. Often he was guessing with no idea of the spelling or pronunciation of the word. When I told him to look at the words he said, "I need to look at you to see if I'm right." Later we discussed Charles at the staff meeting. Other teachers, too, expressed concern about him. The group decision was to help him feel better about himself and to help him gain self-confidence so that he would be willing to take risks with other children.

I was surprised to learn that the Ninth Street girls who work as aides at Salvin are classified trainable mentally retarded youths. They are both effective and competent working with the children. They are assigned jobs and carry them out with little supervision.

The daily staff meetings after school may serve as another example of how well this program operates. The teachers and aides change their assigned option tasks each week. This is the first time many of these people have worked together in this program, but they function well as a team. The primary concern is for the children. Often the staff will zero in on a particular child. Suggestions are made by members of the group, some background is furnished, and questions are asked and answered. In this way, there can be consistency among the staff in their response to a particular child. The meetings are limited to fifteen minutes. This approach was chosen to keep the meetings from dragging, keeps the staff interest, and to avoid unnecessarily long meetings.

Being with children is important to me. Being at Salvin was a new experience. These children with their special needs gave me a brief introduction to the area of special education. I wonder if I wouldn't like to investigate further the field of special education?
CHAPTER IV

LEGISLATION

Special Education legislation in California provides services for individuals with exceptional needs. Children with special needs fall into several categories:

1. Physically handicapped, including
2. Mentally retarded
3. Educationally handicapped
4. Developmentally handicapped
5. Mentally gifted.

The California Master Plan Proposal for Special Education, September, 1973, is based upon the belief that education is for all children, regardless of differences in their abilities. Special Education legislation is based upon the assumption that every child has the right to educational opportunities synonymous with his ability.

Special education began in 1869 when legislation established the California State School for the Deaf and Blind. Today, in response to the needs and pressure of various groups, some twenty-eight program options have been developed at different times and for different reasons. Special schools have been established as a direct result of urgent needs expressed by various groups. As recently as October, 1971, a landmark court decision involving the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania made mandatory, rather than permissive a program of free
public education for retarded children.

The California Master Plan proposes that special education services for all children with exceptional needs should be mandatory for handicapped children. If local districts cannot provide such services, counties must do so. However, the legislation permits parents of handicapped children to make a choice about enrolling their children in such schools. Allowing parental choice denies special education to many otherwise eligible handicapped children.

There are still loopholes and exclusion clauses in California law. Some children do not fit into the regular school requirements, nor do they meet the specifications for special education. According to California's Master Plan, the state annually reports waiting lists of several thousand handicapped children in need of appropriate services.

The goal of special education is to "reduce the impact of disability upon an individual and in so doing, increase his potential for independence." (California Master Plan, 1973). To date, only between 65% and 70% of the total number of identified exceptional children are being educated. The Master Plan, if implemented, projects that by the 1980-1981 school year, 155,000 additional individuals will be served, all those known to be in need. This requirement can only be met if and when legislation is passed to make mandatory education for the handicapped. It means identification, classification, and placement standards for many still forgotten children.

Under the California Master Plan for Special Education, recommendation for improvements in the field include provisions for personal
preparation and development. It provides for ongoing in-service training programs for personnel both in special education and in general education. The content of the program is to be decided by the schools. In all categorical aid programs, as well, there are also requirements, for staff development plans and proposals.
CHAPTER V

THE IN-SERVICE CLASS

The Los Angeles Unified School District Special Education Branch has a grant from the United States Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The grant is under P.L. 91-230, EHA VI-C, the Model Early Childhood Education Program, with funding provisions for staff development.

During the summer of 1973, an in-service education program was held at Salvin School as part of a continuing effort to locate other Los Angeles Teachers and administrators who might be interested in implementing an early childhood program which integrated handicapped and non-handicapped children within a public school setting. The approach to be demonstrated in the DEAL Program (Dual Educational Approach to Learning) which offers both an open-structured plan (option period) and a teacher-selected plan (formal period).

The objectives for the Model Early Childhood Education Program are as follows:

1. Children in this educational environment will demonstrate growth in independence, communication and academic skills.

2. The Salvin Early Childhood Education Program will serve as an instructional model for teachers and student teachers demonstrating the dual Educational Approach to Learning.
3. Selected handicapped secondary students will be trained as teachers' helpers in the Model Early Childhood Program.

4. Parents of children in the Early Childhood Unit will be invited to take part in a comprehensive program, including parent education, school participation, counseling services, and group discussions.

5. Educational administrators will be invited to observe the program integrating handicapped and non-handicapped children, and the model will be replicated in at least one other location.

There were four one-week in-service classes held at Salvin School. The project coordinator and the early childhood consultant directed the in-service classes. Each class ran for five consecutive days, Monday through Friday, from eight in the morning until three in the afternoon. It included observation, participation and an in-depth exploration of every facet of the model early childhood program. The program objectives were to encourage each teacher to return to his own school with a plan to utilize all or any part of the program and to interest other teachers in the program.

For the summer, the children's program was expanded to a five-teacher team. The team consisted of one teacher of the deaf, one teacher of the trainable mentally retarded, two teachers of the orthopedically handicapped, and one teacher of the non-handicapped. Trainable mentally retarded high school students from a neighboring school worked as aides in the program under close supervision of a teacher. Each teacher also had an adult aide.

Fifteen non-handicapped and twenty-four orthopedically handicapped children made up three classrooms for the formal period of the
day. The deaf and trainable mentally retarded children each stayed in separate classrooms. During music and during the option period, all the children, teachers, and aides worked together as a single unit. The orthopedically handicapped, deaf and non-handicapped children were between the ages of three and seven, while the mentally retarded children were between the ages of six and eight.

The teacher in-service day began at eight each day. The teachers helped the Salvin teacher set up the classroom environment before the children arrived. Each day included observation of the children at music, a choice of observing or participating in the many options available to the children, and observation of the formal portion of the program.

Time was provided for daily presentations regarding the theory and practice of open classroom structure. For some of the teachers (most teachers were from special education) this was their first opportunity to observe children in their specialization in a school program with other children. There were many questions to be discussed, and more questions arose as people became involved in the program itself.

Betty Brady, California State University, Northridge, demonstrated for the in-service participants the use of an "intellectual kit," a concept developed by Dr. Marie M. Hughes and Mrs. Helene Weaver of the Tucson Early Education Model. Ms. Brady laid on the table a large assortment of spoons of various sizes, shapes and patterns. In addition, butcher paper and magic markers were provided. From then on, the children, in small groups of three, four, or five, took over.
They did whatever the materials suggested to them. Patterns were sorted, sizes were sorted, and some questions were asked about the function of a particular utensil. Ms. Brady became the observer and, at times, the facilitator. She took on the facilitator role more often to demonstrate to the teachers some of the possible happenings. Had it been a regular classroom setting, there would not be any time pressure; curiosity and experimentation would have sufficed. It was easy to see that many different learning experiences related to cognitive processes could evolve from spoons; counting, sorting, and language, for example. As it was, the spoon kit inspired the teachers to compile a list of possible materials to collect for other kits.

Pat King, consultant with the International Center for Educational Development, gave a workshop within a workshop. The topic was the "informal" program and the learning that takes place intellectually, physically, and emotionally. This too, would be in agreement with Lillian Weber (1971). Using Piaget's theory of child development, Pat went through the Piaget phases and went on to discuss ways of assessing child growth and the understanding of basic concepts. Instead of using standardized achievement tests, the teacher could use informal assessment strategies. The following suggestions for evaluation were made:

1. Engage in conversation with a child as a fellow-seeker, never as a judge.

2. Have a multi-faceted goal in conversing with children. Among the goals: to have a personal interchange, to participate in a child's inquiry, to give assistance, to learn more about the child's attitudes and interests, to gather data about growth needs.
3. Learn as much as possible about each child: his interests, personality traits, background knowledge, and intellectual development.

4. Develop some guidelines regarding possible concept understandings and skill developments for the ability range of children in the group.

5. Consider these developmental guidelines as possibilities rather than as expectations.

6. Be familiar with learning possibilities inherent in the activities that children pursue.

7. Be sensitive to body-movement cues that indicate receptiveness to dialogue.

8. Guard against posing questions when children do not appear receptive.

9. Use simple manipulative check-up activities to gain additional information regarding specific skill development.

10. Develop record keeping procedures that are simple and effective.

The remainder of the day was devoted to teachers making choices and using the materials available to the children at option time. Choices included tools and wood, water play, cooking and collage. Later, the teachers discussed the discoveries and learning experiences the teachers had had that children, too, might experience.

Over the course of the week, many prepared materials were distributed to participants. There were displays of instructional materials available for duplication; many people used this opportunity too.

The daily staff meeting was a part of the workshop agenda. The Salvin teachers and aides held their daily meetings where the in-service participants could observe and, if they wished, participate in the discussion. The meetings were brief, but it was here that plans for daily
activities were made, schedule changes were accomplished, and needs of individual children were discussed.

At one meeting, the teacher of the deaf wanted help in integrating her children more fully with other children during option time. Some of the deaf children had little or no hearing, even with their hearing aids, and this made communication difficult. The use of simple signing was demonstrated at music time. Only their teacher was able to communicate with the children. One little boy in particular often got into difficulty by hitting other children. He had almost no language. Was there a way teachers could help Johnny in his child-to-child relationships? Problems of the children were the problems the workshop participants faced, too. How can teachers help children work and play together in spite of individual differences?

The parent meeting took place under the leadership of the Parent Coordinator, observed by the workshop participants. This time, the participants remained in the background to listen and to comment later. Parents shared problems and feelings, helping one another resolve a problem or devising ways to cope with a problem. One child who was the topic of the discussion was a mentally retarded child, one easily led astray by a friend. She got into difficulty easily. Her mother indicated concern for what the mother's expectations might be in regard to the child's capacity to make a judgement about picking flowers in someone else's yard. Can you help the child understand? Do you keep her confined to her own yard? What do you do?

Were you to listen to many such meetings, the discussion would cover all the different problems all mothers of young children face.
These people were faced with the usual problems and more. Having a handicapped child puts an additional burden on the family unit.

Part of a very full agenda included films. One film was on block building, one on dramatic play, and another on discipline. In addition, there were slides shown of scenes taken at Salvin of children during the option period and at other schools showing the use of an outside area. In each scene children were busy at one of many activities in the school environment.

Each of the five days of the workshop was filled from morning until afternoon with activities. There was hardly time left to eat. People brought lunch, and many ate as they discussed or made things for use in September at their own school. It was a busy productive week. There were many questions. People questioned the appropriateness of the open classroom for children in special education. Some questioned team teaching and the integration of non-handicapped and handicapped children. Someone questioned or commented upon every phase of the program.

At the completion of the class each participant was asked to fill in an evaluation of the in-service. These class results were made available to the writer and are included in Table I. It is a composite of many of the remarks made by the teachers.

Many people made statements about this being the most useful workshop they had ever attended. Statements were made about the need for more of these kinds of experiences. The overall feeling of enthusiasm was observable in relation to any and all areas of the program.
TABLE I

EVALUATION OF THE IN-SERVICE

1. This week was
   long, successful presentation of philosophy

2. Things I liked
   observation, films, staff enthusiasm, parent group, teacher's meetings, consultant time, materials available to make, seeing children in action, learned the value of play.

3. Things I didn't like
   too little time for teacher discussions, long day, safety of children.

4. Things I would have liked more of
   resource people, particular child for evaluation, time.

5. Things I would have liked less of
   sitting, pressure of time.
CHAPTER VI

FOLLOW-UP STUDY

The writer became a participant at Salvin School as an outgrowth of her fieldwork experience in the early childhood unit. She continued to become a participant in the week-long in-service class. The writer was able to finalize her experience in the acceptance of her Master of Arts degree project plan to explore teacher reaction to the in-service program and the effect of the program in facilitating change.

Immediately following the in-service class, the participants were asked to fill out a "feeling" level questionnaire. This was to be their immediate response following the in-service program. (Table I) This study was to be a follow-up on the results of the in-service education. The primary possibility to be explored was the level of involvement of participants that could be traced to participation in the program. Secondary emphasis was to be laid upon the level of cooperation of support personnel, such as consultants and administrators.

The questions asked dealt with teachers' level of involvement in the DEAL program the following September. Had they been familiar with the DEAL program before attending the in-service class? Were they team teaching? Have consultants been helpful? Do they feel they were instrumental in starting an option time at their school? If they
started but stopped, what was their reason? (Appendix B & C) The object of the questionnaire was to learn what workshop participants' experiences were between the summer of 1973, and the beginning of the spring term, 1974.

A letter was written to participants asking their help in replying to the questionnaire. Included with the letter was a copy of the questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Teachers were asked to return the questionnaire within ten days. (See Appendix A, B, and C, a copy of the letter and the questions).

Sixty-six teachers participated in the four one-week in-service classes. The group included only teachers from the Los Angeles Unified School District: teachers of the blind, deaf-blind, trainable mentally retarded, speech, and orthopedically handicapped children; resource teachers; and teachers from the regular classroom. There were two students from California State University, Northridge; one the writer. Some of the schools represented had several teachers in attendance.

Each questionnaire was color coded, underlining the last statement on the questionnaire in one of eight different colors. Each color indicated an area of teaching, e.g., teachers of the deaf-blind were coded in red. By this means, it was possible to determine whether one group responded more completely than another. It became possible also to trace whether a particular group had similar difficulties within a particular area. The color coding allowed the writer to determine the number of questionnaires returned without asking the recipient to identify himself or his school. The letters were mailed and within a few days answers were received.
The writer attended a one-day workshop on DEAL at Salvin almost immediately following the mailing. One of the participants made a special point of returning her questionnaire in person, and a few others used some kind words to express their approval of the questionnaire. One person said it had suggested a teaching possibility of which she had not thought previously.

Of the sixty-six questionnaires, three were returned to the sender due to an incorrect address. Forty-four completed questionnaires were returned. The forty-four completed responses represented a two-thirds return on the mailing. This may indicate a high level of acceptance. See Table II for the total response.

The groups that proved to be least responsive were teachers of the trainable mentally retarded children and regular classroom teachers. One recipient said that the program was inappropriate for her children. Such a response raises the possibility that other unreturned copies indicated a lack of interest in the program, a lack of interest in the workshop, or a lack of interest in the questionnaire.

The largest single group of questionnaires were mailed to teachers of the deaf. Of the 24 mailed, 19 were returned. Twelve of the recipients knew of the Salvin program before attending the in-service class and, because of their interest in the Salvin program, attended the in-service class. Six other of the teachers said that their administrator had suggested they attend the program. Four of the 19 teachers are at present not in a DEAL program: one because of a change in class scheduling; another because of itinerant status; two started but stopped; one complained of problems with the school environment; and the other considered it inappropriate for the children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers of</th>
<th>Mailed</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedically handicapped</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainable mentally retarded</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-blind</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital-orthopedically handicapped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the orthopedically handicapped teachers, 13 questionnaires were mailed and 11 returned. Six of this group knew about DEAL, and five were team teaching before the class began. Only one teacher was not at present in a DEAL program, but only because she was not in a preschool program.

The results indicate that of 66 teachers, 44 returned questionnaires, 34 are now involved in a DEAL program (Question 2, Table II). Seven of these people were familiar with DEAL before the summer program, and 16 were already using some form of an option type program. Thirty-five said their administrator suggested they attend the in-service class (Question 2, Table III). However, 43 said they attended because of their own interest (Question 4, Table III). The overlap here, the writer thinks, is a result of some teachers' personal interest in attending the in-service class, but were also asked by their administrators to attend.

Thirty-three participants are teaming with one or more teachers. Fifteen of the group felt they personally were instrumental in starting the option time at their school. This may be a positive indicator of teacher acceptance of the content of the program.

Six people started the program but stopped for one or more of the following reasons:

- Fellow teachers were non-supportive
- Team-mate and teacher in conflict
- Found it inappropriate for the children
- Took too much time and energy
- Materials for option time not available
- Rather work alone.

Four people who did not team were unable to find someone with whom to team or did not think the physical environment was suitable. Twelve
TABLE III

DUAL EDUCATIONAL APPROACH TO LEARNING

SUMMARY OF ANSWERS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION #</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not numbered</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION #</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers considered stopping the DEAL program, but they changed their minds and continued the program. These people either received the needed consultant help, did not want to disappoint other teachers, or wanted to prove to themselves they could do the job. Teachers had generally more than one reason for their decisions to stop or to continue the program.

Most of the participants said the consultant was in contact with them (34). (Question 4, Table III) The materials passed out at the class and the other materials available to copy received overwhelming approval (Question 18, Table III). Only one teacher of the 44 thought the materials were not useful. The final question asked participants whether they were planning to attend a future one-day workshop to be held on a Saturday at Salvin. Twenty-five said yes. Question 20 added more information about future plans. When teachers were asked, "Would you like a follow-up in-service next summer?", 32 people said, "Yes."

The Model Early Childhood Unit was a testing ground for new ideas. This was a program in action. Questions could be discussed as they arose. Differing points of view could be aired and shared with people who have interests and problems in common. A teacher is isolated in a classroom, and the workshops provided an arena filled with expertise.

Twenty-three teachers said their administrators were supportive, and only two complained that their administrators were negative to the program. Administrative support adds to the success of staff development programs and encourages teachers to attempt new things.

The problems upon which people elaborated were most often in
regard to room space and the requirement of time, time related to time necessary for material preparation, lack of teacher break time, the frequent changes in the environment, and the time needed for team planning. Along with this category there were feelings that this type of program was more taxing physically.

Some teachers complained about interpersonal relationships of teams, citing a lack of agreement in philosophy. Comments were made about the need for others to learn about DEAL and about its value for children. They felt that there were positive values to be gained by teachers who were not in the program.

The Salvin Model Early Childhood Program continues to serve as a model and is open to visitors. To date, the project has been visited by 1,500 persons. The summer in-service was on a volunteer basis, and requests far outnumbered the spaces available. In addition to the summer in-service, there are opportunities for teachers to attend periodic one-day workshops. Through these types of programs, teachers can become advocates. They can talk about what they are doing, share their experiences, complain about their problems, and, with help, institute change. All these techniques were evidenced by participants in the in-service class.

The extension of the DEAL Program is entitled the DEAL Outreach Project. The demand for service demonstrated the need for the Outreach project which will provide an individual approach to in-service training. The projected plans will result in the implementation of seventy-five programs serving 1200 children.

Objectives of the Outreach Proposal include:

1. The implementation program will be available to 100
early childhood educators from both Los Angeles and other communities. Since the Los Angeles Unified School District is the largest school district serving the greatest number of young handicapped children in the nation, it will receive first priority for service. Other spaces will be available for representatives of such other programs as Headstart, Children's Centers, and other school districts.

Orientation and In-service training will be provided to an additional 100 early childhood educators.

The Outreach activities will be designed for replication and include five major activities.

1. An observation at the model site by a program representative.

2. An orientation by staff meeting at the participant program site.

3. A one-week training program at the model site to include a written plan developed for implementation of the DEAL program at the participant's site.

4. Follow-up consultant service on participant site as part of the in-service contract.

5. Continued on-call consultation service to program participants.

Other in-service studies, the writer found, measured the success of the program in terms of pupil knowledge or change in pupil behavior. Studies were not found to be based upon data regarding teacher change. The point of origin of such studies occurred after teachers had already adopted new techniques, and what appeared to be studied was the effect of the change upon children. There appears to be definitely a need for more and varied types of research to measure the effect of in-service programs on staff development.

Louis Rubin in *Improving In-Service Education*, points out that there must be a workable system for improving teaching practice (1971).
The system must allow for individual differences among teachers, must increase the instructional options available and must, "assist the teacher to clarify long-standing personal perceptions of self, school, and society." (This statement could just as appropriately apply to what we want for our children.) It reiterates Rogers' statement, "A teacher must be in touch with himself to be effective with others." (1969)

Continuing education, whether it be formal or informal, is vital in a changing world. School reform can be effective only as teachers are involved and, in turn, can bring relevant ideas and materials to the classroom. Since many teachers are isolated in their own classrooms, coming together with other teachers in in-service classes can be an effective means of improving and broadening teacher perceptions of the value of education.
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APPENDICES
March 8, 1974

Dear

I am working on my Master's degree in Early Childhood Studies at California State University at Northridge. I attended the Salvin School workshop last summer and did my fieldwork in the Early Childhood Unit at Salvin School. As a part of my studies, I have taken the responsibility of conducting a study of staff development.

During the past year, you have participated in activities related to the DEAL (Dual Educational Approach to Learning) Program at your school and/or at the summer workshop at Salvin School. The workshop was one phase of a type of staff development activity. My question is: Is an in-service program of this type an effective instrument of change? In what way does an in-service program of this type help teachers?

I need your help. Please complete the attached questionnaire and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. You will remain anonymous, but your response is vital to the validity of the final results. I will share the results of my findings with Bea Gold and Stephanie Vendig. This information, I hope, will be helpful to them and to others in planning for effective future workshops.

Thank you for your prompt response and your assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Hazel Wittenberg

Enc.
**APPENDIX B**

**DUAL EDUCATIONAL APPROACH TO LEARNING**

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONNAIRE. FEEL FREE TO ELABORATE WHERE NECESSARY. YOU NEED NOT SIGN YOUR NAME. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED FORM WITHIN TEN DAYS.

1. Were you familiar with DEAL before last summer?

2. Did your administrator suggest you attend the summer in-service program?

3. Did you attend the program primarily to earn points toward a salary increase?

4. Did you attend the program because of your own interest in it?

5. Did other people from your school attend?

6. If yes, did you attend with other people from your school?

7. Were you teaming with another teacher before attending the in-service program?

8. If yes, was it an option program?

9. Are you teaming now?

10. Are there other people teaming at your school? How many?

11. Are you using a formal/option time now?

12. Are there other people in your school using the formal/option time now?

13. Do you feel you were instrumental in starting an option time at your school?

14. Have consultants been in touch with you?

15. Have consultants been in touch with your team?

16. Have consultants offered you help but not been needed?

17. If you started a DEAL Program and it fell apart, did you request consultant help?
### APPENDIX B (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Have the materials you received last summer or from your consultant been useful?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Have the materials you developed been useful?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Would you like a follow-up in-service next summer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

CHOOSE THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER OF ANSWERS

21. I am now involved in a DEAL Program.
   If yes,
   a. Alone
   b. With others
   c. How many?

22. My administrator has been
   a. Supportive
   b. Tolerant
   c. Negative

23. I started but stopped because
   a. My administrator was not supportive
   b. My fellow teachers were not supportive.
   c. Consultant help was not available when needed.
   d. My team mate and I were in conflict.

24. I started but stopped because
   a. I found it inappropriate for my children.
   b. I am more comfortable working alone.
   c. Materials for the option time were not available.
   d. The physical environment was not appropriate.
   e. It took too much time and energy.

25. At one point I considered stopping but I continued because
   a. I got consultant help.
   b. I did not want to disappoint others.
   c. I wanted to prove to myself I could do it.

26. I did not start because
   a. My administrator was not supportive.
   b. I could not find someone to team with.
   c. I am not teaching now.

27. I did not start because
   a. I did not feel the program was valuable
   b. My physical environment was not conducive to teaming.
   c. My assignment was changed.
   d. I did not feel it was appropriate for handicapped children.
   e. Other reason?

28. If you are involved in DEAL, what problems are you encountering now? Can your consultant be of help?
   Will you be attending the March 23, Salvin Workshop?