Combining Categorical Services
Does Make A Difference

by Forest Hertlein
Mukilteo School District
Everett, Washington

The Mukilteo School District in Everett, Washington has initiated a plan to combine categorical programs in an effort to improve services to low performing students. The Mukilteo Learning Support System (MLSS), initiated in 1982, was established on the belief that students learning needs, rather than eligibility categories, are the important basis of effective program design and delivery. Although Federal and State systems for various programs such as Chapter I and special education (P.L. 94-142) are intended to provide services to different student populations, the significant overlap in student characteristics and needs demands a coordinated approach. Another major goal of program coordination is to increase communication between categorical and regular classroom students.

Eliminating Categorical Separateness

The first step in combining services is eliminating or diminishing administrative and programmatic separateness of categorical programs. Initially, this effort was facilitated in Mukilteo at the district level by placing all categorical programs under the responsibility of one administrator who was committed to program coordination. Some argue that the barrier to coordination is that district administrators continue to treat Federal and State categorical programs as separate entities that must be administered separately from the basic program and from one another. The tendency by such administration is to fragment responsibilities for instructional planning among several program coordinators who select their program designs because they suffer lesser burdens against compliance issues and audits. By placing categorical administrative responsibility under one administrator, a range of cross-supervisory roadblocks are significantly reduced.

At each building in the Mukilteo School District, Chapter I, ESL, remedial, and special education resource room programs are consolidated into a Learning Support Center (LSC). The LSC is staffed by one certificated teacher and a number of instructional assistants. When the school year begins, all students are assigned to regular classrooms and students in greatest need of learning support are identified through curriculum based assessments. Typically, students in greatest need are those who function more than one year below grade level and who can not be accommodated in the regular classroom. Further curriculum testing is completed by LSC staff to form appropriate placements in LSC groups. Therefore, it is common to find special education, Chapter I, remedial and bilingual students receiving basic skill instruction in the same instructional group. A common referral system is used with emphasis placed upon identifying skills the student has and has not mastered. Categorical funding labels are considered only with respect to the administration of the system in areas such as program funding, eligibility, and accountability.

Increasing Curriculum and Instruction Coordination

Operating categorical programs in a separate manner often exposes students to different and, sometimes competing, instructional materials and practices. Chapter I reading materials and instruction may differ from remedial reading which may differ from regular reading. To provide curricular continuity and rigor, the MLSS adopted Direct Instruction materials and techniques as the primary instructional approach. To the use of structured and highly sequential materials such as Reading Mastery, Spelling Mastery, Corrective Reading, Diller Language, Corrective Math, and Mastering Fractions allows instruction to be carried out by non-certificated staff and supervised by the LSC teacher. Utilization of aides in this manner provides a coordinated and structured curriculum throughout the system. Time spent by LSC teachers in training and supervising aides in curricular and instructional methods is an on-going and essential component to the program’s success.

It is the Learning Support Teacher’s responsibility to monitor student progress and to adjust groups accordingly. This assures that students are receiving instruction at the appropriate level of difficulty. The LSC teacher also assures that students are “planned” back into regular curriculum materials prior to existing in the LSC. This is accomplished by applying Direct Instruction methods such as pre-teaching, model-model-taést, and mastery learning to district adopted curricula. Therefore, the MLSS is effectively linked and designed to support the learning activities and materials of the regular classroom. In this manner a coordinated service model fosters a team approach in which regular and categorical staff members share responsibility for providing services to students.

Teaching Handicapped Preschoolers with DI

by Georgia Layton
Director, ADI Preschool

In 1981, the Early Education Program came into existence to test the applicability of Direct Instruction principles and practices with handicapped preschool-age children. We are presently serving sixty severely, moderately, and mildly handicapped three to five-year-olds in Lane County, Oregon. This article overviews our program.

Like other programs with a commitment to Direct Instruction, ours has as its underlying rule, “Teach more in less time” (Beckert, 1986). With this rule comes a responsibility to: (1) choose functional instructional objectives with both economy and power (Bruner, 1966), (2) engage in efficient and effective teaching practices, and (3) adopt procedures that allow us to reduce wasteful time and increase the time children are engaged in relevant instruction. What follows is a description of our efforts in each of these areas.

Instructional Objectives

Over the past six years, we have realized that unfortunately none of the commercially available DI programs (even the newly revised Diller Language I) can be used with our students without great adaptation. This is certainly no criticism of these programs, but rather an acknowledgment that the goals and instructional detail in them do not often meet the needs of our younger, more severely handicapped learners. It has become increasing clear that we must generate our own instructional goals, and that these must help our children maximally succeed not only in school but at home and in the community as well. To this end we add an interest in economy and power, that is, teaching the fewest number of objectives needed to achieve the greatest generalization of application. Table 1 presents our instructional content in the cognitive and motor areas (see page 4).

The great majority of our time in the classroom is spent teaching important cognitive and concepts and operations. Possibly our most important goal is to provide our children with an understanding of the basic sensory concepts that surround them. We spend much instructional time teaching our children regular nouns and concepts like book, apple, and nose; classification nouns like clothes and color; adjectives like good, nice, happy, shoes, them, before, loud, and round and words frequently used in instruction like yes and no, nor and same. We are also interested in teaching our children a myriad of functional ways to demonstrate their newly acquired vocabulary (i.e., cognitive operations). We focus on making kids “smart” in a variety of contexts by teaching them among other things to communicate their needs in increasingly sophisticated ways (requesting), answer a host of questions about objects/events (answers questions) and sequence events in time.

We attempt to include basic cognitive concepts and operations that are functional for all of life, in that they promote movement in the child’s present and future home, school, and community environments. Noun concepts like ball, chair, sandwich and toy and descriptive concepts like hot, sleeping, in, and mine are likely to be needed in many present and future contexts, and are taught early-on in our curriculum. Operations like requesting, following directions, some objects functioning, and engaging in conversation are similarly included because of their importance in a host of real-life routines.

Our interest in economy and power leads us to select goals strategically. We are particularly apt to choose goals (component skills) that we can combine and use in a variety of contexts. Our basic concepts are particularly well-suited for this purpose. Once a child has a core repertoire of these basic concepts, they are combined and used in some of our many programs to teach cognitive operations. For example, after our children are taught to identify a select set of common objects like shoe, ball, and car, these same objects are then used to teach a variety of more complex skills like touching pictured objects, sorting and matching objects, naming touched objects, requesting desired objects, and the like. These operations are then combined with others and included in a variety of more “natural” contexts. In this way, a minimum number of basic concepts are combined and recombined to provide maximum generality of application.

Our interest in functional and “reconstructive” skills (Alsenz, 1987) extends to the motor domain as well. Motor goals relevant to school (e.g., sitting, writing, cutting), leisure time (e.g., climbing, building, swinging) and self-help routines (e.g., washing, unbuttoning, dressing) are focused upon. A host of basic fine motor, gross motor and verbal responses important to a variety of contexts are shaped from day 1. These are later combined in more complex chains and are continually required in naturally occurring settings.

Our ultimate responsibility is to see to it that our children achieve and succeed in those naturally occurring life activities.
Dear Readers:

I am sorry for the delay in putting together this issue of the ADI News. In June when we normally put together the Summer issue there were just not enough articles on hand. Weeks by late July the material was ready, we were into the workshop season in Eugene, Salt Lake City, and Newport Beach. To deal with this problem and to catch up, we will put out two 12 page issues (Vol. 6, No. 4 and Vol. 7, No. 1).

What we need more than anything else are more contributors to describe what they have learned in teaching, supervising, and program evaluation related to D.I. Send articles to Dr. Wes Becker, ADI News, P.O. Box 10252, Eugene, OR, 97440.

Wes Becker, Editor
Dear Editor:

I want to thank you very much for the article regarding the achievement gains in Algebra classes, etc. (ADI News, Spring 1987, Vol. 6, No. 3).

As I read it, I came across the portion on the case study. I got goose-bumps reading my own quoted words. What a compliment. Thank you so much, and yet you may certainly use my name in your future articles.

You've made my job seem significant again—a rare feeling for those of us who are striving hard to reach those "hard to reach students."

I know this is every informal note but I am unable to obtain letterhead from San Diego High school because we are out of school. Yeah!

Good luck to you and all the others involved in your project and future projects.

Karen Crowe-Lips
P.S. Thanks again for the grand compliment in the writing of this paper of yours.
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The first grade are seriously behind in reading skills. According to the National Assessment of Academic Progress, the average 7th grader cannot add simple fractions that have unlike denominators, like 1/3 and 1/4. And the one who has ever observed the performance of typical, middle-class, intelligent students in 5th grade science or in 7th grade history knows that these students have serious deficiencies in critical reasoning, logical inference, and knowledge.

I don't think we would have very much trouble documenting the fact that the average school or the average school district is doing a poor job of instructing kids—comparing how what is possible and what is possible and what is actually achieved 30 years ago. B.F. Skinner in a recent article called "The Shame of American Education" (Skinner, 1984). How do the schools respond to their failure? They make up guidelines. These guidelines tell how particular skills should be taught. They express both the objectives and the grade levels at which instruction is to happen. They describe the format of instruction. Sure, agencies other than schools or school districts play this game of guidelines. In 1983, "textbook" commissions and adoption procedures. These are governed by "guidelines." Even states that don't have such commissions have "guidelines." Obviously, guidelines are important, and I'm not arguing against them. But guidelines are supposed to protect, and one wonders, when were unprotected by guidelines? Or, as the title of this article asks, "Who is kidding whom?" Consider the joke: The school districts don't know how to teach a skill that is not known. By knowing how to do, an average student doesn't learn the skill ("on schedule"). So the school districts make up guidelines that tell the student what they taught and how it should be scheduled. The guidelines now function as self-fulfilling prophecies and guarantee that the skill will never be taught effectively. Only the uninformed, or the naive, would teach it the way the guidelines demand it to be taught. Think of the preassumption. They don't know how to teach it, but they insist that it is taught the way. If we were to follow the typical sequence outlined by the typical school district (or by "Inservice Training for Instructors") for teaching reading comprehension, we will be guaranteed of failing with a large percentage of students who could easily learn the skills if an appropriate program and format of instruction were used.

The same is true of arithmetic. The National Council of Teachers of Arithmetic, has published, promulgated, the guidelines that will guarantee failure in math. Many of the districts that have incorporated these guidelines into their guidelines are the ones with the most serious problems in student performance.

The saddest part of this situation is that those who are on the committees, and those who make the decisions about "guidelines" have typically never seen classes where all students are taught and learn. So, they have no knowledge of the facts that are relevant to constructing intelligent guidelines—how many examples it takes, what kind of experience, what type of strategy, what type of instruction, what type of activities.

That's the problem. What's the solution? Using brain data-based procedures for current selection and guidelines for program selection. What that means is this: 1. Don't adopt any guidelines from any body who has not demonstrated the ability to teach the skill in question and teach it uniformly—so that virtually all students who qualify for being taught the skill master it in the predicted time. A good procedure would be for the school or the program to pay the advocate or author of a procedure (or program) to put on a demonstration with a selected sample of students. Then it would be relatively easy to evaluate whether the program works, which is the most important question.

If the program passes the test of working, the district can move to step 2, if it fails, throw it out (along with the consultant or advocate). After all, the district doesn't need another program that doesn't work.

2. If the program does work, the district must next find out whether or not teachers can be uniformly trained to teach the program and if so, what kind of training is needed. Again, it would be much more possible for the district or agency to have a program advocate demonstrate the training requirements. (This alternative is a lot better than the district trying to interpret "school effectiveness" research and making up their own training programs because we have the problem that the teachers could fail after district training, whereas training of a different format could succeed.

If we move to step 3, that program that a program can work well with the students, but still be very difficult for teachers to use. This is information the district needs. If the teachers can be trained, then the district can move to step 4, that is, the whole period of time, we can move to step 3.

3. Next, the district should make provisions for implementing training.

The purpose of this should be to guarantee that the district or agency to have a program advocate demonstrate the training requirements. (This alternative is a lot better than the district trying to interpret "school effectiveness" research and making up their own training programs because we have the problem that the teachers could fail after district training, whereas training of a different format could succeed.

If we move to step 4, that program that a program can work well with the students, but still be very difficult for teachers to use. This is information the district needs. If the teachers can be trained, then the district can move to step 4, that is, the whole period of time, we can move to step 3.
Changing Reading Programs: North Thurston’s Gradual Move Toward Reading Mastery

by John Woodward

University of Oregon

North Thurston School District is a medium-sized district just south of Tacoma, Washington. With approximately 10,000 students, it is one of the fastest growing districts in the state. North Thurston has a diverse social and economic makeup, and for a district of its size, it has a typical shape of transition of low income students. Yet, what has concerned teachers and administrators the most over the last five years has been the increasing number of low achieving and “at risk” students in its ten elementary schools.

Consistent low performance in the area of reading, especially as students move from kindergarten to first and second grade, has prompted the district to re-evaluate its elementary reading program.

North Thurston believes that reading is a program, not a block or an add-on assortment of texts. According to Jim Rydland, Curriculum Director for the district, what they want to achieve, “is a well-defined, student-oriented system and not a fragmented combination of different reading programs.” Reading is at the center of their elementary education program, and the district recognizes that reading problems which begin in the early years only get worse. They are costly to districts in terms of staffing and additional curricula, and more importantly, they cost students. Rather than wait for children to fall into serious deficiencies by the end of third grade or when they encounter content area texts in the intermediate grades, the district has committed to a preventive reading program.

**Guidelines - Continued from Page 2**

districts hundreds of millions of dollars, could remedy some of the metaphysical problems that currently get in the way of intelligent instruction, and would provide schools with programs and procedures that work.

Oh yes, it would also benefit the students enormously.

You get an idea of how much money it would save if you consider the following: School districts that adopt “philosophy-driven” programs spend millions to put them together and imply that the teachers know how to make the right decisions about teaching—will fail. For instance, a few years ago a large district in the state set aside $50,000 for “school effectiveness” information to provide in-service, program adaptations of the district reading program (Ginn), and an ongoing monitoring and support system. The cost of the program was staggering—millions of dollars just for reproducing supplemental worksheet material. By the time the program was implemented, the district had gone way over budget. Teachers who had never seen the skills effectively taught, who had never taught themselves, and who were certainly naive in the principles and intricacies of instructional design, created this project.

It failed.

To spend a few bucks finding out what does work and then implementing those programs is not only to save time, but money. It is the most cost efficient thing the district could do.

---

**District Level Training:**

To maintain a high level of support for the direct instruction reading programs, the district has followed a policy of voluntary participation. No teacher has been told that they must use Reading Mastery, and interestingly enough, the district has had no problem finding teachers who want to use the reading series. In fact, the opposite is more of a problem. There are several elementary teachers who would rather use Reading Mastery, but must use Ginn.

Insuring that Reading Mastery will be successful, the district has realized that it must go beyond the skills of its few, well-trained direct instruction teachers. At this point, North Thurston has begun a detailed and ongoing in-service program. This entails support for both outside training through workshops such as the annual Direct Instruction Conference in Eugene, Oregon; training within the district by SRA consultants; and more recently, district personnel.

The district uses SRA consultants for special programs or to keep all of its teachers abreast of new direct instruction techniques. However, on an ongoing basis, the predominant inservice strategy is to use personnel within the district for training. Not only is this more cost-effective in the long run, but it allows training to be directly related to the unique needs of their teachers. Throughout the year, teachers are able to meet, receive specific training on a Reading Mastery program, and discuss problems that are relevant to their particular school or grade level. Furthermore, as more teachers are trained, they can be evenly placed throughout the district. Those who exhibit the highest skills receive even more training and are asked to become building level experts or facilitators.

The building level expert is an important element in North Thurston’s staff development program. Whereas possible, the district would like to have one well-trained direct instruction teacher in every elementary school as an instructional leader. Ideally, this role would be filled by the principal and in certain instances, such as Carol O’Connell at Olympic View Elementary, it has been done.
Teaching Handicapped Preschoolers with DI —

These activities or routines may be primarily educational in function (e.g., small group teaching activities, large group activities, independent seat work etc.), recreational (e.g., structured play activities, free play, etc.) or part of some other general management (e.g., arrival to school routines, mealtime, dressing, toileting, etc.). We focus on teaching a set of generic skills common to all activities, but not including only the core skills needed but those which allow the child to perform independently (e.g., initiating the routine appropriately, problem solving as necessary) and those which enhance the routine (e.g., communicating needs, socializing). These are more comprehensively described by Frederic Brown (1987).

Teaching children to engage in complex routines depends to a great extent on our success in teaching the many cognitive and motor skills listed above that are components of these routines. When component skills have been taught generally, with an eye to applying them in the many activities in which they naturally occur, we best prepare our children to succeed in those routines.

Free play provides an example. In our free-play activities at school, we want our children to be able to: (1) go to a place of their choosing, (2) go out the door as directed, (2) get toys from off the shelf/beanbag for those that are out of reach, (3) play appropriately, (4) defend one's own toys, (5) talk frequently and intelligibly with adults/peers, (6) put toys away, and (7) leave when asked. Much instruction on the component skills for this activity occurs outside of the free play area using "generalized strategies" to promote their generalization. (These strategies will be discussed later in the section called "Instructional Design.") During our instruction, the children may be taught: (1) "primary" (or "general"") directions which are necessary if the teacher says "When your things are put away, you can go away," (2) to request using the desired object's name such that they can do so when they want toys that are out of reach, (3) a host of relevant fine-motor manipulations and rules about playing with objects which allow them to engage appropriately with those that are available, and (4) to name a variety of basic cognitive concepts like big/small, big and small, for which their objects can then talk about with other children and adults while playing inthe area. In this way, we are able to provide critical practice on relevant component skills such that they can be easily incorporated in naturally occurring routines.

In our classrooms, we teach a variety of cognitive concepts, motor skills, and complex routines. These are functional in that they allow our children to be able to succeed in present and future school, recreational and self management activities. Those that require a minimum amount of instruction with the greatest generalized application are our highest priority. The procedures we use to teach them are further described in the next section.

Issues of Instructional Design

The heart of Direct Instruction lies in the specific program details of how to best teach the task whether cognitive, motor, or a chain involving both cognitive and motor response. DI focuses on teaching the "general case," so that skills initially taught in small instructional groups also occur in a myriad of ways in the environments they should. Without ready-made DI programs, but armed with relevant Direct Instruction principles (Engelman & Carania, 1982; Becker, 1980), a particularly helpful manuscript called Direct Instruction for severely Handicapped Learners (Engelman & Gobin, 1985), and a strong background in DISTAR I (Engelman & Ostern, 1987), we have begun to develop our own teaching programs which include initial teaching sequences and expansion tasks—a process which is both arduous and exciting. I will next describe how we have done this for one, very tiny program objective, a new cognitive concept, "pitcher.

Teaching the concept, "pitcher" is begun only after a core of basic cognitive concepts has been taught. As quickly as we can, we introduce our children to a set of common objects, people and places. Throughout the year, new such concepts are added. We add pitcher when the category containers and examples of containers like basket, pot, and bowl are introduced, which is well into the year. We make sure that pitcher is well separated from other concepts with which it shares characteristics either in appearance or name. That is, pitcher is introduced well after the visually similar concept cup is taught, significantly before the visually similar concept thorns is introduced and well-spaced from picture, which sounds.

Table 1. Instructional Content Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Skills</th>
<th>Basic Concepts</th>
<th>Regular Nouns</th>
<th>Common Objects</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Places</th>
<th>Parts</th>
<th>Classification Nouns</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Toy</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>Basic Concepts</td>
<td>Regular Nouns</td>
<td>Common Objects</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Places</td>
<td>Parts</td>
<td>Classification Nouns</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Toy</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Push/Poke</td>
<td>Threads</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>School Skills</td>
<td>Draw/Write</td>
<td>Erase</td>
<td>Face</td>
<td>Paints</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places</td>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Push/Poke</td>
<td>Threads</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>School Skills</td>
<td>Draw/Write</td>
<td>Erase</td>
<td>Face</td>
<td>Paints</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places</td>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Push/Poke</td>
<td>Threads</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>School Skills</td>
<td>Draw/Write</td>
<td>Erase</td>
<td>Face</td>
<td>Paints</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places</td>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Push/Poke</td>
<td>Threads</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>School Skills</td>
<td>Draw/Write</td>
<td>Erase</td>
<td>Face</td>
<td>Paints</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td>Build</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Thurston's Reading

Continued from Page 3

this is the case. However, most principals lack the training, and the nature of their job does not permit the time needed to answer questions, assist teachers in their classrooms, and model a specific technique, such as a correction procedure, with a group of students. Finding others to take on the training role was a common arrangement in Project Follow Through—well-trained personnel other than principals were the ones who typically provided active instructional leadership. This model certainly does not preclude the principal from the role of instructional leadership; rather, it opens the role of training to other teachers.

Reactions from Teachers and Parents to Reading Mastery

In many districts throughout the country, a certain number of teachers have initially reacted to direct instruction programs with skepticism. This is a natural reaction, and an experienced administrator would predict that this will happen with almost any "new" or "different" curriculum. The emphasis on voluntary use of the Reading Mastery program has mitigated some of the potentially skeptical or negative reactions. Even more important, it has permitted teachers who were initially indifferent or critical of the program to see the marked and positive impact of Reading Mastery on students. Furthermore, community reaction has been quite positive, with parents stating that they are not only pleased that their children are being taught, but that they are reading so well. Many parents, in fact, have come forward and asked that their children be placed in the Reading Mastery programs, regardless of the child's achievement level.

Petie Kerl, principal of one of North Thurston's elementary schools, cites several unusual changes in teacher attitudes that the Reading Mastery Program has gradually been adopted in his school. For example, in the coming year most of the staff trained in direct instruction will go into new assignments. Naturally, there is a need to replace these teachers. In order to fill the gap, a surprising group of teachers have volunteered to teach the program. For example, a teacher with 20 years of experience unexpectedly asked to be trained in Reading Mastery. This also occurred with a sixth grade teacher, and both will receive training this summer. In another year a principal, Kerl has "never seen such a strong grassroots support for a curriculum from teachers from.

Planning for the Future

In August, between 20 to 30 North Thurston teachers will be trained in the Reading Mastery Program for three weeks just prior to the new school year. One week will be devoted to an overview of direct instruction and Reading Mastery. The remaining two weeks will involve actual training in Reading Mastery with groups of students. Follow up sessions will continue throughout the year. Ultimately, the district will incorporate a more generic, program independent form of direct instruction training in its overall in-service program.

To document the effects of the direct instruction programs, the district is engaged in a variety of data collection activities. Preliminary data, such as the progress by fourth grade students described earlier, is fueling this effort and the district is strongly committed to going beyond enthusiasm and subjective judgement in order to describe the long term impact of the programs. Carol O'Connell at Olympic View, is collecting longitudinal data and is particularly interested in what happens to students who have been in Reading Mastery for three years and will be returning to the district adopted reading program next year. Finally, all principals are encouraged to keep careful data on student progress, both on the form of the program's continuous tests and standardized tests administered twice a year. We hope to have further reports on progress at North Thurston School District for future editions of the ADI News.
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To assure that our children will be able to make the verbal response pitcher, we need to begin shaping that response. The first step in teaching the concept, pitcher, is understanding the concept, pitcher. That shaping will take place during what we call our "articulation track." During this track our children are taught that the concept "pitcher" is a very specific term with specific meanings in everyday language. Manuals signs are often taught with the verbal approximations to allow children who are otherwise unintelligible to be understood. Improved articulation can generally be shaped over several days and sessions.

For young children, Eglin and Carmine (1982) for motor responses work well. Once an improved verbal response, "pitcher," and manual sign are established, they are required when the concept task is introduced.

To introduce the concept pitcher Eglin and Carmine's "noun sequence" is used. To teach "pitcher," we point to 3 or 4 maximally different physical objects and manual signs. For example, "This container is a pitcher." Next, our children are asked to label several of these objects with the word, "pitcher." Many children will look at you for help in understanding what we mean by "pitcher." As we said before, the children are required to use their improved verbal response and manual sign. In our classroom, children beyond the age of 3 have been taught to use the words "pitter" or "pitch." These children have been taught to use the terms by repetition and structured activities. The sequence is shaped from day 1. New skills taught in instructional groups are routinely promoted and reinforced here.

Staff roles are related to efficiency. Our instructional groups are led by well-trained teaching assistants who allows us to spend more time on instruction. Assistants are initially assigned only to a few common areas or tasks. This results in increased efficiency and supervision much more manageable. Keeping programs updated and operating smoothly on a daily basis can be a difficult task. Our instructional groups are constantly being refined. The order of the day for high-stakes and instructional activities.

Our small group practices allow us to get and keep our children maximally engaged during instructional activities. Some of these activities are "struggling" and some are "very easy". Different instructional tasks are related to the structure of our groups. Groups are small (2-4 children) and homogenous when possible. Children are asked to work with a partner and practice more difficult children in the middle. Frequently signaled group responses are characteristic.

The age and level of sophistication of our learners has prompted us to include some additional group activities programs. These are practiced particularly short. These or four different "tracks" are worked on in one of our 15 minute small groups. These are repeated during the day as needed. Task content is varied to keep interest high for this reason. The shaping and testing activities are interchanged. Materials are similarly varied to help keep children motivated. Our classroom rules are to use particular sets of materials in a new way. Reinforcement of a job well done is enthusiastic, frequent, and related to the task whenever possible.

Several conclusions can be derived from this description. First, the pace of group instruction is much more than what was possible with individualized instruction. Second, the pace of group instruction can be much more "strategic" than what was possible with individualized instruction. Some group instruction activities can be done with three children in the group. This allows for a group of children to work on different tasks or activities. The pace of group instruction can be much more "strategic" than what was possible with individualized instruction. Some group instruction activities can be done with three children in the group. This allows for a group of children to work on different tasks or activities.
Distar Language—
A powerful tool for teaching

A powerful tool for teaching:
- A basic vocabulary
- A rich body of knowledge about the world
- The oral language and writing skills needed to ask precise questions and to communicate ideas.

These are the abilities that a new report, Becoming a Nation of Readers, lags as being important to all children who are learning to read... critical for children who have not grown up with oral language that resembles the language of school and books... because these abilities are the basis of comprehension.

And these are the abilities that teachers have been successfully teaching children for almost twenty years with Distar Language programs.

But Distar Language does more than teach the complex language skills needed to understand classroom instruction and comprehend written text. Distar Language programs go beyond the content of other language programs to give you the help you need to teach critical thinking skills, skills that enhance a child's intellectual development.

With Distar Language you teach logical thinking through:
- Classification
- Analogy
- Deductive reasoning
- Inductive reasoning

You teach students to be "THINKERS" who use language as a tool. And that is the foundation for eventual success in all school subjects.

And now the Distar Language program is better than ever! Distar Language I has been revised to give you:

- Expanded Language Activities—ideas for fun-to-do songs, read-aloud stories, nursery rhymes, and plays. These informal lesson extensions encourage students to apply their language skills in classroom activities.
- Language achievement full naturalness as a remarkably early stage.
- Fast Cycle—an in-line skipping schedule eliminates unnecessary drill and practice for average and above-average students. A "star" identifies the tasks that you teach to all students. You are free to adapt the remaining exercises with the faster children. Lessons are easier to adapt to student ability.
- Take-Home—lively pencil and paper activities teach color, shape and workbook skills. Activities reinforce skills, demonstrate that students can apply language concepts. Illustrations are improved. There is more to do on each page.

Use this order form to receive these exciting new materials as soon as possible.

Mail to SRA, 135 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago, IL 60606

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-7340</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-7346</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-57345</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-57349</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SRA®
## Table 1. Mulkiteo Learning Support System Metropolitan Achievement Test NCE Gains Fall to Spring (Months) 1996-87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>+6.8</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>+6.4</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td>+6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+4.0</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>+9.8</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td>+12.0</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
<td>+11.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All MLSS Students</td>
<td>+12.8</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+4.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>+5.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All MLSS Students</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All MLSS Students</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maintaining Program Accountability

In order to meet requirements of fiscal accountability, a student and personnel tracking system is used that allows proportional funding of staff members in each LSC. District payroll records reflect the specific amount of time each person works with eligible students according to the various categorical labels. In order to ease the paperwork burden, this tracking system uses the district's VAX computer system which is networked to all schools. This tracking system is not only allows the district to comply with regulations, but also allows the compilation of an efficient, student-oriented model of support service delivery that co-mingles services but tracks expenditures separately.

### Increasing Benefits and Achievement

There are several advantages to a coordinated approach to intervention for low-performing students. Program coordination can promote school-wide and district-wide cooperative approaches to meeting the needs of students and encourage the sharing of instructional and administrative expertise across a broad range of staff. Coordination may also provide a “critical mass” of support resources to more effectively and efficiently utilize finite educational funding. Any apparent reduction in the duplication of support services increases the efficiency of services delivered.

Another benefit of combining categorical programs is that timely intervention occurs for students with instructional needs without extended delays due to meeting eligibility standards. Service within the MLSS is designed to permit early and appropriate intervention. For example, a student who is suspected as having a handicapping condition may enter the LSC as a Chapter 1 or remedial student. Should a student lack of progress warrant it, a referral for additional assessment may be made to determine eligibility for special education. The student continues to receive assistance during the referral and testing process.

Improving student achievement is the organizational goal of the Mulkiteo Learning Support System. Table 1 gives the normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains in months on fall-to-spring Metropolitan Achievement Testing for elementary students in MLSS for 1986-87 school year. All students in grades 2-6 who were served by the system for at least 1 semester were included in the project test group. These data indicate that a cooperative approach model utilizing Direct Instruction as the primary instructional model can make a significant difference for students.

### Summary

The staff at both schools learned the Direct Instruction teaching methods and approached this program in a very positive manner. Teachers using Reading Mastery through VI spoke in favor of the program as follows:

- Words and context of stories are repetition and straightforward.
- Stories are interesting and appealing to youngsters as well as being fast paced.
- Students attend consistently with good success rates; students enjoy the "system." The entire program is well organized and easy to follow.
- The program is easy to administer and a classroom management system.
- There is maximum student-teacher interaction, as the program lends itself to small group instruction.

Arms in which teachers felt the most concerned included the following:

- The Take-Home Book pages are too easy in the beginning Reading Mastery series. Storywalk pages are too easy.
- Students are not introduced to the skills as measured on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS).
- Sentences begin with "And," and "But." Initially, teachers were most concerned with the lack of capital letters in Reading Mastery. However, most students are bolder with this lack of capital and readability adjusted when they are taught capital letters in their language arts lessons. Similarly, the "a" was difficult for youngsters to write. Students called it the "reading a." Corrective Reading

As stated in the aforementioned, the Corrective Reading Program was used with the immediate grade youngsters. Teachers using the Decoding lessons love the sequential introduction of phonetic and sight words and the reinforcement of these elements. Students readily see their own progress. There is spontaneous class participation. Teachers using the Comprehension books like the focus of reading in the content areas. They feel that skills can easily be transferred to other areas. There is also story writing with every lesson.

### Reading Mastery

The staff at both schools learned the Direct Instruction teaching methods and approached this program in a very positive manner. Teachers using Reading Mastery through VI spoke in favor of the program as follows:

- Words and context of stories are repetition and straightforward.
- Stories are interesting and appealing to youngsters as well as being fast paced.
- Students attend consistently with good success rates; students enjoy the "system." The entire program is well organized and easy to follow.
- The program is easy to administer and a classroom management system.
- There is maximum student-teacher interaction, as the program lends itself to small group instruction.

Arms in which teachers felt the most concerned included the following:

- The Take-Home Book pages are too easy in the beginning Reading Mastery series. Storywalk pages are too easy.
- Students are not introduced to the skills as measured on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS).
- Sentences begin with "And," and "But." Initially, teachers were most concerned with the lack of capital letters in Reading Mastery. However, most students are bolder with this lack of capital and readability adjusted when they are taught capital letters in their language arts lessons. Similarly, the "a" was difficult for youngsters to write. Students called it the "reading a." Corrective Reading

As stated in the aforementioned, the Corrective Reading Program was used with the immediate grade youngsters. Teachers using the Decoding lessons love the sequential introduction of phonetic and sight words and the reinforcement of these elements. Students readily see their own progress. There is spontaneous class participation. Teachers using the Comprehension books like the focus of reading in the content areas. They feel that skills can easily be transferred to other areas. There is also story writing with every lesson.

### Summary

The staff at both schools learned the Direct Instruction teaching methods and approached this program in a very positive manner. Teachers using Reading Mastery through VI spoke in favor of the program as follows:

- Words and context of stories are repetition and straightforward.
- Stories are interesting and appealing to youngsters as well as being fast paced.
- Students attend consistently with good success rates; students enjoy the "system." The entire program is well organized and easy to follow.
- The program is easy to administer and a classroom management system.
- There is maximum student-teacher interaction, as the program lends itself to small group instruction.

Arms in which teachers felt the most concerned included the following:

- The Take-Home Book pages are too easy in the beginning Reading Mastery series. Storywalk pages are too easy.
- Students are not introduced to the skills as measured on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS).
- Sentences begin with "And," and "But." Initially, teachers were most concerned with the lack of capital letters in Reading Mastery. However, most students are bolder with this lack of capital and readability adjusted when they are taught capital letters in their language arts lessons. Similarly, the "a" was difficult for youngsters to write. Students called it the "reading a." Corrective Reading

As stated in the aforementioned, the Corrective Reading Program was used with the immediate grade youngsters. Teachers using the Decoding lessons love the sequential introduction of phonetic and sight words and the reinforcement of these elements. Students readily see their own progress. There is spontaneous class participation. Teachers using the Comprehension books like the focus of reading in the content areas. They feel that skills can easily be transferred to other areas. There is also story writing with every lesson.

### Summary

The staff at both schools learned the Direct Instruction teaching methods and approached this program in a very positive manner. Teachers using Reading Mastery through VI spoke in favor of the program as follows:

- Words and context of stories are repetition and straightforward.
- Stories are interesting and appealing to youngsters as well as being fast paced.
- Students attend consistently with good success rates; students enjoy the "system." The entire program is well organized and easy to follow.
- The program is easy to administer and a classroom management system.
- There is maximum student-teacher interaction, as the program lends itself to small group instruction.
ADI Presents
Washington State Inservice Day DI Training Workshops

October 9 & 10, 1987

Holiday Inn West
Spokane, Washington

Training Sessions Offered:
Reading Mastery I & II
Tracey Hall
Teaching Expressive Writing Skills
Carole Allen

Direct Instruction for Severely Handicapped Learners
Ann Arbogast

Facilities Way
Federal Way, Washington

Training Sessions Offered:
Reading Mastery I & II
Phyllis Haddock
Reading Mastery III-VI
Mercy Stein
Teaching Expressive Writing Skills
Jerry Silbert

Workshop Descriptions

Participants will choose one.

Reading I & II
Presenter: Tracey Hall (Spokane), Phyllis Haddock (Federal Way)
Regular grades K-2, non-readers in grades 1-6. How to teach beginning students to read and how to teach remedial students—those who read very poorly or not at all. This session will provide training in SRA’s Reading Mastery I & II. Participants will learn the basic information and skills needed to implement the program—placement, acceleration, scheduling, grouping, presenting prereading exercises. Participants will receive Reading I and Reading II Teacher’s Guides.

Reading Mastery III-VI
Presenter: Mercy Stein (Federal Way)
These programs present a careful sequence for teaching comprehension and decoding skills to students who have mastered the basics. Programs provide for meeting the full range of decoding and comprehension objectives, including management systems for monitoring student progress, and teaching all component skills (vocabulary, rules, information, map skills, context analysis) needed for students to completely understand the expository and fictional selections presented in the program.

Teaching Expressive Writing Skills
Presenter: Carole Allen (Spokane), Jerry Silbert (Federal Way)
Regular grades 3-4, remedial 4-12. Overview and training in specific procedures for using Levels I & II of SRA’s Expressive Writing Program. These programs teach students the most difficult first steps in expressive writing through a basic sentence writing strategy and an organization strategy that are applied to simple reporting and interpreting activities. Students learn editing, punctuation and paragraphing skills. Participants will receive an Expressive Writing Teacher’s Guide.

Direct Instruction for Severely Handicapped Learners
Presenter: Ann Arbogast (Spokane)
This workshop provides technical information on how to manage and teach severely retarded learners. Participants will learn management techniques for including compliance to verbal instructions, inducing generalizations, learning responses, and expanding the range of activities presented to the learner. Participants will practice techniques for dealing with problems of echolalia, stupitious behavior, and very limited receptive language. This practical, how-to workshop, uses video demonstrations of the techniques being discussed.

Registration Information

Workshop Fees & Discounts: The workshop fee is $70.00, which includes all workshop materials. ADI Members receive a 20% discount ($54.00). Groups of 5 or more from a single district or agency receive a discount of $10.00 per participant. Contact Bryan Wickman at (503) 485-1293 for additional information.

Optional College Credit: One unit of credit is available from the University of Oregon for $20.00 (in addition to the workshop fee).

Workshop Locations & Lodging:
Federal Way: Federal Way Executive, 3161 20th Ave., South, Federal Way, Washington, 98204. The Executive has extended a $45.00 single, $51.00 double room rate to workshop participants. To reserve rooms call (206) 941-5689.

Workshop Registration Form

Name:
Address:
City, State, Zip:
Day Phone:
Position:

I would like to attend the session titled:

In _______ Spokane or _______ Federal Way
Please check one:
___ I have enclosed $70.00 Workshop Registration fee ($54.00 for ADI Members).
___ I have enclosed a Purchase order from my School District in the amount of

___ I have enclosed _______ for a group of _______ Participants ($60.00 per participant for groups of 5 or more).

8 DIRECT INSTRUCTION NEWS, SUMMER, 1987
Planning for Substitute Teachers

by Geoff Calvin

Lane E.S.D.
Robert Lowe,
Principal, Tacon, Wyoming

Editors note: This is a chapter from the book Establishing a Schoolwide Discipline Program by Geoff Calvin and available in paperback for $9.95 through Behavior Associates, P.O. Box 867, Delano, Minnesota 55328.

There are several reasons for this situation such as: the substitutes do not know the children; the assigned work is unclear; the substitute teacher does not follow the normal routine; the substitute teacher may try to just get through the day quickly. However, it would not be back the following day; children test the substitute teacher thinking they may be able to get away with more; and the substitutes may be unfamiliar with the discipline procedures throughout the school. At a recent workshop substitutes were asked to identify problems or difficult situations that arose while they were teaching. The following quotes were taken from the survey:

1. "I told a principal that I never would shut students up again. The kids had no respect and everyone did what they wanted to do.

2. "I once called one child only six at the time to his drum and bang. The kid had no respect and everyone did what they wanted to do.

3. "I went one student out to the hallways and he just disappeared. The principal could not find him and ended up having to call the police. I felt so bad.

4. "While showing a film one day I got hit in the face by a rock. No one stopped me or even said hello. So I stopped the film. Then all of the class got mad. I then said they had to do assignments and no one would do an assignment. So I just sat there at the desk and tried to read a book.

5. "I sent out one kid to the principal for calling me an obscene name and the principal sent the kid back to me with a note to take care of discipline myself and that I was supposed to be trained. I was furious.

6. "I could not read the teacher’s notes on what was supposed to happen to the children that were assigned to me. So I spent the whole day trying to make up math problems, reading problems etc. The children were no help. They kept saying things like, "We have already done that.", or "We normally have free time now."

While substitute teachers will have difficult times, they can be provided systematic assistance which will help to minimize the problems they are likely to have. There are two basic strategies for assisting substitute teachers: (1) Provide adequate communication from principal, classroom teacher, office staff and, support staff; (2) Use a behavior control system specifically designed for substitute teachers.

Provisioning Adequate Communication: The Role of the Building Principal

The building principal needs to communicate to the substitute that they are teachers and that they play a significant role in helping to teach the educational goals of the school. Substitutes need to feel that they belong and the principal’s attitude is a key factor in meeting this need. There are several specific steps a principal can take to assist the substitute teacher. These steps could be written down in a checklist and given to the principal (Principal does not need to rely on memory):

1. Assure the substitutes that they will be assisted with any problems and that they will be given the support needed to help the building should the principal be absent.

2. Introduce the substitute to key personnel, especially staff who may be working with the class in any capacity.

3. Take the substitute on a quick tour of the building and be sure to point out the kitchen, cafeteria, and classrooms.

4. Walk the substitute through school policy regarding problems and procedures (accidents, fire drill etc.).

5. Inform the substitute of any meetings or assemblies and invite him/her to attend where appropriate.

6. Let the substitute know when you will be available throughout the day should any questions arise.

7. Check occasionally throughout the day to see how the substitute is doing or to see if there are any problems.

8. Do not send discipline problems back to the classroom. This is how the substitute can thank you for your assistance.

9. Encourage teachers to maintain updated folders and lesson plans and check to see that they are kept current.

10. Inform the substitute of any specific problems or special programs for the students.

11. Have the substitute inform the principal of any special problems or special programs for the student.

12. Have any available current schedules for Music, Art, and P.E.

13. If possible have teachers prepare and discuss with the substitute in advance, the details of lesson plans (especially in the case of an extended absence). Some teachers make their telephone number available to substitute teachers.

14. Have the classroom teachers identify priority work from the lesson plans.

15. Give the substitute information of what can be told to the students regarding the teacher’s absence.

16. Give the substitute an up-to-date packet of information on school policy and procedure such as procedures for purchasing lunch if appropriate.

17. Encourage the substitute to do a good job and wish them well for the day.

Role of the Classroom Teacher

The classroom teacher is the one who can make or break the substitute teacher. If the lesson plans are complete and the substitute folder is current and sufficiently detailed then the substitute teacher can have a chance of making things easier. However, if the lesson plans are vague and the folder is quite inadequate then even the most capable substitute teacher will have a difficult time. The classroom teacher should attend to the following details in order to lay the groundwork for the substitute teacher:

1. Make available clear, precise and complete lesson plans for the duration of the substitute time in the classroom.

2. Make available the daily schedule and clearly identify any special activities.

3. Make available updated seating charts.

4. Ensure there is adequate work for all students and leave a file for extra work or alternative activities should the faster students finish early.

5. Indicate where materials are located.

6. Leave notes in the room to tell the teacher who is to complete the building should the principal be absent.

7. Leave the name of a teacher who may be called on for information or assistance. Ensure the designated teacher is aware of this arrangement.

8. Ensure the substitute folder is readily available and up-to-date.

9. Leave a copy of classroom rules and information on any specific discipline procedures or plans.

10. Leave the names of helpful or reliable students.

11. Leave some alternative activities in case the regular plans have to be changed.

12. Leave answer sheets.

13. Indicate whether or not the papers or assignments need to be graded. Leave a copy of the grading procedures.

14. Leave the teacher’s gradebook available.

15. Invite comment on how the daily’s went and establish some way for the substitute to provide feedback or to identify any pertinent information about the class.

16. With the substitute teacher well.

Role of Office Staff

Office staff can play a significant role in assisting the substitute teacher. Office staff should come forward to introduce themselves to the substitute and the help them with some of the clerical details such as signing in. Specifically, office staff could help with the following details:

1. Have substitute information on hand and where to sign in and out of the building.

2. The substitute to the classroom if the principal is unavailable.

3. Locate lesson plans and any information that the classroom teacher may have left for the substitute teacher.

4. Show the substitute where the children enter the room and or building and where the teacher begins supervision.

5. Provide any building information: manuals, fire drills, lunch, recess schedules and any exceptions for purchasing lunch if appropriate.

6. Inform the substitute of any particular changes in the schedule and notify them if the substitute teacher will be involved with the class that day.

7. Inform the substitute of any detail regarding materials or supplies.

8. Inform the substitute of teachers who may help and identify the teacher in charge should the principal be absent.

Role of Support Staff

Support staff can also provide important assistance to the substitute teacher. Support staff can make the transitions from regular classroom activities to the specialty activities much smoother if they attend to the following details:

1. Introduce yourself to the substitute teacher, and tell him/her exactly what specialist area you have and identify any specific requirements that may be necessary (where the children line up etc.).

2. Inform the substitute of any special materials you may need.
Two Consulting Models—Their Impact on Teachers

by Craig Darch* Auburn University

Russell Gersten and Gary Davis University of Oregon

Within the last decade a movement calling for the removal of the "pull out" or traditional resource room model in special education has developed, arguing that the core educational programs for mildly handicapped students should be conducted within the regular classroom. This movement has intensified in the past few years (Will, 1986; Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1986). Its emphasis has shifted to include the need to provide effective services for all low performing students rather than students who have gone through a formal identification process for special education placement. Will (1986) in a recent essay discusses some changes necessary for the implementation of this model and suggests the need for an individual within a school responsible for providing these services.

This alternative model calls for a new role for the special education teacher, that of providing consulting services to regular education teachers, in order to effect the needs of low achieving students in the regular classroom. However, the exact role of the person who provides and coordinates these services in the regular classroom has not been specified.

This research was supported in part by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education. The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of Philip Deubel, William Green, and Steve Stobie to this project.
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to believe that they are an essential part of the teaching system and that they have a clear, constructive function in the classroom. Finally, it is important for the substitute teacher to act quickly on behavioral infractions. They should not allow things to slowly get out of control. It is far better to sweep on behavior problems versus waiting to see if things go farther or go away.

Substitute teachers often experience hard times with behavior problems. Many of these problems can be prevented if there is a clearly formulated system to assist substitutes at the beginning of the term. These systems can be put into broad categories. First, school personnel (principal, office staff, support staff, and the classroom teacher) need to communicate important pieces of information to the substitute. Second, the substitute teacher should have a discipline plan, either one already in place, or one that the substitute readily uses. In addition, the substitute's attitude, in many respects, holds the key as to how the children will behave. If the substitute is business-like, work oriented, and behaves as though he is there to communicate that he or she is a serious teacher and an important teacher, then the children will more likely stay on task with the assigned work for the day(s).

crystalized. When the issue of providing technical assistance to regular educators is discussed, little is said about the role of resource teachers. Instead, the question of how resource teachers can carry out their assigned tasks effectively or how classroom teachers will acquire the skills needed to effectively high classroom teachers and in the classroom and in three instructional management functions. Gersten, Carnine, and Green (1981) have described six instructional management functions that served as a conceptual model for the present study. Research suggests that these functions need to be performed by resource teachers, facilitators and/or supervisors in order to have a serious impact on improving the quality of classroom practices. The six instructional management functions were: (1) planning and monitoring instruction, (2) directing the design of instruction, (3) monitoring student progress, (4) evaluating student progress, (5) providing feedback to students, and (6) providing feedback to teachers. (The second and third functions were subsumed under the first function.)

The purpose of the present study was to evaluate the effects of two different models of teacher consultation, each designed to maintain low-performing students in the regular classroom. To help achieve a rich picture of the effects of both the Direct Instruction and the All Schools Achievement Program supervision model (described below), quantitative and qualitative methodologies were used. In the present study, the observations of the resource teachers, and interviews with the regular classroom teachers were guided by a conceptual framework of those six instructional management functions. A conceptual framework of those six instructional management functions. A conceptual framework of those six instructional management functions.

Instructional Programs

The two instructional programs were All Schools Achievement Program (ASAP) and Direct Instruction Program for teaching academic skills (DI). Both programs had a cadre of resource teachers trained to provide support and technical assistance to help implement each instructional model. Both programs were designed to maintain the greatest number of low-performing students in the regular classroom by using resource teachers as consultants to the classroom teachers. ASAP is a district wide program based on principles of mastery learning and some of the research on time-on-task and effective teaching. Teachers use traditional basal reading and math series; however, they follow semi-scripted teachers' guides developed by the district while teaching the lessons. The guides highlight each phase of the lesson. Students are tested at the end of every unit (approximately once a week). Students who fail to pass the unit test are given a one-day "retesting" lesson. Students who pass the test are provided with enrichment activities. The teacher's rate of progress through the curriculum is monitored by the resource teacher. It is the resource teacher's role to facilitate impact of the model and provide technical assistance to the regular faculty. The Direct Instruction program must be considered highly structured. Teachers use scripted lesson formats oriented toward the explicit academic skill being taught. The format guides teachers with explicit wording to use, and specific procedures for correcting errors, reviewing material, and assessment.

The support functions listed below have particular relevance to efforts to assist classroom teachers in programming for special education students placed in regular classrooms and to "educationally at risk" students.

1. Direct Instruction Program
2. Provision for Climate for Improvement
3. Monitoring Student Progress
4. Monitoring Teacher Performance
5. Planning at Specific, Concrete, Technical Assistance
6. Miscellaneous

Method

Setting

The study was conducted in four urban schools in the West. In each school, the preponderance of students were low income, i.e., 91% qualified for free or reduced lunch. Ninety-three percent of the students were minorities (Black, Latino, or Asian). Each of the schools was fairly large (ranging from 500 to 1,150 students). Student mobility rates were relatively high. The overall achievement level of these schools was quite low in reading. Fifth grade scores ranked from the 5th to 22nd percentile on a standard score scale. A history of special education students was present, and students for special education pullout programs as a first service action.

Naturalistic Observations of Resource Teachers

Trained observers spent a full day with all resource teachers for each model, and in total 50 days were spent observing. This resulted in each resource teacher being observed for 46 days. When observed, the resource teachers were told to follow their normal routine for the day. In one case, this involved unpacking and sorting textbooks for five hours, but more typically, this involved classroom observation, record keeping, informal conferences with teachers, or conferences with the principal and/or other supervisors at various points during the day. In the DI resource teacher, observers served 14 teachers and 5 AEP resource teachers serving 25 teachers. When observing, the observer recorded the time and activity the resource teachers performed in the DI classrooms. Observers were structured to capture how effectively the resource teachers engaged in the six support functions listed earlier. At some point during the day, the observer discussed the resource teachers the purpose of specific activities.

Teacher Interviews

In total, 39 classroom teachers were interviewed individually. The semi-structured teacher interviews lasted 45 to 60 minutes. The items asked to teachers to describe what the supervisor did and how useful these activities were. Items ranged from a sample of administrative and technical assistance activities. In addition, teachers were asked to give an overall assessment of the usefulness of the observations-feedback process, areas for improvement and their feelings about the ASAP and DI programs. All interview items were field tested in pilot study (Green, Gersten, Miller, & Movrand, 1986) and revised once more.

Results

Results are discussed in two sections. First, the data from the interviews with the resource teachers is presented first to provide the context of how teachers felt the resource teachers met their administrative and technical assistance responsibilities and how useful teachers felt feedback from their resource teacher was. Next, naturalistic findings taken from the observations will be presented. In this analysis we will discuss our findings in the context of the six support functions.

Analysis of Interviews with Regular Classroom Teachers: A Contrast Between Two Models

Table 1 presents the data from the interviews conducted with the 39 regular classroom teachers served by the ASAP and DI resource teachers. Interview items are presented hierarchically. Items most closely tied to specific instructional low performers (items 1-3) are presented first under the Procedural/Supervisory rubric, while items most closely tied to adapting instructional practices for low performers (items 4-9) are next presented under the Technical Assistance rubric. All data are presented as the percentage of teachers who reported positively about how their resource teacher met their needs in the specific areas. Analysts of items from the teacher interviews suggest that although teachers perceive the models very similarly in some respects, in other, more important areas related to adapting instruction, particularly for the low-performing student, there are major differences in teacher perceptions.

For example, there were no significant differences between ASAP and DI teachers on each of the three procedural/Supervisory items. For all teachers the responses were quite positive. None of the test analyses revealed any significant differences between ASAP and DI teachers on each of the three procedural/Supervisory items.
of teachers emerge on items assessing in- structural areas which directly impact the characteristics of special education stu- dents in a regular classroom. For five of the six items, all of which are closely tied to instructional issues that have a direct impact on low-performing stu- dents, the DT teachers were significantly more positive in their responses when evalu- ating the role of the resource teacher than the ASAP teachers. For example, when asked if their resource teachers helped inter- pret and implement curriculum materials (item 5), 86% of the DT teachers responded positively, while only 44% of the ASAP teachers responded similarly (p < .005). Comparable outcomes were found for item 6 (Help with use of test information for teachers of the resource teacher help with classroom organization and management?), item 7 (Does your re- source teacher model different instructional strategies?), and, most importantly, item 4 (Does your re- source teacher provide suggestions to help the low-performing students in your class- room?)?

Table 2 presents another possibly even more important perspective taken from teacher interviews. Each of the five items on this interview instrument related teachers in gen- eral how useful they felt their resource teacher was. As can be noted, significant differences were found on each question. These data parallel the results on the Technical Assistance questions presented in Table 1.

Findings from Naturalistic Observations of the RT's

For the sake of brevity, findings from the naturalistic observations are consistent with the data from the teacher interviews and provide useful insights as to why teachers responded to the interview items as they did.

Visible commitment to program of imple- mentation. Activities relating to this area of support would best be characterized as administrative and programmatic. Teachers looked at activities such as, did the resource teachers get instructional materials for teachers and provide appropriate schedule modifications when necessary. Also assessed was whether resource teachers showed support of the instructional program which is through enthusiastic performance of their as- signed responsibilities. Observations indi- cate that all teachers felt their needs were met in this area.

Provision for climate for improvement.

The ASAP model did provide a system for resource teachers to focus in on problem encountered by classroom teachers. Unfortunately, the resource teachers rarely used the system to aggressively identify instruc- tional problems and also failed to implement alternatives. As an example, except for groups in the less successful placement in aca- demic groups, almost all of the problems at- tended to by the resource teachers were initi- ated by the classroom teacher. In these cases, the resource teacher would ask the ASAP re- source teacher and ask for assistance on a specific technical instructional/curriculum issue. The resource teacher rarely attempted

| Table 1. Classroom Teachers' Responses to Questions about the Role of Their Resource Teacher (RT). Results Reported in Percent for Those Responding Yes. |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Procedural and Supervisory Questions          | ASAP^a | Di^b    | P       |
| 1. Has your RT ever helped with student placement? | 79      | 84      | NS      |
| 2. Has your RT ever helped you to obtain materials? | 88      | 100     | NS      |
| 3. Has your RT ever observed your teaching? | 100     | 100     | NS      |
| Technical Assistance Questions                |         |         |         |
| 4. Has your RT ever made suggestions to you about how to help low performers in your classroom? | 48      | 79      | .03     |
| 5. Has your RT ever helped you to implement and interpret curriculum materials? | 44      | 86      | .005    |
| 6. Has your RT ever helped you with classroom organization and management? | 32      | 57      | .05     |
| 7. Has your RT ever modeled a lesson for you to observe? | 51      | 86      | .007    |
| 8. Has your RT ever provided you with test data for regrading students? | 57      | 87      | .02     |
| 9. Has your RT ever discussed student test results with you? | 44      | 36      | NS      |
| a (N = 25)                                    |         |         |         |
| b (N = 14)                                    |         |         |         |

<p>| Table 2. Classroom Teachers' Evaluations of the Usefulness of the Role of the Resource Teacher (RT) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ASAP^a</th>
<th>Di^b</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent was the overall quality of feedback helpful?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent was the RT's feedback helpful?</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent was the RT's feedback specific?</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent were the observations of the RT helpful?</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: Scores are based on a 5-pole scale with 5 = helpful, 3 = neutral, 1 = not helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (N = 25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (N = 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a = to identify classroom problems or the solutions during classroom visits.

One example helps document the above orientation. In this instance a regular class- room teacher was quite upset about a lesson. She was concerned about the performance of the low-functioning students placed in her group. She asked the resource teacher's advice on how to best modify instruction and although the resource teacher was supportive and did instead try to help the teacher cope with her concern, it was mostly accom- plished with statements such as "Don't worry, the program is good," "all you have to do is present the material and the kids will pick it up."

Monitoring student progress. The dis- satisfaction of the teachers served by the ASAP resource teacher was found in the lack of precise, explicit technical assistance pro- vided to them. Typically, help needed to be administrative.

An example from our observations will again serve to illustrate. Typically, when a DI resource teacher entered a classroom, she would check the work done by the students, noticing the type of errors which appeared on student papers. If these error patterns were consistent, the resource teacher would either immediately talk to the teacher or schedule a time to talk. What was fascinating when watching this resource teacher and the two interacting was that in each case these discussions focused upon the student, curriculum, and the teacher, and how the instructional situation could be modified to accommodate each student in the group.

Monitoring teacher performance. The monitoring of specific teacher instructional

activity is closely a critical variable when low-performing students are placed in main- streamed classrooms. The best chances for the successful accommodation of special education students would be developed if the resource teacher could track teacher behavior and provide feedback about critical in- structional skills. This type of monitoring is at the core of successful program modifications for the low-performing student (cf., Gentile, Wolfer, & Duff, 1980).

The findings from our observations provide an interesting contrast between the two resource teacher models. The DI resource teachers consistently focused on student performance issues. For example, these resource teachers often would ask: "How is Jerry (a child with problems in reading) doing on that reading unit?" "How is his independent seatwork coming along?" Of- ten, a DI resource teacher would observe the target children herself, working in a reading or math group, or evaluate their work. As can be easily noted, the DI resource teachers focused on important/relevant instructional issues often asked for by the classroom teachers.

Prevention of specific, concrete technical assistance. The key to the successful place- ment of low-performing students into the regular classroom is in the DI teacher's ability to provide the "nuts and bolts" of how to modify instruction to meet the needs of all the students in a classroom. As the interview data in Tables 1 and 2 show, differences between the resource teachers of the two models were significant.

Again, we present a vignette to illustrate our discussion. One afternoon, the ASAP

resource teacher had a brief discussion with a first grade teacher regarding the perform- ance of a skill-deficient student in her classroom. What transpired was similar to many other conversations that were observed.

First, the discussion dealt with paperwork, specifically about school policy regarding the appropriate method to fill out report cards. Teachers of both groups were very general and provided the teacher with little or no guidance; her comments were: "Do the best you can," and "Make sure all students in your group are doing OK." As before, there was no technical assistance given or methods to modify instruction to help this low-performing student.

Interpersonal thrust of most of the DI resource teachers was to provide explicit methods of instruction which were demonstrated to teachers and they received very useful. In contrast, the functional modifications were closely tied to student achievement.

Conclusions

Clear and important differences emerged between the two models in areas closely tied to the ability of regular classroom teachers to maintain low-performing students in the classroom. The results have important im- plications for the development of consulting teacher models.

First, the DI teaching and supervision model emphasized many teaching tech- niques shown to be closely tied to increased student achievement. The DI resource teach- ers focused on developing correction proce- dures, adjusting the type and frequency of teacher questions, and the appropriate use of explicit instructions. Also a focus of the group-instruction orientation in the regular classrooms, DI resource teachers were able to interact with students and provide them with the group-learning situation more interactive for the less-able students. Consequently, these teachers used the technical assistance provided by the ASAP resource teachers was social in their overall assessment of the helpfulness and clarity of the technical assistance they received (see Tables 1 and 2). After recording an unskilled number of supervision encounters by both DI and ASAP supervising teachers, we felt it was unclear whether the resource teachers were fulfilling their role in their classroom more interactive for low-performing students which possibly emerged as their most significant shortcom- ing.

It should be noted that the training the DI resource teachers received was extensive. No consulting teacher model can be effect- ive in maintaining low performer in the regular classroom unless supervisors are able to consistently help teachers "manage" the difficult students. In the present study, it was the ability of the DI resource teachers to translate teacher-effectiveness literature concisely, explicit procedures for the classroom teacher that teachers reacted to most positively. Needless to say, this consulting skill does not just develop, but is fostered from a model which trains the consulting resource teacher to (a) identify academic problems of the low performer, (b) generate workable remedies for these problems, (c) be able to coach the classroom teacher, and (d) negotiate with others on the instructional

Continued on Page 12
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implementation of the specified remedy.

The model of supervision in this study is vastly different from traditional resource consultant models. First, the DI model is probably best characterized as proactive. Problems are identified, and specific alternative teaching strategies are quickly generated to help the regular teacher solve a problem. Low-performing students were able to re-

tain in the instruction group. It was this proactive orientation which many of the teachers were most pleased about.

At the core of the DI model was the curriculum emphasis of classroom management. As discussed earlier, the DI resource teacher would carefully define student problems as curriculum problems. Thus, defined, solutions were interpretable to the classroom teachers. It seemed to us that when the ASAP resource teachers discussed the specific problems of the referring student with a teacher, the cause of and solution to the problem remained unindicated. Clearly, this is not the stuff of parent consultation is made of.

Leithaud and Green (1986) have described the instructional techniques of certain expert teachers. In their words, expert teachers: "constructed their lessons around a core of activities, and...used efficient routines to make effective use of the time spent in guided or monitored practice." (p. 15)

One major implication of the present study is that export supervisors do very much like export teachers. They provide explicit strategies for teachers on how to help maintain the lowest student to actively learn what is being taught.
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DI Returns to Peru—

Doug and Linda Carnine made presenta-

tions at San Augusto University in Arequipa, Peru after Doug gave an invited ad-

dress to the International Behavioral Psychology Conference. An enthusiastic group at the University is planning the initial stages of a Peruvian Direct Instruction program. Doug presented to a group of over 400 pro-

fessors and students on the DI Model and Instructional Design. He included demon-

strations of the Systems Impact Videoecodic programs in the Design lecture.

The Carnines also conducted a three hour workshop for about 40 participants from the larger cities in Peru on DI Reading. Profes-

sors Cuestas, who organized the Interna-

tional Conference, will meet with a subgroup of teachers, school psychologist, and gradu-

ate students to begin working on Spanish DI reading materials. The Carnines hope to facilitate their ef-

forts by providing state-side approaches using DI methods to teach reading in Spanish if they can be found, and by making appropri-

te texts available. Any Spanish speaking DI

experts or others interested in helping with the program should contact Doug or Linda Carnine in care of ADI. They could help in reviewing tapes or lessons, and possibly return to Peru to conduct training. Training would stay with University faculty facilities.

In 1981, the year ADI was founded, Wes Becker visited the International Conference on Behavioral Approach in Psychology and Education in Lima, Peru. After his visit, Dr. Liliana Mayo, who ran a school for retarded children just outside of Lima, came to the Eugene ADI Conference and was our guest speaker at the first annual ADI meeting.

She received a standing ovation for her presentation on the work going on in her school.
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August 1-5, 1987, Eugene, Oregon
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