

11-1-1985

A Description of the Individualized Achievement Center Program of the Omaha Public School District

Loma F. Howard

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Howard, Loma F., "A Description of the Individualized Achievement Center Program of the Omaha Public School District" (1985). *Student Work*. 2769.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2769>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

Footer Logo

A DESCRIPTION OF THE INDIVIDUALIZED ACHIEVEMENT
CENTER PROGRAM OF THE OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

Presented to the
Department of Educational Administration
and the
Graduate Faculty

University of Nebraska
at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Loma F. Howard

November, 1985

UMI Number: EP74297

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74297

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

FIELD PROJECT ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the Graduate faculty, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Specialist in Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Supervisory Committee

Name

Department

William J. Salata

Counseling & Special Education

R. W. Perry

Ed. Admin. + Super.

Doreen Keelams
Chairman

Date 1 - 21 - '86

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	2
DELIMITATIONS	3
LIMITATIONS	3
ASSUMPTIONS	3
METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED	4
DEFINITION OF TERMS	4
ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT	7
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
3. METHODOLOGY.	17
THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT	17
PROCEDURES	18
4. PRESENTATION OF DATA	20
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	24
SUMMARY	24
CONCLUSIONS	25
RECOMMENDATIONS	26
FOOTNOTES.	28
BIBLIOGRAPHY	30
APPENDIXES	33
A.	33
B.	36
C.	37
D.	38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The landmark law, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, that established mainstreaming as an integral part of our educational system was PL 94-142 passed by the United States Congress in 1975. Rule 51: Regulations for School Age Special Education Programs which established the regulations for school age special education programs in Nebraska was adopted by the Nebraska Department of Education in 1981.

Since the enactment of these laws and rules most special education students have been mainstreamed or placed in regular classes to the extent that their handicapping condition allowed. However, on the secondary level special education students were identified who did not succeed academically in some or all of their mainstreamed classes.

In an attempt to meet the needs of these students, the Special Education Department of the Omaha Public School District established a pilot program in 1983-84. This program outlined a multi-categorical Level II program to be called an Individualized Achievement Center (I.A.C.). The I.A.C. was established to serve a student population including Learning Disabled, Educable Mentally Handicapped, Mildly Behaviorally Impaired, Accoustically Handicapped, Visually Handicapped, Physically Disabled, and possibly, the non-special education low average student.

"The Report of the O.P.S. Senior High School Special Education Programming Task Force" (1982-83) which was compiled by the Task Force and presented to the O.P.S. School Board stipulated that all student placements must be made via the standard procedures of the O.P.S.

Special Education Department with proper consideration to federal and state guidelines. The definitions for handicapping conditions were set forth in 1981 by the Nebraska Department of Education in Rule 51. The definition of nonspecial education students as established by the task force would include the following students:

An established low-average I.Q. as measured by the WISC-R or other suitable individual psychological test. The student's standard scores must be commensurate with or below the student's full scale I.Q. Generally, the student should be functioning at or below the sixth grade academically. The student must have been unsuccessful in regular academic classes and must need structured assistance and a modified curriculum. This could include the student who no longer qualifies for a special education program though previously placed in special education. Current psychological examination must indicate a continued need for a modified instructional program.

Students within the I.A.C. are mainstreamed into these subject areas: English, Social Studies, Science, Math, P.E., Industrial Arts, Homemaking, Drama, Music, and Art. The teachers in the I.A.C. teach classes in English, Social Studies, Math and Vocational Awareness. Students are also qualified for the Work Experience Program through the Career Awareness and Readiness Training Program (C.A.R.T.) which is taught as a part of the Vocational Awareness classes.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the Individualized Achievement Center Program on the senior high school level in Omaha

Public School District. In order to do so, it was necessary for the investigator to answer the following questions:

1. What evidence exists that teachers of I.A.C. rooms are qualified to teach this type of room?
2. What evidence exists that the teachers of an I.A.C. have the time available to prepare materials for the students?
3. What evidence exists that students are being mainstreamed?
4. What evidence exists that materials are available for teaching I.A.C. students?
5. What evidence exists that the facilities available meet the needs of this type of room?

DELIMITATIONS

This study was limited to the Individualized Achievement Center Program as it is conducted in the three Senior High Schools in the Omaha Public School District.

LIMITATIONS

This study was limited to the current structure of each Individualized Achievement Center Program. Each of the three programs, although somewhat similar, has its own characteristics.

ASSUMPTIONS

The assumption was made that the questions used are appropriate in generating the evidence needed to obtain an accurate picture of the quality of education that is taking place in an Individualized Achievement Center.

METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED

1. Informal interviews were held with Jackie Hoyt, Supervisor of Special Education, Omaha Public Schools, for the purpose of discussing the goals of the I.A.C. and establishing criteria to be considered in formulating an evaluation instrument.
2. Informal interviews were held with current I.A.C. teachers concerning objectives of the I.A.C. teachers.
3. Informal sessions were held with Dr. William Callahan, Associate Professor of Special Education at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, concerning objectives of evaluation and methods of formulating evaluation instruments.
4. "The Report of the Senior High School Special Education Programming Task Force" was used to determine the original goals for this program.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Behaviorally Impaired: "Behaviorally impaired (BI) children are children with a serious condition exhibiting one or more of the characteristics specified in sufficient frequency, duration, or intensity to require intervention for educational, social, or emotional growth and development. The term shall include children who are autistic. The behavioral impairment cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors." (Nebraska Department of Education, Rule 51).
2. Categorical Program: An educational program organized, funded and provided for handicapped individuals with a specific type of disability (e.g., a program for the mentally retarded or

visually handicapped).

3. Cross-Categorical Program: An educational program organized to serve the mild to moderately handicapped, particularly those described as learning disabled (LD), emotionally handicapped (EH), and educable mentally handicapped (EMH), within the same resource class rather than in separate settings.
4. Educable Mentally Handicapped: "Educable mentally handicapped (EMH) children shall mean children of school age who, because retarded intellectual development as determined by individual psychological examination and deficiencies in social adjustment, require additional supportive services in order to function profitably within regular educational programming."
5. Least Restrictive Environment: "To the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children are educated with children who are not handicapped and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily." (Nebraska Department of Education, Rule 51).
6. Level I Programs: "Those programs which are established for the student with a verified handicapping condition who can profit from a regular class program through the provision of not more than three hours per week of supportive services." (Nebraska Department of Education, Rule 51).

7. Level II Programs: "Services which are established for a child with a verified handicapping condition who requires a special education program outside of the regular class program for a period of time exceeding three hours per week." (Nebraska Department of Education, Rule 51).
8. Mainstreaming: "Placing children in programs of no more special character than is absolutely necessary." (Council for Exceptional Children, Dybwad, p. 88).
9. Noncategorical Program: An educational program that is based on the type of service needed (e.g., special class, resource room) rather than on a categorical classification.
10. Regular Education: The educational program serving the non-handicapped students in the public schools.
11. Resource Room: An educational setting that provides assessment services, and remedial instruction to handicapped students on a regularly scheduled basis for a portion of the school day.
12. Self-Contained Room: An educational setting in which students are placed according to handicapping condition and where they receive the majority of their instruction.
13. Special Education: Programs and services (classes, instruction, materials, curricula, corrective services) designed to allow handicapped and gifted individuals to obtain an appropriate education and to develop to their fullest potential.
14. Specific Learning Disability: "Children of school age who have a verified disorder in one or more of the basic psycho-

logical processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which disorder may manifest itself in an inability to listen, think, speak, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations. Such term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing or motor disturbance, or of educational disadvantage." (Nebraska Department of Education, Rule 51).

ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT

Chapter I-Introduction

Chapter II-Related Literature

Chapter III-Methodology

Chapter IV-Presentation of Data

Chapter V-Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Before the enactment of PL 94-142, special education programs focused on the mentally retarded student. During the 1950's and 1960's special classes were the dominant organizational arrangement for the students with mild cognitive impairments. (Turnbull and Schutz, p. 54). Students were placed in self-contained classrooms where they were taught by a teacher using special materials, techniques and curricula. There was little interaction between the students in the educable mentally retarded (EMR) room and the students in the regular classroom. (Turnbull and Schutz, p. 54). Many researchers have questioned the self-contained special classroom as being academically underproductive and/or unnecessarily stigmatizing, particularly for the mildly handicapped pupil. (Glazzard, p. 67).

One of the requirements of PL 94-142 is the placement of children in a least restrictive environment has been defined by the Council for Exceptional Children to be "placing children in programs of no more special character than is absolutely necessary." (Dybwad, p. 88). For many handicapped children it has meant placement in the regular classroom. (Salend, p. 409).

The idea for least restrictive environment has been conceptualized in the form of mainstreaming. Mainstreaming has been defined to mean "children who need special support who are receiving high quality special education while they enjoy the personal, educational and social advantages of life in regular classes. It also means that quality education is going on at the same time." (Turnbull and Schutz, p. 8).

Further, it means that the regular teacher coordinates all pupil activities with the assistance of a staff of special educators, aides, principals, and other specialists. Together with parents, these personnel make up a team whose central concern is top flight instruction for all children.

When handicapped students were mainstreamed into regular classes they needed the support system of special education. This need brought about development of the resource center. The resource center was an educational setting that provided assessment services and related instruction to handicapped students on a regular basis for a part of the school day. (Turnbull and Schutz, p. 53). The special education self-contained class in most schools provided a more permanent educational program where students received part to all of their instruction. Students were assigned to these classes according to their handicap and the degree of severity.

School systems have developed a variety of mainstreaming programs that vary considerably regarding the administrative organization and the services offered. Within the resource room concept programs have been developed in the handicapping areas of Learning Disabilities, Behavior Disorder, and Educable Mentally Handicapped. The programs have been built upon the severity of the handicapping condition as the student was considered for Level I placement (regular classrooms with support in a resource room) or Level II placement (varying amounts of regular classroom and special class instruction.)

Recently there has been a trend toward multihandicapped special education programs. In the past, these programs have centered on the

handicapping condition of the student. These programs have been expanded to serve the mild to moderately handicapped student, particularly those categorized as learning disabled (LD), emotionally handicapped (EH), and educable mentally handicapped (EMH), within the same resource class rather than in separate settings. This has been termed "cross-categorical", "multicategorical" or "non-categorical", and represents one of the most current innovations in special education programming. (Vallecora, p. 131).

There were two strong points concerning the cross-categorical room. One was the ease of establishing it and the other was the ability to put students of different handicapping conditions together and teach to their similar needs.

In the establishment of a special education resource room when there were too few pupils in a particular category from any one school students from several buildings were brought together to form a class. A cross-categorical room offset the need for transportation by putting students together because of their educational needs. Cross-categorical rooms were especially appealing to administrators in small towns or rural areas.

The other main point in favor of the cross-categorical class or resource room was the ongoing controversy within the area of special education concerning the educational needs and characteristics of students labeled learning disabled (LD), emotionally handicapped (EH), and educable mentally handicapped (EMH). While these students maintained some categorical uniquenesses, they were not homogeneous in their behavior or instructional needs. Although the labels are used differently,

teachers have been unable to identify differentiating characteristics of learning disabled or emotionally handicapped students. There was clear evidence of behavioral overlap among the three categories most likely to be served in a cross-categorical room. The major distinction is the frequency of particular behaviors. (Vallecora, p. 133).

Cross-categorical resource programs have become popular. The number of states offering cross-categorical teaching certificates has increased during the last few years. As a result, the number of schools offering training programs for these certifications has also expanded. The Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities surveyed forty state departments and found that sixteen departments were reviewing regulations which would permit more cross-categorical placements. Of 193 educators surveyed, sixty-eight favored greater use of this model. This indicated that the cross-categorical trend was gaining momentum and that its use was likely to continue. (Vallecora, p. 134).

Evaluation is not new to special education. The major requirements and procedures for evaluation of special education programs funded under PL 94-142, The Education of all Handicapped Children Act, were established in Section 618 of the Act. The Act stipulated that the impact of program activities authorized under PL 94-142 be adequately evaluated. (Dunst, p. 24).

In Section 618, precise information and data were required as part of process evaluation. The requirements of product evaluation were general, applying to methods and procedures used in measuring the effectiveness of various program components. Overall, the Act required that

the program, empowered by PL 94-142, be measured and evaluated and that the results of state efforts to insure the free appropriate education of all handicapped children be assessed. (Dunst, p. 26).

Evaluation of pupils for placement and evaluation by state agencies for compliance with the federal mandate have long been a part of special education.

Stake (Saracho, p. 75) identifies three goals of educational evaluation (1) to foster an understanding of the curriculum, (2) to provide data for the reward of merit and for the correcting of shortcoming; and (3) to move the never-ending evolution of the curriculum toward a better balance among the rational, the intuitive, and the humane. (Saracho, p. 75).

Stufflebeam (Dunst, p. 24) outlined four levels of program evaluation (i.e. context, input, process, and product), each of which provides decision makers with relevant information for assessing the effectiveness of different aspects of program development and implementation.

Evaluation should be a part of any education program. However, evaluation of programs was often perceived as a judgmental process and a threat to programs rather than as an aid to program improvement. (Callahan, et al, p. 157). Program evaluation requires information on three dimensions of the program; its worth, its practicality, and its effectiveness. The worth of a program relates to the values of the educator and the underlying values of the program. The program's practical aspect can be measured by recording observations of the program's intentions; its effectiveness is supported with evidence about outcomes, which are observations, interviews, and questionnaires. (Saracho, p. 75).

"In special education, the knowledge of what and how much mentally retarded children learn is not advanced enough for creating a database sufficient for creating quality practice statements regarding child change." (Thomas, p. 199). Instead of comparing child change data available in a particular program against some arbitrary criteria, Dr. Laurence Sargent collects instructional outcome data available in a particular program in the hope that outcome data can be developed in the future. At present we only have the capability for comparing service delivery processes against quality practice criteria. (Thomas, p. 199).

Local school districts approached program improvements through a series of evaluation steps. The first step was to establish what the ideal delivery of services and outcomes would be. The second step was to develop a data collection procedure to determine how current services compared to the ideal. If a discrepancy existed between the ideal and the service provided, the agency could develop plans to initiate changes to achieve the ideal level of service. A local school district might best be serviced by implementation of some type of formative evaluation involving a continuous data collection and program monitoring. (Thomas, p. 200).

Often program evaluations were poorly conceived and poorly timed. Too often these evaluations were made up of bits and pieces of information that did not reflect a sense of the wholeness of the program. Lieberman and McNeil (p. 121) outlined a concise, realistic approach to both internal and external evaluation. The plan had a three-part conceptual framework involving the nature and needs of students, the

goals and objectives of the program, and the match between the two.

California had a state-wide evaluation program for special education based on local agencies evaluating their programs and the Department of Education using this information to address questions of state and national importance. (Scheffelin, Ragsdale, and Martinez, p. 87). In order for a local agency to have the capability for evaluation the agency must develop "(1) the ability to report data accurately and on time, (2) the ability to ask an evaluation question, design and carry out a study to answer that question, and (3) to use the information to improve programs." (Scheffelin, Ragsdale, and Martinez, p. 87). Key features of the California effort were local control of evaluation questions, efficient design of evaluation studies, use of existing information and staff, collection of information as a part of the cycle of services to students, and ongoing statewide technical assistance tailored to the organizational structure and resources of each local education agency. (Scheffelin, Ragsdale, and Martinez, p. 87).

Another method used to provide evaluation services was the Program Evaluation Team. The team method provided three kinds of evaluation services: (A) director of special services, (B) special education teacher, (C) regular education teacher, (D) support specialist and (E) school administrator. Each member was responsible for surveying the evaluation information needs about special service programs in his/her own reference group. Team members were selected by either a staff committee or by the director of special services. Training in evaluation of programs was provided the Team in the form of workshops targeted at developing skills necessary for members to function effectively.

(Maher, p. 456).

Maher and Barbrack (p. 413) present Special-Service Program Evaluation as an alternative for providing an objective basis for making decisions about program design and delivery. Such evaluation would be conceptualized as a broad-based methodology that attempted to judge the worth of a program by examining different aspects of it, thereby contributing to program decision making. Special-Service Program Evaluation has been defined as a process of acquiring technically adequate information on the design, performance, and impact of a special-service program and reporting that information to program decision-makers to assist them in deciding about the relative worth of the program.

The diversity of special education services, combined with the importance of goal-based evaluation approaches. (Maher, p. 525). Goal attainment scaling has been used widely to evaluate a range of human service programs. Utilization of the approach allowed for the individualization of program goals where the needs of the client (e.g., individual group) and nature of the program (e.g., counseling, instructional) were accounted for in an explicit manner by the evaluator. The GAS method was a program evaluation approach, with its primary feature being the development of a scaling process for evaluating levels of goal attainment could be useful for criterion-referenced program evaluation activities. Successful implementation and utilization of GAS method at the local education agency level required that practitioners (a) possess understanding of potential measurement and statistical issues, (b) be aware of the overall advantages and limitations of the approach, and (c) apply certain guidelines in developing a GAS system. (Maher, p. 538).

Evaluation should be as much a part of the special education delivery system as the books and instructional materials. Some school districts are very proud of their innovative programming and good facilities; but, if these programs and facilities are not evaluated, there is no assurance that the children they serve, parents, or taxpayers are receiving any benefit either from the innovations or the money spent on facilities. Evaluation can assist in pointing out the need for making major program changes or contribute to the fine tuning of a very strong program. (Thomas, p. 201).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The noncategorical resource room is one of the newer forms of special education classrooms. In these rooms students are placed according to academic abilities rather than handicapping conditions. On the senior high school level, the Omaha Public School District had three centers, one at each of these schools, Benson, Burke, and Central. These rooms were referred to as Individualized Achievement Centers.

The purpose of this paper was to develop an instrument for the evaluation of the I.A.C. program on the senior high school level of O.P.S.

THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

In developing this instrument it was necessary to determine the goals of the Special Education Programming Task Force in establishing the I.A.C. program in 1983. "The Report of the Senior High School Special Education Programming Task Force" described the student population, discussed placement of students, determined facilities for the classrooms, and outlined the curriculum to be taught. The task force also included recommendations for program development and implementation.

When preparing the evaluation instrument these questions were first considered:

1. What evidence exists that teachers of an I.A.C. are qualified

to teach this type room?

2. What evidence exists that the teachers of an I.A.C. have time available to prepare materials for the students?
3. What evidence exists that students are being mainstreamed?
4. What evidence exists that materials are available for teaching I.A.C. students?
5. What evidence exists that the facilities available meet the needs of this type of room?

These questions were then separated into smaller parts in order to facilitate answering by the individual teachers and the compilation of the information from the instrument.

PROCEDURES

After the completion of the evaluation instrument, a copy was sent to Dr. Joseph Gaughan, Assistant Superintendent of Special Education for Omaha Public School District, for his approval and for his permission to send the instrument to the teachers of the I.A.C. rooms.

Upon receipt of consent from Dr. Gaughan, the instrument was sent to I.A.C. teachers at Benson (three teachers), Burke (two teachers), and Central (two teachers). It was decided to send the evaluation form to the teachers who have the responsibility for the students; therefore, at Benson, only the three teachers who have class lists for the I.A.C. were included.

A short cover letter which explained the instrument was included when it was sent to the teachers. The letter stipulated that replying

to the form was voluntary. The letter also set May 10, 1985 as the return date. On May 10, 1985 only two forms had been returned.

Another letter was sent to the non-returning teachers requesting that they complete the form and return it by June 1, 1985, the last day of the school year.

The form was returned completed by four teachers who represented two of the high schools that currently house the I.A.C. program. This represented a 57 percent return of the completed forms. One of the forms was returned by a teacher who was hired at second semester to complete the year after the previous teacher resigned.

CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF DATA

In reviewing the report of the Special Education Task Force that established the I.A.C. program on the senior high school level, six objectives were selected to be used as evaluation criteria. In developing the evaluation instrument, these objectives were written as questions. The questions were then divided into small parts to facilitate answering the questions and compiling the answers.

In presenting the data each question will be considered individually.

1. What evidence exists that teachers of an I.A.C. room are qualified to teach this type room?

Three of the responding teachers possessed the education, certification and experience that would qualify them to teach in this type room. The fourth teacher was completing the year for a teacher who had moved, and, while the teacher was a certified teacher, he/she lacked the special education training and certification necessary to teach in this type of room. (See Appendix D).

2. What evidence exists that the teachers of an I.A.C. have school time available to prepare materials for the students?

The responding teachers indicated that they had from four to twenty-three preparations per day. Each teacher had two planning periods per day. The average teacher in regular secondary education has two planning periods per day and has one to three preparations per day. (This was determined by checking the schedule of calls at Burke

High School). (See Appendix D).

3. What evidence exists that I.A.C. students are being mainstreamed?

A review of student schedules indicated that I.A.C. students are being mainstreamed into twenty-four classes in thirteen subject areas. See Table I.

TABLE I

Subject Areas I.A.C. Students Were Mainstreamed
Into During the 1984-85 School Year With
The Number of I.A.C. Students Enrolled in Each Area

Subject Area	Students Enrolled
Art	8
Business/Typing	8
Drama/Stagecraft	4
English/Reading	17
Home Economics	10
Industrial Arts	19
Math	7
Music, Vocal	2
Physical Education	49
Science	26
Social Studies	4
ROTC	2

4. What evidence exists that materials are available for teaching I.A.C. students?

Teachers are using regular classroom texts in English, Math, and Social Studies classes as the Task Force recommended. I.A.C. teachers are doing individualization of student classwork and are using a wide range of materials to supplement the regular texts to meet the needs of the students. Teachers were also using the Special Education Media Center for taped textbooks, especially when using the textbooks from regular education. (See Appendix D).

5. What evidence exists that the handicapping conditions of the I.A.C. students are compatible socially and academically?

Teachers responding to the survey indicated that LD and EMH students tended to be socially and academically compatible. Most behavior problems (i.e., "fighting", leading other students into trouble") were attributed to LD or BI students. Some BI in the program were changed into other educational settings due to the severity of the problem. Teacher response also indicated that assessment of social skills was provided only for BI students. (See Appendix D).

TABLE II

Number of Students Served in I.A.C.
According to Handicapping Conditions

	LD	EMH	BI	AH	VH	Phy.H.
Teacher One	0	7	0	0	0	0
Teacher Two	9	12	2	0	0	0

TABLE II
(continued)

	LD	EMH	BI	AH	VH	Phy.H.
Teacher Three	8	9	0	2	0	0
Teacher Four	5	20	5	1	3	0

6. What evidence exists that I.A.C. facilities meet the need of this type of class?

Classrooms in one center are small; in the other center the teachers are not assigned a classroom and travel to various rooms throughout the building. Physical needs for a special education classroom are not provided for traveling teachers. All teachers do not have study carrels, telephone access, filing cabinets, storage cabinets; electrical outlets were in places where they could not be used for student needs.

A complete compilation of the data gained from this study is found in Appendix D.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The Special Education Department of the Omaha Public School District established the Individualized Achievement Center, a multicategorical special education class on the senior high level in 1983.

The multicategorical classroom is one of the new programs in special education. Students are placed in a multicategorical program because of the similarities of their academic needs rather than due to their handicapping condition. A multicategorical program can serve students with these handicapping categories: Learning Disabilities, Educable Mentally Handicapped, Mildly Behaviorally Impaired, Acoustically Handicapped, Visually Handicapped, Physically Disabled and, possibly, the non-special education low average student. At this time, the I.A.C. programs in O.P.S. have not served the non-special education low average student.

In 1982-83, two high schools, Burke and Central, originated the I.A.C. program. In 1984-85, a third high school, Benson, was added to the program.

Within the structure of the I.A.C., students are divided into grade levels as are regular high school students. I.A.C. teachers follow the scope and sequence of regular education. Students are mainstreamed into regular classes whenever it is possible to do so. Emphasis is placed on the Vocational Awareness classes stressing abilities needed to hold a job after completion of high school. Students are

encouraged to participate in the Work Experience Program, a work-study program for special education students in the Omaha Public School District.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the Individualized Achievement Center program. In formulating the evaluation instrument six questions were asked:

1. What evidence exists that teachers of an I.A.C. are qualified to teach this type room?
2. What evidence exists that the teachers of an I.A.C. have school time available to prepare materials for the students?
3. What evidence exists that I.A.C. students are being mainstreamed?
4. What evidence exists that materials are available for teaching I.A.C. students?
5. What evidence exists that I.A.C. facilities meet the needs of this type of room?

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the evidence generated by the study these conclusions are drawn:

1. Of the four responding teachers, three were qualified to teach in this type program. The fourth teacher, although a certified teacher, was not certified to teach in special education.
2. All students in the I.A.C. are mainstreamed into at least one regular education class per day.
3. Materials are available for teaching these students using both text books from regular education and supplementary materials.

4. Teachers indicated that they had from four to twenty-four class preparations per day with two planning periods. It is assumed that the large difference is based upon individualization of instruction and upon the subject being taught. Many teachers would find it difficult to manage this number of preparations per day with two planning periods.
5. As a step in the placement process for the I.A.C. program, students must receive testing in social skills to determine their social compatibility with students of other handicapping conditions. Students who are categorized as Behavior Dis-oriented must be determined to be within the "moderate" level.
6. The classrooms and facilities within the classrooms do not conform with the guidelines established by the Task Force. Some classrooms are quite small. Some teachers did not have an assigned classroom and had to travel to various classrooms within the building. All classrooms did not have carrels, typewriters, telephones, tape recorders, electrical outlets.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings in this study the following recommendations are presented:

1. "Grouping", the placement of students in small groups of similar ability levels, rather than "individualizing", working with each student at his/her ability level, would decrease the numbers of preparations per day for I.A.C. teachers without altering the purposes of the Task Force when setting up

the program.

2. Screening must be done to determine if Behaviorally Impaired students meet the qualification of "mild to moderately handicapped" before placement in an I.A.C. is made.
3. Teachers should be assigned a permanent classroom of adequate size equipped with the proper number of desks, study carrels, tape recorders, electrical outlets, storage cabinets, filing cabinets with access to a telephone as recommended by the Task Force Committee.

FOOTNOTES

- Callahan, Carolyn; Covert, Robert; Aylesworth, Martin; and Vanco, Peggy
"Evaluating a Local Gifted Program: A Cooperative Effort,"
Exceptional Children, Vol. 48, No. 2, (October 1981), pp. 157-163.
- Dybwad, Gunnar, "Avoiding Misconceptions of Mainstreaming, the Least
Restrictive Environment, and Normalization," Exceptional Children,
Vol. 47, (October 1984), pp. 85-89.
- Glazzard, Peggy, "Training Students to Work Independently in the
Classroom," Teaching Exceptional Children, Vol. 14, (Winter 1981),
pp. 66-71.
- Lieberman, Laurence E., and McNeil, Donald, "Evaluating Special Edu-
cation Programs," Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 15, No. 2,
(February 1985), pp. 87-88.
- Maher, Charles A., "Evaluating Special Services Using a Program Evalu-
ation Team," Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 20, (October 1983),
pp. 456-458.
- Maher, Charles A., "Goal Attainment Scaling: A Method for Evaluating
Special Education Services", Exceptional Children, Vol. 49, No. 6,
(April 1983), pp. 529-536.
- Maher, Charles A., "Program Evaluation of a Special Education Day
School for Conduct Problem Adolescents," Psychology in the Schools,
Vol. 18, No. 2, (April 1981), pp. 211-217.
- Maher, Charles A., and Barbrack, Christopher R., "Perspective and
Principles for the Evaluation of Special-Service Programs,"
Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 17, No. 4, (October 1980), pp. 485-
490.
- Salend, Spencer J., "Factors Contributing to the Development of Suc-
cessful Mainstreaming Programs," Exceptional Children, Vol. 50,
pp. 408-409.
- Saracho, Olivia, "New Dimensions in Evaluating the Worth of a Program",
Education, Vol. 103, (Fall 1982), pp. 74-77.
- Scheffelin, Margaret Merrick; Ragsdale, David; and Martinez, Jose;
"Program Evaluation in Special Education: From Policy to Practice
in California," Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 18, No. 2,
(February 1985), pp. 87-88.
- Thomas, M. Angele, "Evaluating Programs for Retarded Students: A
Conversation with Laurence R. Sargent," Education and Training of
the Mentally Retarded, (October 1982), pp. 196-201.

- Turnbull, Ann and Schulz, Jane, Mainstreaming Handicapped Students: A Guide for the Classroom Teacher, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1979.
- Vallecorsa, Ada L., "Cross-Categorical Resource Rooms: An Emerging Trend in Special Education," Education, Vol. 104, (Winter 1983), pp. 131-136.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Callahan, Carolyn; Covert, Robert; Aylesworth, Martin; and Vanco, Peggy; "Evaluating a Local Gifted Program: No. 2, (October 1981), pp. 157-163.
- Dybwad, Gunnar, "Avoiding Misconceptions of Mainstreaming, the Least Restrictive Environment, and Normalization," Exceptional Children, Vol. 47, (October 1984), pp. 85-89.
- Finn and Resnick, "Issues in the Instruction of Mildly Retarded Children," Educational Researcher, Vol. 13, No. 3, (March 1982), pp. 9-12.
- Gajar, Anna, "Educable Mentally Retarded, Learning Disabled, Emotionally Disturbed: Similarities and Differences," Exceptional Children, Vol. 45, (March 1985), pp. 470-472.
- Glazzard, Peggy, "Training Students to Work Independently in the Classroom," Teaching Exceptional Children, Vol. 14, (Winter 1981), pp. 66-71.
- Lieberman, Laurence E., and McNiell, Donald, "Evaluating Special Education Programs," Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 15, No. 2, (February 1985), pp. 87-88.
- Maher, Charles A., "Evaluating Special Services Using a Program Evaluation Team," Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 20, (October 1983), pp. 456-458.
- Maher, Charles A., "Goal Attainment Scaling: A Method for Evaluating Special Education Services", Exceptional Children, Vol. 49, No. 6, (April 1983), pp. 529-536.
- Maher, Charles A., "Program Evaluation of a Special Education Day School for Conduct Problem Adolescents," Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 18, No. 2, (April 1981), pp. 211-217.
- Maher, Charles A., and Barbrack, Christopher R., "Perspective and Principles for the Evaluation of Special-Service Programs," Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 17, No. 4, (October 1980), pp. 485-490.
- Nebraska Department of Education, Guidelines for the Verification of Speech Handicapped, Learning Disabled, Educable Mentally Handicapped, Mentally Retarded, and Behaviorally Impaired in the State of Nebraska, Nebraska Department of Education, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1983.
- Nebraska Department of Education, Rule 51: Regulations for School Age Special Education Programs, Nebraska Department of Education, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1981.

- Olson, Judy, and Midgett, Jeanice, "Alternative Placements: Does a Difference Exist in the LD Populations?" Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 17, (February 1984), pp. 101-103.
- Omaha Public Schools, "Report of the Senior High School Special Education Programming Task Force," Omaha, Nebraska, Omaha Public Schools Department of Special Education, 1983. (Mimeographed).
- Omaha Public Schools, "Review of the I.A.C.," Omaha, Nebraska, Omaha Public School District, Department of Special Education, 1984. (Mimeographed).
- Roddy, Eugene A., "When are Resource Rooms Going to Share in the Declining Enrollment Trend? Another Look at Mainstreaming," Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 17, No. 15, (May 1984), pp. 279-281.
- Ryan, Dennis, "Mainstreaming Isn't Just for Students Anymore," Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 17, No. 3, (March 1984), pp. 167-169.
- Salend, Spencer J., "Factors Contributing to the Development of Successful Mainstreaming Programs," Exceptional Children, Vol. 50, pp. 408-409.
- Salend, Spencer and Lutz, J. Gary, "Mainstreaming or Mainlining: A Competency Based Approach to Mainstreaming," Vol. 17, No. 1, (January 1984), pp. 36-38.
- Saracho, Olivia, "New Dimensions in Evaluating the Worth of a Program," Education, Vol. 103, (Fall 1982), pp. 74-77.
- Scheffelin, Margaret Merrick; Ragsdale, David; and Martinez, Jose; "Program Evaluation in Special Education: From Policy to Practice (February 1985), pp. 87-88.
- Swanson, H. Lee, "Process Assessment of Intelligence in Learning Disabled and Mentally Retarded Children: A Multidirectional Approach," Educational Psychologist, Vol. 19, No. 3, (March 1984), pp. 149-162.
- Thomas, M. Angele, "Evaluating Programs for Retarded Students: A Conversation with Laurence R. Sargent," Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, (October 1982), pp. 196-201.
- Turnbull, Ann and Schulz, Jane, Mainstreaming Handicapped Students : A Guide for the Classroom Teacher, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, (1979).
- Vallecorsa, Ada L., "Cross-Categorical Resource Rooms: An Emerging Trend in Special Education," Education, Vol. 104, (Winter 1983), pp. 131-136.

Zigmond, Naomi and Silverman, Rita, "Informal Assessment of Program Planning and Evaluation in Special Education," Educational Psychologist, Vol. 19, No. 3, (Fall 1982), pp. 163-171.

Evaluation of I.A.C.

1. What evidence exists that teachers of I.A.C.'s are qualified to teach this type room?

Certificate(s) held:

Degree(s) held:

Experience before I.A.C.:

Class taught:

Number of years:

Experience in I.A.C.:

Subject areas taught:

Number of years:

College major(s):

2. What evidence exists that the teachers of an I.A.C. have school time available to prepare materials for the students?

Number of planning periods per day:

Number of class preparations per day:

Subjects you are teaching:

Number of students per day you are teaching:

APPENDIX A

3. What evidence exists that I.A.C. students are being mainstreamed?

Student	Mainstreamed classes	I.A.C. classes
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
22.		
23.		
24.		
25.		

APPENDIX A

4. What evidence exists that materials are available for teaching I.A.C. students?

Textbooks in subject areas taught:

Supplementary books (novels, reading materials, etc.)

Taped textbooks and other taped materials:

5. What evidence exists that the handicapping conditions of the I.A.C. students are compatible socially and academically?

Learning Disabled:

Educable Mentally Handicapped:

Behaviorally Impaired:

6. What evidence exists that I.A.C. facilities are adequate? Is the classroom size appropriate to number of students?

Are physical needs provided:

Desks

Carrels

Electrical Outlets

Filing Cabinets

Storage Cabinets

APPENDIX B

April 10, 1985

Dear

As a part of my field project for the Specialist in Education degree at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, I am formulating an instrument for the evaluation of the senior high school Individual Achievement Center program.

Would you please complete the form that is included with this letter and return it to me by May 10.

Participation in this activity is voluntary.

Thank you in advance,

Loma Howard

APPENDIX C

May 21, 1985

Dear

On April 10, I sent you an Evaluation Form for the I.A.C. The information gained from this form is to be used on my field project in Special Education Administration.

I have not received a completed copy of this form from you. Would you please complete this form and return it to me before school is out, June 1.

Thank you,

Loma Howard.

APPENDIX D

COMPILATION OF DATA

1. What evidence exists that teachers of an I.A.C. are qualified to teach this type room?

Certificates and Degree Held:

Teacher One: Nebraska Teaching Certificate; Bachelor of Arts

Teacher Two: Nebraska Teaching Certificate, Iowa Teaching Certificate; Bachelor of Science in Education.

Teacher Three: Nebraska Professional Teaching Certificate, Texas Permanent Teaching Certificate, Arizona Teaching Certificate; Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Science.

Teacher Four: Iowa Permanent Professional Teaching Certificate, Nebraska Teaching Certificate; Bachelor of Science; Master of Science.

<u>Experience before I.A.C.</u>	<u>Number of years</u>
<u>Teacher One:</u> Ninth Grade English	Two years
<u>Teacher Two:</u> Junior/Senior High-EMH	Two years
Senior High EMH	Three years
Senior High DRC	Three years
<u>Teacher Three:</u> Junior High Social Studies	One year
Elementary School, Grades Four, Five and Six	Thirteen years
Senior High DRC	Eight years
<u>Teacher Four:</u> High School Resource Room	Four years
Special Education Consultant	Five years

APPENDIX D

Experience in I.A.C.College MajorTeacher One: One Semester

English

Teacher Two: Two yearsElementary Education/Special
EducationTeacher Three: One yearSecondary Ed./Social Studies
Special Ed./Learning
DisabilitiesTeacher Four: One yearEnglish/Psychology/Special
Education

2. What evidence exists that the teachers of an I.A.C. have school time available to prepare materials for the student?

Planning Periods per DayClass Preparations per DayTeacher One: Two

Four

Teacher Two: TwoTwenty-three average/due to
individualized classworkTeacher Three: TwoMinimum of five/not counting
individualized classworkTeacher Four: Two

Six

Subject TaughtNumber of Students per DayTeacher One: Reading,
Spelling, English, Two
DRC

Forty-five

Teacher Two: Am. Govt.,
Am. Hist., World Hist.,
Math 10S, 11S, 12S

Fifty-one

Teacher Three: English 10S, 11S,
12S, Vocational Awareness 10, 11

Fifty-seven

Teacher Four: English 10, 11,
Vocational Awareness 10, 11 DRCThirty (approx-
imately some twice a
day)

APPENDIX D

3. What evidence exists that IAC students are being mainstreamed?

<u>Mainstreamed Classes</u>	<u>Total Students Enrolled</u>
Physical Education	49

Teacher One: Target Spelling Series, Survival Spelling, RD 2000 Reading, Lauback Reading Series, SRA Reading Laboratory.

Teacher Two: Math 12S: Essentials in Math, Working Makes Sense, Budgeting Makes Sense, Math for Today - Blue Book, Math for Today - Red Book; Math 11S: Math for Today - Blue Book, Spectrum Math Series; Math 10S: Spectrum Math Series, The Banking Book; Social Studies 10S (American Government): American Civics, Civics (5th Edition); Social Studies 11S (American History): Exploring Our Nation's History, Workbook to the American Nation, The Story of our America, Books 1 and 2; Social Studies 12S (World History): World History, World History and You, Books 1 and 2.

Teacher Three: English 10S: Glencoe 10, Nova, Language Exercises, Red Book, Triple Takes Reading Series, English on the Job, Book I, The Outsiders; English 11S: Glencoe 11, Album, Language Exercises, Blue, Gold Books, Specific Skills Series, Reading, English on the Job, Book II, Hiroshima; English 12S: Language Exercises, Red, Blue, Gold, and Green Books, Specific Skills Series, Reading, What It Takes, Of Mice and Men; Vocational Awareness 10: Entering the World of Work, Nebraska Simplified Driver's License Manual, CART 10 Materials; Vocational Awareness 11: Entering the World of Work, You, the Consumer, CART, Job

APPENDIX D

Seeking, CART, Job Keeping, Nebraska Simplified Driver's License Manual.

Teacher Four: English: Glencoe English, The Outsiders, The Old Man and the Sea. Vocational Awareness: Entering the World of Work.

<u>Mainstreamed Classes</u>	<u>Total Students Enrolled</u>
ISIS Science	25
Art	8
Reading	8
English	7
Math	7
Food/Nutrition	7
Keyboard/Typing	6
Building/Construction	5
Woods Fundamentals	4
Small Engines Fundamentals	4
Auto Fundamentals	3
Psychology	2
American History	2
Stagecraft	2
Drama	2
Comprehensive Home Economics	2
Music, Vocal	2
R.O.T.C.	2
Astronomy	1
American Government	1

APPENDIX D

<u>Mainstreamed Classes</u>	<u>Total Students Enrolled</u>
Child Development	1
Metals Fundamentals	1

4. What evidence exists that materials are available for teaching I.A.C. students?

Textbooks in Subject Areas Taught:

Supplementary Books (novels, reading materials, etc.):

Teacher One: Too numerous to mention.

Teacher Two:

Social Studies 10S: Citizenship Review, Your Government and You;

Social Studies 11S: Workbook to the American Nation;

Social Studies 12S: World History (G-Level Text);

Math 10S, 11S, 12S: Banking and Budgeting, Working with Money, Shopping Lists Game, Money Makes Sense, Dollars Make Sense.

Teacher Three:

English: The Outsiders, Hiroshima, Of Mice and Men; There was very little supplementary reading material in the classroom.

Teacher Four: Too numerous to mention.

Taped Textbooks and other taped material:

Teacher One:

APPENDIX D

Superthink Sport Series; several "home-made" tapes.

Teacher Two:

From Special Education Media Center: All general level Social Studies texts.

Teacher Three:

From Special Education Media Center: All English Texts and texts for novels used in classroom.

Teacher Four:

No reply.

5. What evidence exists that the handicapping conditions of the I.A.C. students are compatible socially and academically?

Teacher One:

All students are in the same category (EMH).

EMH: Yes, for the most part. Some are more socially mature than others, but they all get along well.

BI: No students.

Teacher Two:

LD and EMH: The LD and EMH students that we work with are captible. (The only near fight was between two LD students).

BI: The BI students that are leaders tend to lead other students into trouble, especially if the follower has trouble saying no.

Teacher Three:

LD and EMH: Students were socially compatible; most

APPENDIX D

behavior problems caused by LD or BI students.

BI: I started the year with two, both were sent into another placement by the end of the first semester; both were too severe for this program.

Teacher Four:

LD and EMH: All have low academic scores--no documentation of social skill assessment that I am aware of other than for students identified as BI.

6. What evidence exists that IAC facilities are adequate?

Is the classroom size appropriate to the number of students?

Teacher One: Yes, for the number of students in my class the room is large enough.

Teacher Two: Rooms are much too small--one will seat ten; the other room--fifteen. The smaller room has no room for carrels. The larger room lacks outlets for use of cassette players. The two rooms are across the hall from one another.

Teacher Three: Same as two.

Teacher Four: Classes are held in various rooms throughout the building.

Are physical needs provided?

Desks:

Teacher One: Yes

Teacher Two: Yes, but the runners mar the floor.

Teacher Three: Yes, but when I had seventeen students I could

APPENDIX D

not get more desks (there are fifteen in the room).

Teacher Four: Yes

Carrels:

Teacher One: No

Teacher Two: No, room size does not allow carrels

Teacher Three: Yes, two only.

Teacher Four: No

Electric Outlets:

Teacher One: Yes

Teacher Two: Two, adequate for the size of the room.

Teacher Three: Two, but not in proper places for usage in
this type of room.

Teacher Four: Yes

Telephone:

Teacher One: No

Teacher Two: Yes, next door in another room.

Teacher Three: No

Teacher Four: No

Filing Cabinets:

Teacher One: Yes

Teacher Two: Yes

Teacher Three: Yes

Teacher Four: No

Storage Cabinets:

Teacher One: Yes

Teacher Two: Yes

Teacher Three: Yes

Teacher Four: No